



AENSI Journals

Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences

ISSN:1991-8178

Journal home page: www.ajbasweb.com



The Learning Transfer System Inventory: Competencies and Performance Among Employees in Sabah Hotel Industry

Toh Pei Sung and Arsiah Bahron

Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Faculty of Business, Economics and Accounting, Jalan UMS, 88400 Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 11 October 2014

Received in revised form 21 November 2014

Accepted 25 December 2014

Available online 16 January 2015

Keywords:

Secondary influence, motivation, environment, ability, reaction, Competencies, employee performance, hotel

ABSTRACT

Background: Employees are one of the important elements in the hotel industry as they are the main assets in providing excellent service quality towards the customers. In order to provide an excellent service, employee training is a very prominent factor. Therefore, the training outcomes should be evaluated to ensure that the training contributed to an increase in competencies and employee performance. **Objective:** The aim of this paper is to examine the relationship between learning transfer, competencies and performance among employees especially in Sabah hotel industry. **Results:** The main results indicated that secondary influence and motivation have significant relationship with employee performance. The results also revealed that all transfer-related factors have significant relationship with competencies. Besides that, the results showed that competencies as a mediator has mediation effect on the relationship between transfer-related factors (secondary influence; motivation; environment) and employee performance. **Conclusion:** This study contributes to the theory of the formation of a new model of learning transfer in which contains the elements of human resource outcomes and also the inclusion of a new variable such as reaction; and secondly, the study contributes to the human resource practices by identifying the importance of factors that will enhance learning transfer in the context of Sabah hotel industry.

© 2015 AENSI Publisher All rights reserved.

To Cite This Article: Toh Pei Sung and Arsiah Bahron, The Learning Transfer System Inventory: Competencies and Performance Among Employees in Sabah Hotel Industry. *Aust. J. Basic & Appl. Sci.*, 9(4): 87-94, 2015

INTRODUCTION

Tourism has become the significant key growth engines in Malaysia, which is one of the core economic sectors on 12 National Key Economic Areas (NKEAs) for transforming Malaysia into a higher nation income by 2020 and boosting the economy. The tourism sector has grown from RM58.3 billion in 2011 to RM60.6 billion in 2012 which placing Malaysia 13th in terms of global tourist receipts meanwhile from 24.7 million in 2011 to 25 million in 2012 which placing Malaysia 10th in terms of global tourist arrivals (United Nation World Tourism Organization, 2013). In line with this, accommodation services especially hotels, which is one of the sub-sectors on tourism that currently hailed as the important key economic area in Malaysia for now and the future.

However, hotel industry is confronting with the uncertainty environments and the strong competition. The unexpected fluctuations influencing the tendency of travel by business and leisure travellers and also the willingness to spend on leisure and hospitality related activities (Wong, 2004). The natural disasters, health emergencies and terrorist attack such as Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS); earthquake and tsunami disaster; and terrorist attacks on 9/11; intruder attacks and H1N1 diseases are known as highly uncertainties that lead to the negative impacts on hotel performance (UNESCAP, 2005). The numbers of tourists have been decreasing due to an avoidance of travel (Lau, Akbar and Fie, 2005).

Furthermore, the numbers of hotels are increasing tremendously for nowadays (Malaysian Association Hotel, MAH, 2014). As such competitive and uncertainty environment, hotels are aggressively boosting the promotion activities to attract and retain customer loyalty with its hotel for the sustainability and growth. On top of that, employee is an important element as hotel product by providing an excellent service quality towards the customers, which beyond the expectation of customers. In fact, hotel industry is facing with the challenge of achieving a greater of performance. Apart from this, employee performance could be enhanced through the training neither informal nor formal training as learning transfer occurs. Furthermore, this relationship could be improved by competencies as a mediator. The learning transfer is crucial as well as the human capital, which is

Corresponding Author: Toh Pei Sung, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Faculty of Business, Economics and Accounting, Jalan UMS, 88400, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia.
Tel: +6016-8180339 E-mail: tohpeisung@gmail.com

the key for enhancing employee performance that builds the strength of organization for sustainability and growth.

Therefore, the objectives of this study are to examine the relationship between transfer-related factors (secondary influence, motivation, environment, ability and reaction) and employee performance; to examine the relationship between transfer-related factors (secondary influence, motivation, environment, ability and reaction) and competencies; to examine the relationship between competencies and employee performance; and finally, to examine the mediating effect of competencies on the relationship between the transfer-related factors (secondary influence, motivation, environment, ability and reaction) and employee performance. This study attempts to fill in the gap by concerning the learning transfer as a key to improving competencies and employee performance as well as the role of competencies as a mediator on the hypothesized relationships in the context of hotel industry.

The Concept of Performance:

The definition of performance has been defined in broadly concepts. Researchers have made progress in clarifying and extending the performance concept during the past 10 or 15 years (Campbell, 1990). That is, the concept of performance is ongoing make changing with the ongoing changes of organization environments. Campbell (1990) pointed out that performance is defined as “behaviors or actions that are relevant to the goals of the organization” and this is in line with Liao and Chuang (2004) stated that performance is described as behaviors that are relevant to organizational goals. Aguinis (2009) similarly stated that performance is about behavior or what employees do and not about what employees produce or the outcomes of their work. Performance also concerned with the multidimensional concept (Sonnentag and Frese, 2002). Meaning to say, there are many different types of behaviors to understand the performance. However, Kane and Lawler (1976) defined performance as a record of task achievement or outcomes such as productivity, profit growth, market share, customer satisfaction and quality improvement that can be effectively achieved for a certain period of time. Based on these varying definitions of performance, it was appearing generally concerned with behaviors and results.

There are two types of behavior aspects stand out which are task performance and contextual performance. Task performance described as behaviors that directly and indirectly contribute to the organization’s technical core process whereas contextual performance as behaviors that support the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Campbell, 1990). The result aspect refers to the outcome of the individual’s behavior (Sonnentag and Frese, 2002). For instance, behaviors may result in outcomes such as sales figures, number of satisfied customers or number of occupied rooms. However, outcome aspects of performance depend also on other factors than the individual’s behavior. For instance, imagine a front office employee in backpackers who shows only moderate performance in dealing with customers (a behavioral aspect of performance) but nevertheless achieve high sales figures for hotel rooms (outcomes aspect of performance) because of the high demand of independent travelers. For the purpose of this study, employee performance is regarded as service quality of employees based on task performance and contextual performance that directly and indirectly to the organization’s technical core process (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994; Sriyam, 2010).

Learning Transfer System Inventory:

Training effectiveness is a study of learning system as a whole that providing a macro view of training outcomes (Alvarez, Salas and Garofano, 2004; King, King and Rothwell, 2001). Learning transfer is the most vital impact for the training effectiveness criteria that leads to improvement of individual performance (Bhatti and Kaur, 2010). It is defined as the degree to which employee applies the knowledge, skills, and attitudes gained in training to their job (Wexley and Latham, 1991). Furthermore, Baldwin and Ford (1988) defined learning transfer as the effect of having learned activities such as knowledge, skills, and attitudes from the training to the job in the sense that learned behavior must be generalized to the job and maintained over a period of time on the job for the effectiveness of training and development.

Holton, Bates and Ruona (2000) developed the Human Resource Development Research and Evaluation Model as a conceptual framework to evaluate the learning transfer. That is, Holton III’s model developed the concept of transfer system to understand the factors in the person, training, and organization that affect learning transfer, which influence employee performance. In this model, three primary training outcomes, namely, learning; individual performance; and organizational results are defined respectively as achievement of the learning outcomes desired in the Human Resource Development (HRD) intervention; change in individual performance as a result of the learning being applied on the job; and results at the organizational level as a consequence of the change in individual performance (Holton III *et al.*, 2000). Furthermore, the Learning Transfer System Inventory (LTSI) has four constructs with 16 dimensions that build up the learning transfer system in the framework, namely, secondary influences (performance self-efficacy and learner readiness); motivation variables (motivation to transfer, transfer effort–performance expectations and performance

outcomes expectations); environmental variables (feedback, peer support, supervisor support, openness to change, personal outcomes–positive, personal outcomes negative and supervisor sanctions) and ability variables (content validity, transfer design, personal capacity for transfer and opportunity to use). Several studies have successfully used the Learning Transfer System Inventory (LTSI) model to confirm the factors affecting learning transfer (Chen, 2003; Donovan, Hannigan and Crowe, 2001; Holton III *et al.*, 2000; Yamnill, 2001). For instance, a study conducted by Chen (2003) found that Learning Transfer System Inventory is valid in Taiwan and another study conducted by Yamnill (2001) also confirmed about the validation of Learning Transfer System Inventory (LTSI) in Thailand. Donovan *et al.*, (2001) claimed that the Learning Transfer System Inventory (LTSI) is to be influential in measuring training effectiveness.

On the other hand, Kirkpatrick (1994) argued that reaction is the first level of evaluating effectiveness of training programs in the Four-levels Evaluation Model. There are two common of reactions, namely, affective reactions and utility reactions (Alliger, Tannenbaum, Benett, Traver and Shotland, 1997). Affective reactions are regarded as participant satisfaction of the training course meanwhile utility reactions are the perceived utility value or usefulness of training for subsequent job performance (Ruona, Leimbach, Holton III and Bates, 2002). According to the previous studies, a measure of the training evaluation at the reaction level is the most common approaches in organizations. This is due to the complexities and cost increase, training ends up being evaluated only at the reaction level. A survey of 276 organizations reports that 75% of organizations measure the reaction, 41% learning measures, 21% behavior measures and only 11% result measures (Werner and DeSimone, 2006). This indicates that the reaction measures are still highly used in organizational practices. Yamnill (2001) found that 80% of sampled organizations focus on learners' reaction in the training and development evaluation. For the purpose of this study, four major components of transfer-related factors, namely secondary influence, motivation, environment, ability and reaction have been used to identify the factors that affecting learning transfer on the job.

The Concept of Competencies:

There are many descriptions of competencies from previous literature. One of the most well known definitions of competency by Boyatzis, (1982) and also Spencer and Spencer, (1993) have defined competency as an underlying characteristics of an individual that enables to perform a superior and an effective performance in a job. This definition is on the idea that certain abilities or personal characteristic enable them to perform specific appropriate actions (Boyatzis, 1982). Besides that, competencies are defined as cognitive (e.g. knowledge and skills), affective (e.g. attitudes and values), behavioral and motivational (e.g. motives) characteristic and personality of a person, which enables him or her to perform well in a specific situation (Ley, 2006; Boyatzis, 1982 cited by Shirazi and Mortazavi, 2009). Following by another definition, a competency is the capability of applying or using knowledge, skills, abilities, behaviors, and personal characteristics to successfully perform critical work tasks, specific functions, or operate in a given role or position (Ennis, 2008). McClelland (1973) and Jackson and Schuler (2003) points out that a competency is the skills, knowledge, abilities and other characteristic that individual needs to perform a job effectively. Knowledge, skills, abilities and personalities (Others) (KSAO) are good indicators in measuring employee performance (Noe and Hollenbeck, 2007). For the purpose of this study, competencies described as the underlying attributes of a person focus on knowledge, skills, abilities and others (KSAOs) (Spector, 2008; Daud, Abidin, Sapuan and Rajadurai, 2011).

Research Methodology:

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between learning transfer, competencies and employee performance in the Sabah hotel industry. The study also examining the mediating effect of competencies on these hypothesized relationships. The scope of the study is carried out among hotel operational employees in Kota Kinabalu, Sandakan and Tawau, Sabah. This study focused on star-rated hotels by simple random sampling as well as the respondent selection for this study, which have an equal and known chance of being selected. There is a total population of 2413 operational employees in star rated hotel, Sabah. Hence, the sample size for this study is 331 operational employees (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970). Questionnaires through survey are used as data collection instruments and distributed to operational employees randomly. The unit of analysis in this study is individual, as operational employees of the star rated hotels.

The survey instrument comprised of 156 measurement items in four sections. The section one measures the demographic profile. The section two measures the employee performance, which comprised of 25 measurement items and adapted from the instrument used by Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994; Sriyam, 2010). The section three measures the learning transfer, which comprised of 88 measurement items, which adapted from the instrument used by Baharim (2008) and Morgan and Casper (2000). Finally, the section four measures the competencies, which comprised of 43 measurement items and adapted from the instrument used by Daud, Abidin, Sapuan and Rajadurai, 2011). The study used a five-point Likert scale in the survey instrument, which ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Most

studies about learning transfer are using a five-point Likert-type in the instrument (Holton *et al.*, 2000; Yamnill, 2001; Chen, 2003; Bates, Holton III, Paul Hatala, 2012).

Data Analysis:

A total of 331 questionnaires were distributed and 275 responses were obtained and useable in this study, which brought a response rate of 83% while 56 (17%) of responses were not useable due to an incomplete data and refused to participate. Therefore, a total of 275 respondents were included in the final sample. Next, the study applied the Partial Least Square based Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). Initially, model assessment focuses on the measurement model and the structural model. The purpose of measurement model evaluation is to ensure the reliability and validity of the construct measures and provide support for the suitability in the path model (Hair, Mult, Ringle and Sarstedt, 2014). The criteria assessment comprised of composite reliability, convergent validity (AVE) and discriminant validity (Fornell-Larcker criterion and cross loadings) as suggested by Hair *et al.*, (2011). There are many scholars have given different cut off values on the factor loadings for items retention, which varying from 0.35 to 0.70 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black, 1998; Hair *et al.*, 2011; Chin, Gopal and Salisbury, 1997). In this study, loadings of 0.50 or more were considered as minimum acceptable value and significant. Additionally, the recommended value for the composite reliability (CR), which is minimum value of 0.70 (Gefen, Straub and Boudreau, 2000; Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson, 2010) while the cronbach's alpha accepted at the recommended value of 0.70 (George and Mallery, 2003). In the average variance extracted (AVE), the acceptable value should exceed the recommended value of 0.50 (Bagozzi and Yi, 1988; Hair *et al.*, 2010; Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Moreover, the square root of the AVE should exceed the squared correlations between the latent variable and all other latent variables (Chin, 2010; Chin, 1998; Fornell and Larcker, 1981). With regard to the assessment of the structural model, the path coefficients are obtained for the structural model relationships, which testing the hypothesized relationships among the constructs (Hair *et al.*, 2011). The hypotheses of the research model were tested using the bootstrapping procedure with 500 subsamples, which is recommended guidelines from Chin (1998). The significance of the path coefficients is based on the t-values.

Measurement Model:

Table I: Measurement Model

Constructs	Items	Loadings	AVE ^a	CR ^b
Secondary Influence (SECOINFL)	Self-Efficacy (SE)	0.862	0.736	0.848
	Learner Readiness (LR)	0.854		
Motivation (MOTIVA)	Motivation to Transfer (MT)	0.809	0.654	0.850
	Transfer Effort-Performance Expectations (TEP)	0.816		
	Performance-Outcomes Expectations (POE)	0.801		
Environment (ENVIRON)	Feedback (F)	0.764	0.537	0.889
	Peer Support (PS)	0.789		
	Supervisor Support (SS)	0.783		
	Openness to Change (OC)	0.779		
	Personal Outcome-Positive (POP)	0.784		
	Personal Outcomes-Negative (PON)	0.677		
	Supervisor Sanctions (S_S)	0.513		
Ability (ABI)	Content Validity (CV)	0.803	0.666	0.889
	Transfer Design (TD)	0.846		
	Personal Capacity for Transfer (PCT)	0.815		
Reaction (REACT)	Opportunity to Use (OU)	0.800	0.785	0.880
	Affective (AR)	0.874		
	Utility (UR)	0.898		
Competencies (COMP)	Knowledge (K)	0.829	0.743	0.920
	Skills (S)	0.878		
	Abilities (A)	0.865		
	Personality (P)	0.874		
Performance (PERF)	Task Performance (TP)	0.867	0.791	0.883
	Contextual Performance (CP)	0.911		

^aAverage Variance Extracted (AVE) = (summation of the square of the factor loadings)/{(summation of the square of the factor loadings) + (summation of the error variances)}

^bComposite Reliability (CR) = (square of the summation of the factor loadings)/{(square of the summation of the factor loadings) + (square of the summation of the error variances)}

Table II: Discriminant Validity: Fornell-Larcker Criterion

CONSTRUCTS	ABI	COMP	ENVIRON	MOTIVA	PERF	REACT	SECOINFL
ABI	0.816						
COMP	0.663	0.862					
ENVIRON	0.733	0.621	0.733				
MOTIVA	0.655	0.599	0.759	0.809			
PERF	0.445	0.434	0.479	0.521	0.889		

REACT	0.742	0.635	0.622	0.528	0.387	0.886	
SECOINFL	0.561	0.545	0.632	0.717	0.503	0.492	0.858

Note: The square root of AVE values is shown on the diagonal and printed in bold; off diagonals are the latent variable correlations

ABI = Ability; COMP = Competencies; ENVIRON = Environment; MOTIVA = Motivation;

PERF = Performance; REACT = Reaction; SECOINFL = Secondary Influence

Table I presents the measurement model of constructs. The average variance extracted (AVE) was ranged between 0.537 and 0.791, which exceeded the recommended value of 0.50 (Bagozzi and Yi, 1988; Hair *et al.*, 2010; Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Moreover, the square root of the AVE exceeded the squared correlations between the latent variable and all other latent variables except for environment (ENVIRON) as shown in the Table II (Chin, 2010; Chin, 1998; Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Overall, it can be concluded that measurement model in this study has showed satisfactory with the evidence of overall reliability, convergent validity and discriminant validity although the square root of the AVE of environment variable was slightly not exceeded the squared correlations with other latent variables.

Structural Model:

Table III: Significance Testing Results of the Structural Model Path Coefficients

H	Path	Beta	Strd. Error (SE)	T-value ^a	Decision
H1	SECOINFL → PERF	0.206	0.084	2.445**	Accepted
H2	MOTIVA → PERF	0.156	0.093	1.672*	Accepted
H3	ENVIRON → PERF	0.177	0.114	1.549	Rejected
H4	ABI → PERF	0.070	0.076	0.921	Rejected
H5	REACT → PERF	0.042	0.080	0.528	Rejected
H6	SECOINFL → COMP	0.105	0.063	1.658*	Accepted
H7	MOTIVA → COMP	0.145	0.073	1.984*	Accepted
H8	ENVIRON → COMP	0.140	0.088	1.696*	Accepted
H9	ABI → COMP	0.160	0.078	2.037*	Accepted
H10	REACT → COMP	0.316	0.080	3.938**	Accepted
H11	COMP → PERF	0.441	0.069	6.374**	Accepted
H	Mediating Effect	Indirect Effect	CI	T-value ^a	Decision
H12	SECOINFL → COMP → PERF	0.105*0.441=0.046	LL=0.029 UL=0.063	5.326**	Accepted
H13	MOTIVA → COMP → PERF	0.145*0.441=0.064	LL=0.053 UL=0.075	10.945**	Accepted
H14	ENVIRON → COMP → PERF	0.140*0.441=0.062	LL=0.013 UL=0.111	2.464**	Accepted
H15	ABI → COMP → PERF	0.160*0.441=0.071	LL=-0.094 UL=0.236	0.844	Rejected
H16	REACT → COMP → PERF	0.316*0.441=0.139	LL=-0.001 UL=0.279	1.940*	Rejected

*Significant at $p < 0.05$; **Significant at $p < 0.01$

^aNotes: ($t_{(499)}$, One tailed test: $t(0.05; 499)=1.65$; $t(0.01; 499)=2.33$

Table III presents significance-testing results of the structural model path coefficients. As reported in the table, secondary influence (H1 and H6) is perceived as a significant factor that affect both performance and competencies directly as well as the significance of indirect effect (H12) on these relationship between secondary influence and performance. This is similar with motivation (H2 and H7), which is perceived as a significant factor that affect both performance and competencies directly as well as the significance of indirect effect (H13) on these relationship between motivation and performance. Besides that, the results also suggested that environment (H3) is perceived as an insignificant factor that would not affecting performance directly, however, it has perceived as a significant factor that affect competencies (H8) directly as well as the significance of indirect effect (H14) on these relationship between environment and performance. On other hand, the results also suggested that ability (h4) is perceived as an insignificant factor that would not affecting performance directly as well as no indirect effect (H15) on these relationship between ability and performance, however, it has perceived as a significant factor that affect competencies (H9) directly. This is similar with reaction (H5), which perceived as insignificant factor that would not affecting performance directly as well as no indirect effect (H16) on these relationship between reaction and performance, however, it has perceived as a significant factor that affect competencies (H10) directly. Finally, the results also suggested that competencies (H11) have perceived as a significant factor that affect performance. According to Hayes (2013), the bootstrap confidence interval that above zero is found to be have a mediation effect while the bootstrap confidence interval that contains zero is means of no mediating effect.

Discussion and Conclusion:

The overall aims of this paper are to identify the relationship between learning transfer, competencies and employee performance in the context of Sabah hotel industry. Specifically, it attempts (1) to examine the relationship between (secondary influence, motivation, environment, ability and reaction) and employee performance; (2) to examine the relationship between (secondary influence, motivation, environment, ability

and reaction) and competencies; (3) to examine the relationship between competencies and employee performance; and (4) to examine the mediating effect of competencies on the relationship between (secondary influence, motivation, environment, ability and reaction) and employee performance.

A review of the literature found that the learning transfer has potential contribution to the effectiveness of training and development in the organizational research. The Learning Transfer System Inventory (LTSI) developed by Holton III *et al.*, (2000) suggested that four constructs (secondary influence, motivation, environment and ability) affecting the learning transfer to the job, which improving the individual performance. Similarly, Baldwin and Ford (1988) suggested that three main factors, which are trainee characteristics, training design and work environment could influence learning transfer to the job that leads to enhanced performance. Baharim (2008) also found that secondary influence, motivation, environment and ability are significant in explaining the learning transfer to the job. On the other hand, previous studies showed that learner's reaction would contribute to the effectiveness of training (Bates, 2004; Kirkpatrick, 1994). In other words, training participants' reaction leads to greater learning transfer and thus, more positive about individual performance. However, there are also possible that the significance of reaction towards the effectiveness of training, which depends on how it has been measured.

Apart from the previous studies, the results of this study suggested that secondary influence and motivation have an influence on employee performance within the context of this study. On the other hand, environment, ability and reaction are found to be no influence on employee performance. In other words, this transfer-related factors, especially environment, ability and reaction had a lesser impact to employee performance, meanwhile the greater of secondary influence and motivation resulted in better performance of employees within the context of Sabah hotel industry. However, all of these factors should be emphasized, as those are also potential factors in the training effectiveness.

Moreover, previous literature found that secondary influence, motivation, environment, ability and reaction have an influence on competencies in the organizational research (Colquitt *et al.*, 2000; Nijman, 2004; Shaikhah *et al.*, 2010; Pham *et al.*, 2010; Rosmah and Arni Ariyani, 2012; Haslinda and Mahyuddin, 2009). In other words, the greater of these transfer-related factors lead to the greater competencies in the organization. Apart from the previous studies, the results of this study suggested that secondary influence, motivation, environment, ability and reaction as transfer-related factors found to be having a significant relationship with competencies within the context of this study, which in line with the previous studies.

Furthermore, previous literature also found that competencies have an influence towards the employee performance in the organizational research (Shin and Park, 2009; Levenson *et al.*, 2006; June and Mahmood, 2011). In other words, higher competencies would lead to higher performance of employees, which able to perform the job effectively that meet organizational goals. Apart from the previous studies, the results of this study suggested that competencies found to be having a significant relationship with an employee performance within the context of this study, which in line with the previous studies.

Finally, previous literature found that the mediating effect of competencies on the training effectiveness in the organizational research (Blok, 2009; Aruna, 2007; Tharenou *et al.*, 2007). In other words, the higher of the training effectiveness would develop and increase the competencies and then, the highly acquired competencies lead to better performance. Apart from the previous studies, the results of this study suggested that the training effectiveness factors, especially secondary influence, motivation and environment with employee performance are found to be mediated by competencies within the context of this study whereas ability and reaction with employee performance are not found to be mediated by competencies.

As conclusions, this study has therefore suggested a broader view of the learning transfer towards individual performance and the role of competencies as a mediator in mechanism. These results provide insights into understanding the human resource development model (Holton III *et al.*, 2000) and training evaluation model (Kirkpatrick, 1994). This extended view, on the other hand, provides an exploration of the importance of competencies in the organization to facilitate between learning transfer and individual performance. That is, the roles of human capital or human resource outcomes have potential influencing the effectiveness of training as well as employee performance. For future research, this study suggests that a sample, which inclusion of managerial level of hotel employees in order to support the generalizability of these results. If the results are also found to be relevant and applicable, a conclusion can be drawn that transfer-related factors affecting the learning transfer of the non-managerial and managerial level of employees in the context of the hotel industry. In addition, future research should also emphasize the context of hotel industry more broadly especially in the Malaysia.

Furthermore, this study also suggests that for future research should explore the learning transfer in the longitudinal study instead of cross-sectional as the level of learning transfer in the short period after training may differ greatly in the long term period meanwhile future research may consider to examine the demographic profile of respondents as a moderator in the study for better results. Moreover, a further study should be conducted by making a comparison between low star rated hotels (one to three stars) and high star rated hotels (four to five stars) to find out the differences or similarities of transfer-related factors among those hotels.

In addition, future research also can consider to focus on budget hotels because it is also one of the top preferences by tourists especially backpackers. It is important to investigate the effectiveness of training in those hotels for the better understanding especially in this competitive environment. Finally, this study suggests that should examine other potential intervening variables in the theoretical explanation of why learning transfer might help to enhance employee performance. Previous research has examined the effectiveness of training with performance and almost studies disregard potential intervening variables on these relationships. It is vital to identify the other new intervening variables in mechanism affecting the effectiveness of training for future research.

REFERENCES

- Aguinis, H., 2009. Performance management. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Alliger, G.M., S.L. Tannenbaum, J.W. Benne, H. Traver and A. Shotland, 1997. A meta-analysis of the relations among training criteria. *Personnel Psychology*, 50: 341-358.
- Alvarez, K., E. Salas and C.M. Garofano, 2004. An integrated model of training evaluation and effectiveness. *Human Resource Development Review*, 3: 385-407.
- Bagozzi, R.P. and Y. Yi, 1988. On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16: 74-94.
- Baharim, S., 2008. The influence of knowledge sharing on motivation to transfer training: a Malaysian public industry context. Ph.D. Thesis. Victoria University.
- Baldwin, T.T. and J.K. Ford, 1988. Transfer of training: a review and directions for future research. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(1): 63-105.
- Bates, R., E.F. Holton III and J. Paul Hatala, 2012. A revised learning transfer system inventory: factorial replication and validation. *Human Resource Development International*, 15(5): 549-569.
- Bhatti, M.A. and S. Kaur, 2010. The role of individual and training design factors on training transfer. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 34(7): 656-672.
- Borman, W.C. and S.J. Motowidlo, 1993. Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. *Personnel Selection in Organizations*, pp: 71-98.
- Boyatzis, R.E., 1982. The competent manager: a model for effective performance. New York: Wiley.
- Campbell, J.P., 1990. Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Chen, C.H., 2003. Cross cultural construct validation of the learning transfer system inventory in Taiwan. Ph. D. Thesis. Louisiana State University.
- Chin, W.W., 1998. The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Chin, W.W., 2010. How to write up and report PLS analyses in handbook of partial least squares. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Chin, W.W., A. Gopal and W.D. Salisbury, 1997. Advancing the theory of adaptive structuration: the development of a scale to measure faithfulness of appropriation. *Information Systems Research*, 8(4): 342-367.
- Daud, S., N. Abidin, N.M. Sapuan and J. Rajadurai, 2011. Enhancing university business curriculum using an importance-performance approach. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25(6): 545-569.
- Donovan, P., K. Hannigan and D. Crowe, 2001. The learning transfer system approach to estimating the benefits of training: empirical evidence. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 25(2): 221-228.
- Ennis, M.R., 2008. Competency models: a review of the literature and the role of the employment and training administration (ETA). Retrieved from, http://www.careeronestop.org/COMPETENCYMODEL/info_documents/OPDRLiteratureReview.pdf.
- Fornell, C. and D.F. Larcker, 1981. Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 48: 39-50.
- Gefen, D., D.W. Straub and M.C. Boudreau, 2000. Structural equation modelling and regression: guidelines for research practice. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 4(7): 1-78.
- George, D. and P. Mallery, 2003. SPSS for Windows step by step: a simple guide and reference. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hair, J.F., C.M. Ringle and M. Sarstedt, 2011. PLS-SEM: indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 9(2): 139-151.
- Hair, J.F., G.T. Mult, C.M. Ringle and M. Sarstedt, 2014. A primer on partial least square structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). United States: Sage.
- Hair, J.F., R.E. Anderson, R.L. Tatham and W.C. Black, 1998. Multivariate data analysis with readings. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Hair, J.F., W.C. Black, B.J. Babin and R.E. Anderson, 2010. Multivariate Data Analysis (7 ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Holton III, E.F., R.A. Bates and W.E.A. Ruona, 2000. The development of a generalised learning transfer system inventory. *Human Resource development Quarterly*, 11(4): 333-360.
- Jackson, S.E. and R.S. Schuler, 2003. *Managing human resources through strategic partnerships* (8 ed.). South-Western: Mason, OH.
- Kane, J.S. and E.E. Lawler, 1976. Performance appraisal effectiveness: its assessment and determinants. *Research Organizational Behavior*, 1: 425-478.
- King, S.B., M. King and W.J. Rothwell, 2001. *The complete guide to training delivery: a competency-based approach*. New York: American Management Association.
- Kirkpatrick, D.L., 1994. *Evaluating training programs: the four levels*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Krejcie, R.V. and D.W. Morgan, 1970. Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30: 607-610.
- McClelland, D.C., 1973. Testing for competence rather than intelligence. *American Psychologist*, 1: 1-14.
- Morgan, R.B. and W.J. Casper, 2000. Examining the factor structure of participant reactions to training: a multidimensional approach. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11: 301-317.
- Motowidlo, S.J. and J.R. Van Scotter, 1994. Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79: 475-480.
- Noe, R.A. and J. Hollenbeck, 2007. *Fundamental of human resource management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ruona, W., M. Leimbach, E.F. Holton III and R. Bates, 2002. The relationship between learner utility reactions and predicted learning transfer among trainees. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 6(4): 218-228.
- Shirazi, A. and S. Mortazavi, 2009. Effective management performance: a competency-based perspective. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5(1): 1-10.
- Sonnentag, S. and M. Frese, 2002. *Performance concepts and performance theory*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Spector, P., 2008. *Industrial and organisational behaviour*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Spencer, J. and S.M. Spencer, 1993. *Competence at work: models for superior performance*. New York: Wiley.
- Sriyam, A., 2010. *Customer satisfaction towards service quality of front office staff at the hotel*. Masters Thesis. Srinakharinwirot University.
- Werner, J.M. and R.L. DeSimone, 2008. *Human resource development*. New York: Thompson South-Western.
- Wexley, K.N. and G.P. Latham, 1991. *Developing and training human resources in organizations* (2 ed.). New York: Harper-Collins.
- Yamhill, S., 2001. *Factors affecting transfer of training in thailand*. Ph.D. Thesis. University of Minnesota.