DON BOSCO INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES,
VOL – 2 , ISSUE – 1, 2025

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

IMPACT OF LOCUS OF CONTROL, LEARNING GOALS, AND WORK ENVIRONMENT ON TRAINING TRANSFER: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF SELF-EFFICACY AMONG GEN Z EMPLOYEES IN KAMRUP METRO STARTUPS

ANGKITA BORPATRA GOHAIN[1]

ABSTRACT

This research aims to determine the partial influence of locus of control on training transfer, learning goal orientation on training transfer, characteristics of the work environment on training transfer, self-efficacy as a mediating variable which will partially mediate locus of control on training transfer, learning goal orientation. on training transfer, characteristics of the work environment on training transfer, the sample in this study was 210 samples of Gen Z respondents in Start-Up Companies in Kamrup Metro, Assam, this research used SEM-Amos analysis, the results of this research were positive and significant locus of control on training transfer, positive learning goal orientation and its significance to training transfer, positive work environment characteristics and its significance to training transfer, self efficacy mediates positive locus of control and is significant to training transfer, self efficacy mediates positive learning goal orientation and is significant to training transfer, self efficacy mediates positive work environment characteristics and is significant for training transfer. It is recommended that Gen Z in start-up companies.

Keywords**: *Locus of Control, Learning Goal Orientation, Work Environment Characteristics, Self Efficacy, Training Transfer, Gen Z***

INTRODUCTION

Human Resources (HR) are valuable assets that need to be strategically managed to achieve organizational goals. HR is not limited to employees but also includes everyone who contributes to the organization, such as customers, partners, and suppliers (Ulrich, 2020). HR within a company must be continuously developed to enhance capabilities in line with the goals of the business environment. HR management has increasingly been recognized as an intrinsic part of management, dealing with the human capital of an organization. The objective of HR is to maintain better human relations within the

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Golaghat Commerce college, Golaghat

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

organization through policy evaluation, procedures, applications, development, and programs related to HR to enhance their effectiveness in achieving organizational goals (Dessler, 2023).

One of the ways to improve employee capabilities and skills is through education and training. According to Noe et al. (2023), training is a planned process designed to enhance employees' knowledge, skills, and abilities to achieve organizational goals. Aiguinis et al. (2022) explain that the purpose of training is to help individuals develop skills and capabilities that, when applied to their work, can improve performance. Another definition states that training is a planned learning experience designed to bring changes in individuals' knowledge, abilities, or skills.

According to Saks et al. (2020), training transfer (application of training at work) is a critical issue faced by all organizations. This issue is directly related to the impact of training on both employees and the organization. Kimbal et al. (2015) noted that training transfer issues are rarely addressed in developing countries. According to Mathis et al. (2003), effective training transfer must meet two conditions: First, trainees must carry the materials learned during training into their workplace context. Second, employees must continue using the learned materials for an extended period.

Burke et al. (2019) highlight several factors contributing to the failure of training transfer, including a lack of supervisor support, insufficient practice opportunities, and an organizational culture that does not support learning. Training transfer can occur in three ways: positive (training results improve job performance), negative (training results decrease previous performance), and neutral (training results do not affect job performance). Positive training transfer is the desired outcome of training programs, where knowledge and skills are optimally applied to work tasks. Trainee characteristics, such as locus of control, learning goal orientation, and self-efficacy, can support the training transfer process, making trainees more motivated to learn and master the training program content.

According to Caprara et al. (2023), self-efficacy is an individual's belief in their ability to complete tasks or achieve specific goals, considering social and cultural factors. In the context of training, self-efficacy refers to an individual's confidence in mastering and learning the training program content (Sekerbayeva, 2023). Self-efficacy in trainees can enhance their confidence in completing training tasks correctly. Bahrani et al. (2021) argue that individuals with high self-efficacy have greater confidence in

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

succeeding during training processes, allowing them to apply new knowledge and skills in the workplace. Conversely, individuals with low self-efficacy doubt their abilities. Research highlights the significant impact of self-efficacy on training transfer performance, underscoring the importance of trainers considering the role, impact, and motivation of self-efficacy in facilitating training transfer.

Training transfer efforts aim to improve confidence in one's potential. Companies continuously enhance training transfer for employees, including those from Generation Z. According to Corey et al. (2022), Generation Z refers to individuals born between 1997 and 2012. As the first generation to grow up in a digital and highly advanced technological era, they are accustomed to digital communication and technology. McCrindle (2022) notes that Generation Z grew up during economic and political crises, making them more focused on security and stability. Data from Indonesia's Central Statistics Agency (BPS) reveals that Generation Z, born between 1995 and 2012, dominates the population with around 74.93 million people or 27.94% of Indonesia's total population. This young demographic provides a productive workforce and a demographic bonus for the nation.

A LinkedIn survey found that 76% of Generation Z believe that learning is the key to their success. Therefore, this generation prefers to stay with companies that invest in career and skill development, often provided through training programs. This generation tends to have characteristics and values that differ from previous generations. Research conducted by PwC's 2022 Global Workforce Hopes and Fears Survey revealed that Generation Z is more attracted to companies offering high-quality training and development. As many as 74% of Generation Z stated that quality training and development are crucial factors in job selection, and 44% expressed concern about not receiving adequate digital and technological skill training from their employers.

Bucovetch et al. (2019) explained that Generation Z possesses a strong work ethic in planning their careers and strives to make meaningful contributions to the companies they work for. This indicates that Generation Z is highly enthusiastic about learning and developing their skills. According to Teresa Bridges (2015), Generation Z tends to prefer a work environment that offers training, learning, and professional development opportunities, as formal education alone is often insufficient to equip them with the skills needed in the workplace. This preference is influenced by Generation Z's open-

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

mindedness and innovative mindset, which drives them to embrace change and create new developments.

Based on previous studies, there is a research gap indicating that locus of control has a positive and significant influence on training transfer (Smith et al., 2023). Meanwhile, other studies suggest that internal and external locus of control does not positively and significantly affect training transfer (Aryee et al., 2020). Research by Kimberly et al. (2021) shows that learning goal orientation influences training transfer. However, this finding contrasts with research conducted by DeRue et al. (2020), which states that mastery and performance learning goal orientations do not influence the training transfer process. Another study by Dickson Mdhlalose (2022) found that work environment characteristics affect training transfer, but research by Salas et al. (2023) concluded that work environment characteristics do not have a positive and significant relationship with training transfer. Therefore, the researcher is interested in conducting a study with locus of control**,** learning goal orientation, and work environment characteristics as independent variables; training transfer as the dependent variable; and self-efficacy as a mediating variable. The study will focus on Generation Z employees of Start-Up companies in Jakarta aged 22–27 years.

This research is important because few studies have focused on Generation Z as the research subject and to address inconsistencies in previous findings regarding the influence of locus of control, learning goal orientation, and work environment characteristics on training transfer, with self-efficacy as a mediating variable. It is expected that this study will help expand knowledge about the processes of self-regulation or self-confidence, learning orientation, work environment factors, and training transfer, contributing to the development of a skilled and competitive workforce. Based on this background, the researcher has chosen the title: **"The Influence of Locus of Control, Learning Goal Orientation, and Work Environment Characteristics on Training Transfer with Self-Efficacy as a Mediating Variable (Study on Generation Z Employees of Start-Up Companies in Jakarta)."**

LITERATURE REVIEW, HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT, AND RESEARCH METHODS

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Locus of Control

Locus of control, according to Rotter (2020), is a factor that significantly contributes to the quality of an individual's performance, serving as an initial response that forms the basis for subsequent actions. Skinner (2022) defines locus of control as a concept explaining how individuals perceive the causes of events in their lives. Individuals with an internal locus of control believe that they control the outcomes of their actions, while those with an external locus of control believe that external factors determine the outcomes of their actions.

Mischel (2023) describes locus of control as a personality dimension that refers to an individual's belief about whether they control events in their lives or if those events are controlled by external forces. Dweck (2019) defines locus of control as an individual's belief about the source of the causes behind the outcomes of their actions. Individuals with an internal locus of control believe they are in control of their actions' results, whereas those with an external locus of control believe that external factors are responsible for determining the outcomes.

Learning Goal Orientation

Leoni et al. (2023) state that orientation represents an individual's adjustment to their environmental conditions. In organizational contexts, orientation refers to an individual's introduction to a new environment as part of their adaptation process. Learning is something acquired through actions or behaviour, whether intentional or unintentional. Learning theorists believe that learning occurs through interactions, signals, stimuli, reinforcement, responses, and motivation. Learning leads to experiences that can change an individual's behaviour (Kotler and Keller, 2012).

Pintrich and Zusho (2021) describe learning orientation as the extent to which an organization values knowledge, embraces openness, and shares a common vision. Atitumpong (2017) defines learning orientation as an internal mindset that motivates individuals to engage in and develop their competencies. Individuals with a learning orientation are more likely to achieve their desired goals.

From these definitions and explanations, the author concludes that learning orientation is the foundation for increasing an individual’s knowledge, experience, and abilities. It focuses on the goals intended to be achieved through initial learning efforts, reflected in behaviour, actions, and improved capabilities.

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Learning orientation enhances an organization's value by fostering a tendency to create and utilize knowledge. Organizations that incorporate learning within their culture are referred to as learning organizations. Organizational learning is more complex than individual learning, as an organization comprises diverse individuals. Aligning the learning orientations of individuals is essential to establishing effective organizational learning.

Work Environment Characteristics

According to Robbins et al. (2020), the work environment is the setting in which employees perform their daily tasks. A conducive work environment provides a sense of security and enables employees to work optimally. The work environment can significantly influence employees' emotions. When employees enjoy their work environment, they tend to feel comfortable, resulting in more effective use of work time and higher job performance. The work environment includes the relationships formed between employees, relationships between subordinates and supervisors, and the physical surroundings where employees work.

Luthans (2018) defines the work environment as the entirety of tools and surroundings encountered by an individual at work, including work methods, which influence productivity both individually and in groups. Meanwhile, Nkomo (2023) describes the work environment as the setting where employees perform their daily tasks, encompassing social support, job autonomy, and organizational justice.

Based on these definitions, the work environment can be summarized as everything surrounding employees that can influence their job satisfaction and, in turn, their performance. A supportive work environment includes adequate facilities that assist employees in completing their tasks, which contributes to enhanced productivity and overall performance within a company.

Self-Efficacy

Pekrun et al. (2023) define self-efficacy as an individual's belief in their ability to organize and execute a series of actions required to accomplish a specific task. Self-efficacy is shaped by the interaction between external environments, self-adjustment mechanisms, personal abilities, experiences, and education. According to Pintrich (2021), self-efficacy is the result of cognitive processes involving

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

decisions, beliefs, or expectations regarding the extent to which individuals estimate their ability to perform specific tasks or actions needed to achieve desired outcomes. Schunk (2022) describes self-efficacy as an individual's belief in their capability to address and resolve challenges across various situations and to determine appropriate actions to complete specific tasks or problems, enabling them to overcome obstacles and achieve expected goals. Similarly, Alwisol (2017) views self-efficacy as an individual's perception of his/her ability to function according to the situation faced, demonstrating confidence in their competence and capacity to manage tasks and roles in their environment.

Jeanne Ellis Ormrod describes self-efficacy as a person's belief in their ability to perform specific behaviors or achieve particular goals. Bandura, as cited in Howard (2008), emphasizes that self-efficacy serves as a critical motivator for individual success. Baron and Byrne also define self-efficacy as an individual's belief in their competence to perform assigned tasks, achieve goals, or overcome obstacles. Bandura, as cited in Parlar (2017), highlights that self-efficacy is an individual's belief in their capability to manage responsibilities, focusing on desired objectives to improve personal abilities. Frett (2014) further states that self-efficacy is an individual's confidence in their chances of successfully completing a specific task. According to Baroon et al. (2016), individuals with high self-efficacy demonstrate strong enthusiasm and confidence, influencing how they approach challenges, the effort they exert to overcome problems, and their resilience when faced with unexpected obstacles.

From these perspectives, self-efficacy can be summarized as an individual's belief in their ability to perform actions required to achieve established goals, effectively influence situations, and overcome challenges. This belief plays a vital role in determining motivation, persistence, and success in various contexts.

Training Transfer

According to Smith et al. (2023), training is an ongoing process that requires time and effort from both individuals and organizations. Organizations can enhance training transfer by providing ongoing support to employees after training, such as coaching and mentoring. According to Holton (2021), training transfer is a complex process influenced by various factors. These factors can be categorized as individual factors, training factors, and contextual factors. Contextual factors include organizational culture, supervisor support, and available resources. According to Baldwin (1988), training is a planned

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

process to modify attitude, knowledge, or skill behavior through learning experiences to achieve effective performance in an activity or activities. From the various opinions above, the researcher can conclude that training is a reciprocal skill development process that is supportive. Therefore, training should create an environment where employees can acquire or learn specific attitudes, abilities, expertise, knowledge, and behaviors related to their work, thus encouraging them to perform better.

Hypothesis Development

The hypothesis of this study is as follows:

H1 = Locus of control has a positive and significant effect on training transfer.
H2 = Learning goal orientation has a positive and significant effect on training transfer.
H3 = Work environment characteristics have a positive and significant effect on training transfer.
H4 = Self-efficacy mediates the effect of locus of control on training transfer.
H5 = Self-efficacy mediates the effect of learning goal orientation on training transfer.
H6 = Self-efficacy mediates the effect of work environment characteristics on training transfer.

Research Methods

Based on the formulation of the problem and research objectives, this type of research is quantitative research. Sugiyono (2022) defines quantitative research as a research method based on the philosophy of positivism, used to study specific populations or samples, where sampling is generally done randomly. Data collection is carried out using research instruments, and data analysis is quantitative/statistical in nature with the goal of testing the hypotheses that have been established. This quantitative research uses a causal-comparative approach to understand the possible cause-and-effect relationships.

For the population of the study, the researcher will focus on Gen Z employees in startup companies based in Jakarta, with the exact number yet to be determined. The number of indicators from the various variables in this study is 21, so the calculation is (21 x 10 = 210). Therefore, using the Hair formula, the minimum sample size required is 210 respondents. In this study, the researcher will distribute 250

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

backup questionnaires to ensure that if any questionnaires are not returned, the sample size is not reduced.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Characteristics of Respondents

This section provides a detailed description of the characteristics of the respondents who participated in the study. The information includes demographic data such as gender, age, education level, duration of training at the company, and length of employment, which are important for understanding the context of the respondents and the generalizability of the research findings. The following tables summarize these characteristics:

Table 1. Characteristics of Respondents by Gender

Description	Frequency (People)	Percentage
Male	90	43.5%
Female	120	56.55%
Total	210	100%
Source: Data processed, 2024		

As seen in Table 1, a majority of the respondents were female, comprising 56.55% of the sample, while males made up 43.5%.

Table 2. Characteristics of Respondents by Age

Age (Years)	Frequency (People)	Percentage
22-24 years	130	51.2%
25-27 years	80	48.8%
Total	210	100%
Source: Data processed, 2024		

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Table 2 shows that most respondents are between the ages of 22 and 24 years, accounting for 51.2%, while 48.8% are between the ages of 25 and 27.

Table 3 Characteristics of Respondents by Highest Education Level

Education Level	Frequency (People)	Percentage
High School/Vocational	50	23%
Diploma 3	40	21.2%
Diploma IV/Bachelor	115	51.9%
Master's (S2)	5	3.9%
Total	210	100%
Source: Data processed, 2024		

In Table 3, the highest education level of respondents shows that 51.9% hold a Bachelor's degree (Diploma IV), while 23% have completed High School or Vocational education. Additionally, 21.2% have a Diploma 3, and 3.9% hold a Master's degree.

Table 4. Characteristics of Respondents Based on Duration of Training Program at the Company

Description	Frequency (People)	Percentage
1-3 months	50	21.8%
3-6 months	80	33.3%
6-12 months	60	27.9%
>12 months	20	17%
Total	210	100%
Source: Data processed, 2024		

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Table 4. illustrates that 33.3% of respondents have been involved in training programs for 3-6 months, followed by 27.9% who have participated for 6-12 months. The remaining respondents have completed shorter or longer training programs.

Table 5. Characteristics of Respondents Based on Length of Employment

Length of Employment	Frequency (People)	Percentage
<1 year	15	13.8%
1-3 years	115	45.9%
3-5 years	75	31.1%
>5 years	5	9.2%
Total	210	100%
Source: Data processed, 2024		

According to Table 5, most respondents (45.9%) have been employed for 1-3 years, followed by 31.1% who have worked for 3-5 years. Only 9.2% of respondents have worked for more than 5 years.

Descriptive Analysis

Respondents' Perception of Locus of Control

To evaluate respondents' perceptions of the Locus of Control variable, the mean scores are presented in the following table

Table 6.Locus of Control

No	Statement Description	Item	Mean
1	I can handle problems in my life through my own efforts	LC1	4.325
2	I have control over what happens to me	LC2	4.489
3	Success can be fully achieved through my ability	LC3	4.493
4	I believe in my ability to carry out planned activities	LC4	4.414

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

No	Statement Description	Item	Mean
5	I feel I can complete assigned tasks independently	LC5	4.339
6	My life is determined by my own actions	LC6	4.35
7	When I get what I want, it's usually because I work hard	LC7	4.475
Average	**4.411**		

Based on the table, the respondents' perception of the Locus of Control variable falls into the fourth range (4.00–4.99)**,** with an overall average score of 4.411, indicating a high perception.

Respondents' Perception of Learning Goal Orientation Variable

The mean scores for the Learning Goal Orientation variable are presented in the table below:

Table 7. Learning Goal Orientation

No	Statement Description	Item	Mean
1	I find it important to learn new knowledge or skills	OTP1	4.411
2	Making mistakes is not negative as I can learn from them	OTP2	4.507
3	I prefer challenging tasks that help me learn new things	OTP3	4.386
4	I am committed to continuously improving my knowledge	OTP4	4.443
5	I believe learning helps me improve my abilities	OTP5	4.4
6	I believe learning helps me succeed in life	OTP6	4.525
7	I always learn from past experiences to improve my skills	OTP7	4.432
Average	**4.43**		

The results show that the respondents' perception of the Learning Goal Orientation variable is within the fourth range (4.00–4.99), with an overall average score of 4.43, indicating a high perception.

Respondents' Perception of Work Environment Characteristics Variable

The table below shows respondents' perceptions of the *Work Environment* Characteristics variable:

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Table 8. Learning Goal Orientation

No	Statement Description	Item	Mean
1	A conducive work environment supports job execution	KLK1	4.35
2	Post-training discussions with colleagues enhance performance	KLK2	4.468
3	Feedback from colleagues helps me apply training	KLK3	4.525
4	Colleagues assist when I face difficulties in applying training	KLK4	4.396
5	My colleagues teach me about training-related issues	KLK5	4.329
6	My supervisor helps me overcome difficulties	KLK6	4.361
Average	**4.411**		

Respondents' perceptions of the Work Environment Characteristics variable are within the fourth range (4.00–4.99), with an overall average score of 4.411, indicating a high perception.

Respondents' Perception of Self-Efficacy Variable

The table below shows respondents' perceptions of the Self-Efficacy variable:

Table 9. Self-Efficacy

No	Statement Description	Item	Mean
1	I try to solve difficult tasks and succeed	SE1	4.286
2	I know how to act in unexpected situations	SE2	4.332
3	Success comes from my efforts in learning	SE3	4.496
4	I face difficulties calmly, relying on my abilities	SE4	4.361
5	I usually have many ideas to overcome difficulties	SE5	4.293
Average	**4.353**		

The Self-Efficacy variable falls within the fourth range (4.00–4.99), with an overall average score of 4.353, indicating a high perception.

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Respondents' Perception of Training Transfer Variable

The mean scores for the Training Transfer variable are presented in the table below:

Table 10. Training Transfer

No	Statement Description	Item	Mean
1	I use new skills to complete tasks faster	TP1	4.296
2	I use new skills to improve task accuracy	TP2	4.507
3	I get opportunities to apply training results	TP3	4.501
4	I continuously apply my skills through training	TP4	4.314
5	After training, I can handle new tasks	TP5	4.364
Average	**4.396**		

Respondents' perceptions of the Training Transfer variable are within the fourth range (4.00–4.99), with an overall average score of 4.396, indicating a high perception.

Validity and Reliability Test Results

After identifying the characteristics of the respondents involved in the study, data processing is conducted by testing the research instruments. The instrument test involves a validity test. In this study, the validity test uses a unidimensional validity and reliability model for measuring constructs that cannot be directly observed. This has two main objectives: to measure the indicators conceptualized unidimensionally with accuracy and consistency, and to identify the dominant indicators forming the constructs under investigation by examining the correlation between exogenous and endogenous variables. This is evaluated through the loading factor values of each indicator. Each statement item must have a loading factor > 0.40 and be significant at a 5% significance level. According to Hair (2010), a loading factor value above 0.5 is considered valid. The loading factor values for each variable in this study are shown below.

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

The reliability test aims to measure the reliability and stability of a research instrument. This test is conducted after the validity test is completed. The reliability of the research instrument is measured using construct reliability (CR). The commonly accepted reliability value is ≥ 0.70 for construct reliability (CR). The results are presented in the following table:

Table 11 Validity and Reliability Test Results

Variable	Item	Outer Weights	AVE	Description	Construct Reliability	Description
Locus of Control	LC1	0.702	0.512	Valid	0.935	Reliable
	LC2	0.76		Valid		
	LC3	0.683		Valid		
	LC4	0.709		Valid		
	LC5	0.664		Valid		
	LC6	0.57		Valid		
	LC7	0.519		Valid		
Learning Goal Orientation	OTP1	0.599	0.567	Valid	0.955	Reliable
	OTP2	0.894		Valid		
	OTP3	0.737		Valid		
	OTP4	0.788		Valid		
	OTP5	0.773		Valid		
	OTP6	0.763		Valid		
	OTP7	0.728		Valid		
Work Environment Characteristics	KLK1	0.791	0.563	Valid	0.940	Reliable
	KLK2	0.734		Valid		
	KLK3	0.725		Valid		

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Variable	Item	Outer Weights	AVE	Description	Construct Reliability	Description
	KLK4	0.652		Valid		
	KLK5	0.845		Valid		
	KLK6	0.791		Valid		
Self-Efficacy	SE1	0.745	0.533	Valid	0.787	Reliable
	SE2	0.791		Valid		
	SE3	0.692		Valid		
	SE4	0.898		Valid		
	SE5	0.744		Valid		
Training Transfer	TP1	0.721	0.521	Valid	0.898	Reliable
	TP2	0.731		Valid		
	TP3	0.608		Valid		
	TP4	0.829		Valid		
	TP5	0.755		Valid		

Processed Data

The table above shows that the validity test for each statement item, conducted using AMOS, yields loading factor values ≥ 0.50, indicating that the indicators for each statement can measure their respective latent variables. Consequently, all indicators are declared valid and can be used for further testing.

Additionally, validity is also assessed using the average variance extracted (AVE) as a requirement for discriminant validity. The AVE values for all constructs are ≥ 0.50. The AVE values for each variable are: Locus of Control (0.512), Learning Goal Orientation (0.567), Work Environment Characteristics (0.563), Self-Efficacy (0.533), and Training Transfer (0.521). Thus, it can be concluded that each variable in this study achieves a value ≥ 0.50 and is considered valid.

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

The construct reliability values for each variable are: Locus of Control (0.935), Learning Goal Orientation (0.955), Work Environment Characteristics (0.940), Self-Efficacy (0.787), and Training Transfer (0.898). The construct reliability criterion of ≥ 0.70 indicates that all variables meet the reliability requirements. Hence, the instruments demonstrate sufficient reliability and can be used for further testing.

Measurement Model Estimation Results

The estimation results for the measurement model using the Maximum Likelihood method in AMOS are summarized in the table below. The calculation results indicate that the criteria for p-value, GFI, RMR, RMSEA, TLI, NFI, RFI, and CFI provide recommended fit indices and fall into the **good fit** category, as shown in Table 12.

Table 12 Evaluation of Goodness-of-Fit (GOF) for the Structural Model

GOF	Acceptable Match Level	Model Index	Description
Chi-Square	$\chi^2 \leq 2df$ (good fit), $2df < \chi^2 \leq 3df$ (marginal fit), $\chi^2 > 3df$ (bad fit)	411 ≤ 2df	Marginal Fit
p-value	P ≥ 0.05 (good fit), P < 0.05 (bad fit)	0.032 ≥ 0.05	Good Fit
GFI	GFI ≥ 0.9 (good fit), 0.8 ≤ GFI ≤ 0.9 (marginal fit)	0.887 ≥ 0.9	Good Fit
RMR	RMR ≤ 0.5 (good fit)	0.037 ≤ 0.5	Good Fit
RMSEA	0.05 < RMSEA ≤ 0.08 (good fit), 0.08 < RMSEA ≤ 1 (marginal fit)	0.026 ≤ 0.08	Good Fit
TLI	TLI ≥ 0.9 (good fit), 0.8 ≤ TLI ≤ 0.9 (marginal fit)	0.975 ≥ 0.9	Good Fit
NFI	NFI ≥ 0.9 (good fit), 0.8 ≤ NFI ≤ 0.9 (marginal fit)	0.920 ≥ 0.9	Good Fit
AGFI	AGFI ≥ 0.9 (good fit), 0.8 ≤ AGFI ≤ 0.9 (marginal fit)	0.854 ≥ 0.9	Good Fit
CFI	CFI ≥ 0.9 (good fit), 0.8 ≤ CFI ≤ 0.9 (marginal fit)	0.979 ≥ 0.9	Good Fit

Source: Processed Data (2024)

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Based on the results of the Goodness-of-Fit evaluation in Table 12, the overall measurement results indicate a good fit for the model. The chi-square value is 303.004, with a probability level of 0.000, indicating a good or fit model. The Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) value is 0.887, suggesting that the model has a good fit level. The RMSEA value of 0.093 also demonstrates a good fit. The RMR value of 0.037 indicates a fit model. After model modification, the AGFI value of 0.854 shows a marginal fit indication. Nonetheless, overall, the model developed is considered good with respect to the data. The TLI value of 0.975 shows a good fit level, while the CFI value of 0.979 confirms a good fit. The CMIN/DF value for this model is 1.142, further supporting the indication of a good fit.

Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis testing aims to determine the relationship between independent variables and the dependent variable. This study has six hypotheses to examine and identify significant relationships

between variables. If the significance value is below 0.05, the result is considered significant. The hypothesis testing results are shown in the table below:

Table 13 Hypothesis Testing Results for Direct Effect Variables

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P
TP	LC	0.445	0.180	2.468	0.000
TP	OTP	0.486	0.506	2.962	0.000
TP	KLK	0.240	0.193	2.244	0.000
SE	LC	0.537	0.243	2.204	0.000
SE	KLK	0.021	0.242	2.085	0.000
SE	OTP	0.108	0.515	2.209	0.000
TP	SE	0.241	0.070	3.424	0.000

Source: Processed Data (2024)

Hypothesis Analysis

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Hypothesis 1:

- *Locus of Control (LC) positively and significantly affects Transfer of Training (TP).*
- SEM calculations produced an estimate of 2.468 and a p-value of 0.004, indicating significance. Since the p-value is below 0.05, this hypothesis is supported and accepted.

Hypothesis 2:

- *Learning Goal Orientation (OTP) positively and significantly affects Transfer of Training (TP).*
- SEM calculations yielded a p-value of 0.000, below 0.05, supporting this hypothesis and indicating acceptance.

Hypothesis 3:

- *Work Environment Characteristics (KLK) positively and significantly affect Transfer of Training (TP).*

- SEM calculations produced an estimate and p-value of 0.000, below 0.05. This confirms the hypothesis is supported and accepted.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Using AMOS, the Standardized Indirect Effects and Standardized Direct Effects were calculated to analyze direct and indirect effects (mediation). Based on the results, the Standardized Indirect Effects values are greater than the Standardized Direct Effects values. This indicates that the mediating variable (*Self-Efficacy*) acts as an intervening variable between Locus of Control (LC), Learning Goal Orientation (OTP), and Work Environment Characteristics (KLK) and Transfer of Training (TP).

Table 14 Standardized Direct Effects Results

Variables	KLK	OTP	LC	SE	TP
SE	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
TP	.002	.009	.117	.000	.000

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Table 15 Standardized Indirect Effects Results

Variables	KLK	OTP	LC	SE	TP
SE	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
TP	.062	.041	.211	.000	.000

Based on Tables 14 and 15, the Standardized Indirect Effects values are greater than the Standardized Direct Effects values. This concludes that:

- Locus of Control (LC) affects Transfer of Training (TP) through Self-Efficacy (SE).
- Learning Goal Orientation (OTP) affects Transfer of Training (TP) through Self-Efficacy (SE).
- Work Environment Characteristics (KLK) affect Transfer of Training (TP) through Self-Efficacy (SE).

Sobel Test/Mediation (Testing Indirect Variables)

In addition to using the AMOS tool, the Sobel Test can be used to analyze the effects of mediation variables. Below are the results of each Sobel Test conducted in this study:

Table 16 Summary of Sobel Test Results (LC to TP through SE)

Variable	t-stat	P-value	Conclusion
a	0.749	8.866	0.000
b	0.491		
sa	0.064		
sb	0.46		

Source: Sobel Test Results

Table 17 Summary of Sobel Test Results (OTP to TP through SE)

Variable	t-stat	P-value	Conclusion

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Variable	t-stat	P-value	Conclusion
a	0.487	4.913	0.000
b	0.491		
sa	0.088		
sb	0.046		

Source: Sobel Test Results

Table 18 Summary of Sobel Test Results (KLK to TP through SE)

Variable	t-stat	P-value	Conclusion
a	0.633	7.254	0.000
b	0.491		
sa	0.604		
sb	0.046		

Source: Sobel Test Results

RESEARCH DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of Locus of Control on Training Transfer, Learning Goal Orientation, and Work Environment Characteristics on Training Transfer; the effect of Self-Efficacy on Training Transfer; and the mediating role of Self-Efficacy in the relationships between Locus of Control, Learning Goal Orientation, and Work Environment Characteristics on Training Transfer. A total of seven hypotheses were developed and tested using the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) method with the support of AMOS software. The findings of the study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1

Locus of Control positively and significantly affects Training Transfer. SEM calculations resulted in an estimate of 2.468 and a p-value of 0.004, indicating significance as the estimate exceeds the t-table value (>1.96) with a p-value <0.05. Thus, the hypothesis is supported and accepted.

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Supporting Studies:

- Suwaree (2020) demonstrated that internal locus of control influences the effectiveness of the training transfer process among employees. Individuals with an internal locus of control have a strong inclination to complete their tasks and tend to transfer the learned knowledge and skills to their job more effectively.
- Marco et al. (2020) found that employees with high locus of control are more likely to participate in training programs, believing that such training enhances their skills and performance, potentially leading to higher compensation.
- Jason et al. (2021) showed that training programs positively influenced the driving locus of control, reducing external control beliefs and increasing internal control beliefs among drivers. This shift was associated with safer driving behaviors and highlighted the role of locus of control in predicting training outcomes.

Hypothesis 2

Learning Goal Orientation positively and significantly affects Training Transfer. SEM calculations resulted in an estimate of 2.926 and a p-value of 0.000, confirming significance. The hypothesis is supported and accepted.

Supporting Studies:

- Jaidev et al. (2023) reported that learning goal orientation and general self-efficacy significantly impact training transfer, explaining variations of 21.2% and 33.6%, respectively.
- Sitzmann (2019) compared mastery-focused and performance-focused learning orientations, finding that mastery orientation has a stronger positive effect on training transfer, particularly for cognitive training.
- Kimberly et al. (2021) highlighted that students with high mastery orientation in athletic training programs demonstrate greater persistence in challenging situations and are more likely to transfer their learning to future implications.

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Hypothesis 3

Work Environment Characteristics positively and significantly affect Training Transfer. SEM calculations resulted in an estimate of 2.244 and a p-value of 0.000, indicating significance. The hypothesis is supported and accepted.

Supporting Studies:

- Zahid et al. (2022) showed that a supportive work environment enhances training transfer by providing opportunities to apply new knowledge and skills.
- Baldwin et al. (2017) emphasized the importance of organizational climate, pre- and post-training interventions, and leadership discussions in maximizing training transfer.

Hypothesis 4

Self-Efficacy positively mediates the relationship between Locus of Control and Training Transfer. The t-value obtained was 7.564, exceeding the t-table value of 1.965, confirming the mediation role of self-efficacy. Individuals with an internal locus of control believe they can influence their environment, thereby enhancing their confidence to absorb training content and apply it effectively.

Supporting Studies:

- Aigerim Sekerbayeva et al. (2023) and Bahrani et al. (2021) found that self-efficacy is higher among individuals with internal locus of control, positively influencing training transfer outcomes.

Hypothesis 5

Self-Efficacy positively mediates the relationship between Learning Goal Orientation and Training Transfer.

The t-value obtained was 3.459, exceeding the t-table value of 1.965, confirming significance. Learning goal-oriented individuals tend to perceive their abilities as improvable, which boosts their self-efficacy.

Supporting Studies:

- Chung et al. (2019) demonstrated that learning orientation, planning, and self-reflection positively affect self-efficacy.
- Kanfer (2001) indicated that individuals with a learning orientation exhibit higher self-efficacy, as they view their abilities as adaptable and capable of growth.

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Hypothesis 6

Self-Efficacy positively mediates the relationship between Work Environment Characteristics and TrainingTransfer.

The t-value obtained was 6.922, exceeding the t-table value of 1.965, confirming the mediation role of self-efficacy. A supportive work environment fosters confidence and motivates employees to apply newly acquired skills in the workplace.

Supporting Studies:

- Zeshan (2020) highlighted the role of organizational and supervisor support in enhancing self-efficacy and motivating employees to transfer their training.
- Taylor (2020) found that trainees with supportive supervisors were more likely to apply their training effectively, underscoring the importance of external support in boosting self-efficacy and training transfer.

The findings of this study reinforce the critical roles of Locus of Control, Learning Goal Orientation, and Work Environment Characteristics, both directly and indirectly through Self-Efficacy, in enhancing

Training Transfer. These insights provide actionable strategies for organizations to optimize their training programs and achieve greater employee development outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Based on the conclusions drawn from the discussion above, the findings are as follows:

1. Locus of control has a positive and significant effect on training transfer.
2. Learning goal orientation has a positive and significant effect on training transfer.
3. Work environment characteristics have a positive and significant effect on training transfer.
4. Self-efficacy mediates the effect of locus of control on training transfer.
5. Self-efficacy mediates the effect of learning goal orientation on training transfer.
6. Self-efficacy mediates the effect of work environment characteristics on training transfer.

COMPETING INTERESTS DISCLAIMER:

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

Authors have declared that they have no known competing financial interests OR non-financial interests OR personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

REFERENCES

1. Abele, V., & Spurk, D. (2009). The impact of locus of control and self-efficacy on career success. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 74(2), 179-195.
2. Aguinis, H., & Kraiger, K. (2022). The handbook of performance management. New York: Routledge.
3. Agustina, I. (2022). The Influence of Locus of Control, Self-Efficacy, and Adversity Quotient on Business Performance. Economia, 19(2), 183-200.
4. Aigerim Sekerbayeva et all (2023). The Moderating Role of Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy and Locus of Control on the Effect of the University Environment and Program on Entrepreneurial Intention and Attitudes. European Journal of Educational Research Vol (12), 1539 - 1554.
5. Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. Journal of Educational
6. Psychology, 84(3), 261-271.
7. Armstrong M, (1991). Personnel Management Practice, Fourth Edition, Kogan Page limited London. Baldwin T, & Ford K., (l988). Transfer of Training: Review and Directions for Future Research, Personnel Pryclwlogy, 41:63-105.
8. Ary, D., & Sriathi, S. (2019). Pengaruh locus of control terhadapself efficacy dan motivasiberprestasimahasiswa. JurnalIlmu Pendidikan, 26(1), 1-12.
9. Aryee, S., & Chen, X. P. (2020). Transfer of training: A review and meta-analysis. Journal of Management, 46(4), 845-879.
10. Bahtiar, A. (2022). The Influence of Locus of Control, Self-Efficacy, and Accounting Achievement Learning on Accounting Career Maturity of the Twelfth Grade Students of the Accounting Program in Private Vocational High Schools. International Journal of Education, 10(1), 4679-4697.
11. Baldwin, T. T., & Ford, J. K. (1988). Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. Personnel Psychology, 41(1), 63-105.

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

12. Bandura A, (l977). Self Efficacy: Toward a unifying Theory of Behavioral Change, Psychological review, vol, 84: hal 191-215
13. DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. (2020). Learning goal orientations and transfer of training: A review and meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 73(2), 327-354.
14. Dessler, G. (2023). Human resource management. Boston: Pearson Education
15. Dickson Mdhlalose (2022). An analysis of the impact of the environment on the transfer of training in the work environment: A systematic review. International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science, 11(10), 55-62.
16. Dolot, A. (2018). The Characteristics of Generation Z. E-mentor. Hal. 44–50
17. Dweck, C. S. (2020). Mindset: The new psychology of success. Random House.
18. Elliot, A. J., & Dweck, C. S. (2020). Handbook of competence and motivation. Routledge.
19. Elliot, A. J., &Harackiewicz, J. M. (1996). Approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A mediational analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70(3), 461- 475
20. Ferdinand A, (2002). Structural Equation Modelling Dalam PeneltianManajemen. Edisi 2, Seri Pustaka Kunci 03/BP UNDIP
21. Fredrick MuyiaNafukho., & Beverly J. Irby (2022). Training design in mediating the relationship of
22. participants' motivation, work environment, and transfer of learning. European Journal of Training and Development Vol. 47 No. 10.
23. Griffin, R. W. (2012). Management (11th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
24. Griffin, R. W., & Moorhead, G. (2021). Organizational behavior (12th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
25. Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through design of work: Test of a theory. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16(2), 250-279.
26. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., Black, W. C., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). Multivariate data analysis, Eighth. Cengage Learning, EMEA
27. Ones, D. S., & Dilchert, S. (2023). Handbook of personality at work. Routledge.
28. Patten, M. L. (2005). Locus of control and job performance: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26(8), 873-893.
29. Pekrun, R., & Linnenbrink-Garcia, L. (2023). Emotions and motivation in education. Routledge.

ISSN-3048-6823 (Online)

30. Priya D. Gupta, Sonali Bhattacharya, Pratima Sheorey (2017). Relationship between onboarding experience and turnover intention: intervening role of locus of control and self-efficacy. Journal Industrial and Commercial Training.

CITE THE ARTICLE

Gohain, A. B. (2025). Impact of locus of control, learning goals, and work environment on training transfer: The mediating role of self-efficacy among Gen Z employees in Kamrup Metro startups. *Don Bosco International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(1).