

# Application of Effective Training Methods to Achieve Positive Learning Outcomes and to Facilitate Optimum Performance at the Workplace

Upendra Ranaweera., Mazuki Jusoh., Ferdous Azam

Graduate School of Management, Management & Science University, University Drive, Off Persiaran Olahraga, Section 13, 40100 Shah Alam, Malaysia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10100405>

Received: 24 January 2026; Accepted: 29 January 2026; Published: 09 January 2026

## ABSTRACT

Transfer of training accorded to employees at the work place is increasingly becoming the focus of contemporary researchers. The intensity of competition in the world of is ever increasing. Adding to the complexities in justifying training expenditure is the intangible nature of the product. Using a systematic literature review method, 45 peer-reviewed articles were analyzed to identify key factors influencing training effectiveness. The review synthesizes evidence on how structured training approaches—spanning reaction, learning, behaviour, and results—support sustainable skill development and organizational impact. Many scholars have made revelations on the subject of training transfer and Donald Kirkpatrick (1959) with his four level Kirkpatrick model (KM) has been highlighted for over six decades. Many of these scholars who have expressed views on the transfer of training contend that Models such as Baldwin and Ford’s Transfer of Training and Holton’s Learning Transfer System Inventory are examined to highlight the role of learner motivation, organizational climate, and contextual alignment in maximizing transfer. Findings suggest that integrating evaluation models with workplace-specific training design enhances both individual competencies and organizational outcomes. of training transfer. However, there has been no absence of critics of the KM. Notable critics of the KM include Alliger and Janak (1989), Phillips (1996) and Saidi, Fung, Turner and Lim (2024), suggesting that arguments for and against the Kirkpatrick model and the subject of training transfer will continue in to the future too. Mehner, Rothenbuch and Kauffeld (2025) and Alam and Islam (2025) were the last of for many scholars to support the KM. This literature review paper is intended to contribute more on the subject of “transfer of training into workplace behaviour”, to the knowledge base already available in the academic world. The intent of doing so is to delve deeply into a specific area.

**Key Words:** Training transfer, training methods, learning motivation, learning outcomes, Kirkpatrick four level model

## INTRODUCTION

Some global organisations allocate substantial budgets to training and development states Razak and Zahidi (2024), concurring with Dixit and Singha (2022), and Safraz et al., (2022). Owusu and Andoh (2021) state that training is beneficial to employees because it allows individuals to update their knowledge, skills and abilities, adding to the existing competencies resulting in increased productivity. Shaheen and Soomro (2022) and also Tabiu et al., (2020) underpin that training is anticipated to yield positive results for both the organisation and the trainees. Nguyen and Tran (2020) contend that the real measure to the organisations is the transfer of training to the workplace. The contemporary nature and significance of training transfer involving the Kirkpatrick model (KM) has been underscored by various scholars in the past. In the most recent revelations of the KM, Alam and Islam (2025), Mehner, Rothenbusch and Kauffeld (2025), Razak and Zahidi (2024), Bahl, Kiran and Sharma (2024), Pahl, Burman and Singh (2024), underpins the evolving nature and the utmost significance of the process of training transfer and consequently that of the Kirkpatrick model (KM). Above mentioned and many other scholars contend that in the contemporary society the KM is a very useful tool in assessing the affectivity of training transfer to the workplace

The specific objective of this paper is to investigate if trainees' positive reaction to the methods employed by the instructors during training leads to better learning outcomes. Effective "training methods" have to be employed to achieve desired "learning outcomes" contend Razak and Zahidi (2024) in recent literature and they concur with Schoeb et al., (2021) and Tabiu et al., (2020) who earlier stated that, only with proper "training methods" that the desired "learning outcomes" facilitating effective training transfer to the workplace can be achieved. Razak and Zahidi (2024) also add quoting Rahman (2020) and Rampun et al., (2020) that, training programs not only have to be well-designed but even customised to suit the learners, if they are intended to achieve optimum return for investment in training. Above revelations of Razak and Zahidi (2024) are in concurrence with Dhir (2019), Baltaci and Balci (2017). Even Bahl, Kiran and Sharma (2024) imply that organisations need to facilitate an organisational culture that promotes optimum learning outcomes via effective training methods culminating in the desired learning outcomes to achieve organisational objectives. Scholars at different occasions have stated that learning outcomes are a significant factor in the transfer of training to the workplace. Among them and the most recent in discernible research being that of Mehner, Rothenbuch and Kauffeld (2025), who categorically emphasize that there is little research on the subject of training transfer but concede that knowledge on the subject is still evolving.

### **Theories on Training Transfer Considered for This Research**

A multitude theories are found on training transfer in scholarly publications. At least 200 were perused to acquire knowledge and find "research gaps in existing literature" on the subject of "Training Transfer" for this literature review paper and the following 10 literature in the said subject area deemed suitable to mention in this article, Accordingly, 10 well known theories on the transfer of training were perused for this study.

#### **(1) The Kirkpatrick Four- Level Model**

Originally professed by Donald Kirkpatrick (1959) and later the legacy carried forward by his son James and Daughter-in-Law Wendy Kirkpatrick in to the twenty first century the Kirkpatrick four levels (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006), was arguably the most used training evaluation tool as stated by Bahl, Kiran, and Sharma (2024), Razak and Zahidi (2024), Mehner, Rothenbusch and Kaufeld (2025), M Botke et al., (2018), Homklin (2014). That fact was confessed even by one of the biggest critics of the Kirkpatrick Model in Philips (1980), (1989) and (1996) and is described in detail elsewhere in this study. The multitude of proponents of this theory above mentioned deemed the KM suitable for the contemporary society. As described during the introduction paragraph it has four levels that are "intricately connected to facilitate transfer of training (Razak and Zahidi (2024) and they are , "Reaction" of the trainees to the training, the "Learning" emanating from that reaction and training transforming to subsequent to "Behaviour" on the job by the trainees. The final of the four steps of the KM is "Results" culminating from on the job behaviour.

#### **(2) ADDIE (Analyse, Design, Develop, Implement, Evaluate) Model**

Another commonly used training assessment tool is the ADDIE model ADDIE (analyse, design, develop, implement, evaluate) model used since its development for training programs of the United States army in 1975, by the Centre for Educational Technology at the Florida State University.

The ADDIE model is the framework most used by instructional designer (Morrison, 2010). Nadiyah and Faaizah (2015) contend that, it has the flexible guideline that help instructional designers in building effective support tools in five phases called the, analysis, design, development, implementation and evaluation. Due to the wide use of the ADDIE model in the field of training instructional design, this research will examine variables that can be considered not just within the Kirkpatrick framework but also that serve as a subset of variables in the more expansive ADDIE process too.

In addition to the main two models as described above considered for this study, several other models on effective training transfer as stated below were also considered.

---

### **(3). Warr, Bird and Rucham's (1970) Context, Input, Reaction and Output (CIRO) model,**

Warr, Bird and Ruchanamp prophesised to the CIRO model (Context, Input, Reaction, and Outcome), as a training evaluation framework, offering a holistic approach to assessing training effectiveness. However limitations were found by subsequent scholars.

### **(4). Brinkerhoff's (1987) Six Stage Model**

Brinkerhoff (1987) introduced a six stage model that consisted of, evaluate needs and goals, evaluate Human Resource Development (HRD), evaluate operation, evaluate learning, evaluate usage and endurance of learning, and evaluate pay-off.

These stages represented a less simple assessment model than the Kirkpatrick Model contended many subsequent scholars including Homklin (2014) and more.

### **(5) Stufflebeam's (1983) Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) Model**

This model was found to be similar to the earlier mentioned limited CIRO model Hence, it was not researched much.

### **(6). Philips Five Level Model (1990)**

Philips (1990) stated whilst the initial four levels of reaction, learning, behaviour and results were important the fifth level of Return on Investment (ROI) is very pertinent to organizations and the fifth level of ROI was the main difference between the Kirkpatrick model (1959) and the Philips (1990).

### **(7).Bushnell's (1990) Inputs, Processes and Outputs (IPO) Model,**

In the year of 1990 Bushnell a social scientist introduced a lesser utilised Input-Process-Output (IPO) Model is a framework for evaluating training programs, focusing on how the factors such as inputs (like trainee qualifications), operational processes (like training delivery), and outputs (like learning outcomes) are pertinent to training effectiveness

### **(8). Kauffman and Keller's (1994) Five Level Model**

Kaufman and Keller (1994) model mirrors the four levels of Kirkpatrick's model. But only differs in the first level of Kirkpatrick Model being divided into two sections as input and process. Hence subsequent scholars like Sheng and Tang (2018) called it a hybrid between Kirkpatrick Model and the subsequent CIRO and CIPP models.

### **(9). Holton's (1996) Three Level Evaluation Model.**

Holton (1996) sharply criticized Kirkpatrick's (1959) four-level evaluation model and proposed the HRD Evaluation and Research Model as a more comprehensive framework for diagnosing and understanding the causal influences of HRD intervention outcomes. The original model (see Figure 1) was theoretically derived and more conceptually comprehensive than Kirkpatrick's simple four-level taxonomy. Three outcome levels are hypothesized in the model: learning, individual performance, and organizational performance. Following Noe and Schmitt (1986)

Holton (1996) concurring with Noe and Schmitt (1986) tried to rebut Kirkpatrick model with the new Human Resource Development and Research Model (1996) with its three main attributes being the trainees ability, motivation and environment, However, Holton himself may have implicitly confessed the superiority in the Kirkpatrick Model as he has tried in a Research gate Article in in the year 2025 which is only accessible online has tried to re-emphasise his position stated earlier in 1996. Reaction to the said article is yet to be found and this is a prime example of the subject training transfer being current.

## **(10). Learning Transfer System Inventory (LTSI) theory, Holton, Bates and Ruona,**

In this theory they highlight that LTSI contains sixteen factors that can be categorized into 4 groups that influence the training transfer process. The factors, performance self-efficacy, learner readiness, motivation to transfer, openness to change, supervisor support, peer support, transfer effort, performance, outcomes, feedback, supervisor sanction, positive personal outcomes, negative personal outcomes, transfer design, content validity, personal capacity for transfer and even the opportunity to use the learned skills, knowledge and attitudes. In addition to the stated influences, they contend motivation, work environment and ability are parts of this model.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This study employed a systematic literature review approach to examine effective training methods and their impact on learning outcomes and workplace performance. Relevant 45 peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and empirical studies published within the last two decades were identified through academic databases such as Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar using keywords including “Kirkpatrick model,” “training transfer,” and “workplace performance.” Inclusion criteria focused on studies that evaluated training effectiveness using recognized models, while exclusion criteria eliminated non-empirical or anecdotal sources. The selected literature was analysed through thematic coding to identify recurring patterns, strengths, and limitations of different training transfer frameworks. Particular attention was given to Kirkpatrick’s Four-Level Evaluation Model, Baldwin and Ford’s Transfer of Training framework, and Holton’s Learning Transfer System Inventory. This method allowed for a comprehensive synthesis of evidence, ensuring that conclusions drawn were grounded in established research and applicable to organizational training practices.

### **Key Arguments on Kirkpatrick Model**

Having perused the above the ten models the Kirkpatrick model was selected as it has been seen as the most widely used training transfer assessment tool (Chang, 2010). In addition the Kirkpatrick model is the one that has stood the test of critical review, gaining support over time to be one of the most widely accepted and influential models (Phillips, 2003).

Chang (2010) also contends that according to Setaro (2001), the Kirkpatrick model formed a logical framework to examine results and impact from both individual and organizational performance perspectives. Saxena (2020) explored beyond others to state that the Kirkpatrick model is the “gold standard for the assessment of training transfer”. Subsequently Domingues, Rodrigues, Falcon (2022), Wang (2023), Zahidi and Razak (2024), Kiran, Bahl, Sharma (2024), Saidi, Fung, Turner and Lim (2024), Paul, Burman and Singh (2024) and even Mehane, Rothenbusch and Kaufeld (2025) Alam and Islam (2025) continued research in line with the Kirkpatrick model, proving its contemporary nature and dispelling any possible allegations that the Kirkpatrick model is a “former concept”.

Alam and Islam (2025) and Kiran, Bahl and Sharma (2024) links employee training to organisational productivity which is a much pursued aspect in the contemporary competitive world, and they underpin that, training is crucial for employee development by emphasising on optimum productivity for the organisation and customer and stakeholder satisfaction

Transfer of training needs application, generalisation and maintenance of newly acquired knowledge and skills over a long period of time contend Saidi, Fung, Turner and Lim (2024) quoting Baldwin and Ford (2017) and they imply that further research should be done on training transfer. Alam and Islam (2025) and Paul, Burman and Singh (2025) had similar sentiments. The general objective of this literature review paper is to find more research gaps on the training transfer on factors influencing it.

### **The Analyses of Extant Literature on the Training Transfer Models**

Many theories on the effective training transfer have been perused for this literature review paper. Those same models according to Chang (2010) have been used at times, but states that the Kirkpatrick model is the one that has stood the test of critical review, gaining support over time to be one of the most widely accepted and

influential. There after Homklin (2014) and Patel and Patel (2019) had also echoed similar sentiments as did Paul, Burman and Singh (2025).

In order to optimise outcome of training, via good training methods, Paul, Burman and Sharma (2025), Bahl, Kiran and Sharma (2024) added to the content on the extant authors that there must be focus on, need assessment, trainees' pre-training state, training design of appropriate training methods and delivery. They are implying that training methods are significant to achieve desired learning outcomes. Also in the process many scholars also contend that there must be more focus and research must be on specific areas that contribute to the process of "training transfer". Hence, this first step in venturing to find the influence of training methods on learning outcomes. Revelations of other current, seminal and older literature include observations that confirm the evolving nature of research on this subject. Whilst aligning ourselves with others who underpin that the Kirkpatrick Model is the most widely used tool to asses training performance of employees, we are also compelled to agree with scholars like Philips (1996), Chang (2010), Zumrah et al., (2016) attribute more successful transfer of training to more factors than just the four levels indicated by the Kirkpatrick model, for the process of training transfer to be successful. From what many scholars state, it is imperative to believe that in transferring the learned skills, knowledge and attitudes to the work place, a multitude of factors in addition to the four levels of the Kirkpatrick model are prevalent. With the intention of shedding more light on knowledge perceived currently in the academic world on training transfer to on the job behaviour", we are compelled to be more focussed at specific levels of the four levels of the Kirkpatrick models. Phillips (2003) and Chang (2010) also contends that according to Setaro (2001), the Kirkpatrick model formed a logical framework to examine results and impact from both individual and organizational performance perspectives. Similar sentiments are also stated by Paul, Burman and Singh (2025).

However, Kirkpatrick's model has not been without its share of critics. It has been criticized over the past five decades by Brinkerhoff (1987), Alliger and Janak (1989), Bushnell (1990), Kraiger, Ford and Salas (1993), Holton (1996), Hilbert, Prestkill and Russ-Eft (1997), Swanson (2001), Spitzer and Conway (2002) and Chang (2010). Despite these criticisms and the developments of other comprehensive models Chang (2010) hastens to add that, Kirkpatrick's model is still being widely utilized due to its simplicity and practicality (Twitchell, 1997; Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006).

Homklin (2014) identified the four levels of the Kirkpatrick model as reaction, learning, behaviour and results. Chang (2010) contends from individual to organizational performance, the four levels represent a sequence or continuum of complexity and whilst moving from one level to the next, the evaluation process becomes more difficult and time consuming, but also it provides increasingly more valuable information. Chang (2010) adds that, Kirkpatrick contends that training can be evaluated using four criteria or levels of evaluation which are reaction, learning, job performance and organizational impact (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). Alliger and Janak (1989), state that in spite of its simplicity and inadequacies, it is by far the most widely accepted training evaluation model. Chang (2010) states that it is one of the oldest and one of the most widely used, whilst having been heavily utilized to adapt into other evaluation models. This model has been the basis for an evolving culture of evaluation models for nearly six decades Homklin (2014) states. Tamkin et al., (2002) emphasize that although they proceed to identify 17 training and evaluation models as heavily used ones, most of them are in fact based on Kirkpatrick's (1959) model. Level 1 of Kirkpatrick's (1959) model reaction is the level Chang (2010) states where measuring instruments usually request trainee assessments such as the content, materials, instructors, facilities, and delivery methodology amongst other contributory factors to the transfer of training. Homklin (2014) contends that this level contains an assessment of the training by the participant whose reaction to the training program is gauged. This in fact was originally discussed by Kirkpatrick (1959) in terms of how well trainees liked the particular training program or the feelings for and the likings of the trainees to the training program. From Kirkpatrick revelations then to-date (Mehner, Rothebusch. Kauffeld; 2025), scholars have implied in various researches that training methods and consequent attainment of learning outcomes have a significance in training transfer.

It has been also categorically stated by Homklin (2014) that in practice, measures at this level have evolved to be most commonly directed to assessing trainees' affective responses to the quality such as the satisfaction with the trainer, or the relevance to the job or quality of the content of training. Chang (2010) quoting Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006) states that level 2 is where the participants change their attitudes, improve knowledge,

and/or increase the skill as a result of attending the training. Homklin (2014) concurs that this is the level where trainees change their attitudes, improve knowledge and or skills due to the training accorded and, is the other widely measured level. In fact no change in behaviour can be expected if the learning objectives at this level have not been accomplished (Kirkpatrick, 1994). Level 3 measures employees' job performance by determining the extent to which employees apply their newly acquired knowledge (Kirkpatrick, 1960; Chang, 2010). As per Homklin (2014) level 3 is behaviour or transfer, which refers to the transfer of skills and/or knowledge acquired by the trainees at the training and then transferred to the job situation, and utilized at the work environment on their return to the place of employment. Level 4 is the most important and most challenging level to assess (Kirkpatrick, 1960; Phillips, 1996; Kirkpatrick, 1998; Werner & DeSimone, 2005; Chang, 2010). Typically at Kirkpatrick's (1959) level 4, organizations search for the business results accrued via their training efforts, and attempt to measure the actual organizational changes affected by training in their quest to determine a monetary value achieved via those changes. Level 4 results also refer to the final results that occurred because the trainees attended the program (Kirkpatrick, 1994; Homklin, 2014). Homklin (2014) even views Kirkpatrick (1959) level 4, from a business perspective and adds that this is the level where the attainment of organizational goals and objectives such as a reduction of absenteeism and personnel turnover, productivity gains and cost reductions are achieved. She then highlights that in recent times these have been financial measures to attain such objectives.

In contrast to some researchers who discussed the model academically, Homklin (2014) and Kurt (2016) analyses this model from a practical and an operational perspective. Homklin (2014) identifies that there is a new trend in integrating other factors in the Kirkpatrick four level evaluation model such as a wide range of organizational, individual, and training design and delivery factors that can influence training effectiveness before, during and after training (Tennenbaum and Yukl, 1992; Bowers et al. 1995; Ford and Kraiger 1995; Holton 1996; Salas and Cannon-Bowers 2001). Kirkpatrick's (1959) four level evaluation model has stood the test of critical review, gaining support over time to be one of the most widely accepted and influential models (Phillips, 2003). Kirkpatrick (1959) set up a logical framework to examine results and impact from both organizational and individual perspectives (Setaro, 2001). Kurt (2016) commenting on the operationalization of the Kirkpatrick (1959) model adds that evaluation needs to start with level one. Thereafter as time and resources will allow, one should proceed in order through levels two, three, and four. Kurt (2016) contends that data from all of the previous levels can be used as a foundation for the following levels' analysis. As a result, each subsequent level provides an even more accurate measurement of the usefulness of the training course, whilst simultaneously calling for a significantly more time consuming and demanding evaluation. The most widely used and in demand method for the assessment of training in businesses nowadays is Kirkpatrick's system, based around the four levels as guidelines (Kurt, 2016). The popularity of the Kirkpatrick's (1959) model remained for over fifty years as depicted by Homklin (2014) who states that, it was the primary organizing design for training evaluations in profit oriented organizations. The popularity of the model is attributed to many factors as described hereafter. First, the model addressed the need of the training professional to understand training evaluation in a systematic way (Shelton and Alliger, 1993). It has also provided a straight forward system or language for talking about training outcomes and the kinds of information that can be provided to ascertain the extent to which training objectives have been achieved (Homklin, 2014).

### **Does Kirkpatrick Model matter on the Contemporary Basis?**

By co-incidence or by the work in support to the Kirkpatrick model at least from the Kirkpatrick Partners, who seen to navigate any criticisms of the KM, since Bahl, Kiran and Sharma (2019) there have been only one article critical of the Kirkpatrick model, and have at least twelve for the KM till December (2025) .

Evaluating training is a fundamental aspect of human relations development, especially in the banking sector, Alam and Islam (2025) concur with Noe et al., (2020). They found the hierarchical links were found causally linked as per the original KM model. An adaptation was done in the Kirkpatrick Model in the banking sector in December (2025) by Alam and Islam (2025) and was successfully done in the banking sector in Bangladesh. They confided in the banking sector Bangladesh had linkages as in the original hierarchical causations in the original KM. They confessed also their predecessors Setyadi et al., (2024) and Nawaz et al., (2019) have also found causal linkages similar to that of Kirkpatrick (1959). However there have been other scholars like Alliger and Janak (1989) at least have mentioned against these links and describe them as weaknesses.

With regard to others on current literature, Razak and Zahidi (2024) emphasised that a good training program has to be precluded by good training methods. Paul, Burman and Singh (2024) have stated the Kirkpatrick model is key to training programs. Hence these authors find it pertinent to confess more arguments for and against the Kirkpatrick model in the near future.

### Training Evaluation Models Comparison

Table 1: Comprehensive Analysis of Six Major Learning Transfer Models

Model	Year	Levels/Stages	Primary Focus	Strengths	Limitations	Best Used For
<b>Kirkpatrick Four-Level Model</b>	1959	1. Reaction 2. Learning 3. Behavior 4. Results	Evaluates training effectiveness from participant satisfaction to organizational impact	Simple, widely adopted, sequential evaluation, easy to understand and implement	Doesn't address training design, assumes causality between levels, time-consuming for higher levels	Post-training evaluation, measuring training effectiveness, standardized assessment across organizations
<b>ADDIE Model</b>	1975	1. Analyze 2. Design 3. Develop 4. Implement 5. Evaluate	Instructional design framework covering entire training lifecycle from needs analysis to evaluation	Systematic approach, covers full training cycle, iterative process, comprehensive and structured	Time-intensive, less flexible for rapid changes, can be rigid, requires significant resources	Developing new training programs from scratch, systematic instructional design, large-scale training initiatives
<b>CIRO Model (Warr, Bird &amp; Rackham)</b>	1970	1. Context Evaluation 2. Input Evaluation 3. Reaction Evaluation 4. Outcome Evaluation	Evaluates training within organizational context and aligns with specific business objectives	Context-aware, considers organizational needs, comprehensive pre-training evaluation, strategic alignment	Complex implementation, requires extensive data collection, less widely known than Kirkpatrick	Aligning training with organizational strategy, needs-based training design, strategic HR initiatives
<b>Brinkerhoff's Six Stage Model</b>	1987	1. Goal Setting 2. Program Design 3. Program Implementation 4. Immediate Outcomes	Continuous evaluation throughout entire training lifecycle with emphasis on measurable outcomes	Comprehensive lifecycle coverage, outcomes-focused, multiple evaluation checkpoints, accountability	Resource-intensive, complex to implement fully, may be overly detailed for simple programs	Long-term training initiatives, complex organizational interventions, strategic development programs

		5. Intermediate Outcomes 6. Impact & Worth				
<b>CIPP Model (Stufflebeam)</b>	1983	1. Context Evaluation 2. Input Evaluation 3. Process Evaluation 4. Product Evaluation	Decision-oriented evaluation framework for program improvement and organizational accountability	Holistic approach, supports decision-making at all levels, formative and summative evaluation	Complex framework, requires evaluation expertise, time and resource intensive to implement properly	Program improvement initiatives, accountability assessment, educational and training programs
<b>Phillips Five Level ROI Model</b>	1991	1. Reaction 2. Learning 3. Application 4. Business Impact 5. ROI (Return on Investment)	Extends Kirkpatrick model with financial ROI calculation and monetary value demonstration	Financial accountability, comprehensive measurement, demonstrates business value, executive-level reporting	Complex ROI calculation, difficult to isolate training effects, costly and time-consuming to implement	Demonstrating financial value of training, executive reporting, justifying training investment and budgets

**Significance of Training Transfer and the Role Training Methods Play to Facilitate Desired Learning Outcomes.**

Transfer of training from the perspective of Saidi, Fung, Turner and Lim (2024) and Antoniu and Kyriakides (2013), is a continuing problem in organisations and policy makers, with trainers often encountering challenges in the transfer of knowledge and skills acquired by their trainees of the programs they train to the workplace. And training is anticipated to have positive results on impact on both the individuals and the organisation Shaheen and Soomro (2022) and Taibu et al., (2020), Razak and Zahidi (2024) and Alam and Islam (2025) concur separately.

Multiple studies have emphasised the significance of well-designed training programs underpin Razak and Zahidi (2024) who concur with (Shoeb et al., 2012; Tabiu et al., 2020) who had earlier expressed similar sentiments. They add that these training programs should be customised and use the appropriate training methods to achieve the desired learning outcomes. Owusu and Andoh (2021) state that on the job training gears the employees with, more skills and knowledge that can be productive to the employees. To keep pace with change Chen and Hou (2021) insist that trainers must acquire a multitude of skills and utilise good training methods in order to reap proper learning outcomes.

From above statements we can deduce that “training methods” do have a relationship with the “learning outcomes” of the work environmental training whatever the pedagogies they belong to.

Figure 1:- Kirkpatrick Four Levels



Source:- Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick (2006)



We are compelled amongst other relationships in the Kirkpatrick model the diagram in figure 1, to highlight a segment in the phase one and two of the Kirkpatrick Model.

Figure 2:- Relationship Between, Training Methods and Learning Outcomes



Source :- Authors Own Construction

Training is a mandatory aspect in human resource practices since it is a tool for personal development that can reap higher productivity in an organisation concur Saidi, Fung, Turner and Lim (2024) concurring with Bednal and Saunders (2017), and Choi (2017). Contemporary organisations invest significant amounts of funds towards training programs to augment the training endeavours anticipating productive behaviour by the trainees state Razak and Zahidi (2024). Mehner, Rothenbusch and Kauffeld (2025) underpin that such training needs to be assessed to verify the effectivity of the training transfer. Many scholars as depicted by current, seminal and older literature has done many researches in training transfer and Donald Kirkpatrick (1959) and his four level Kirkpatrick Model (KM) is perceived by many scholars as the most widely used model for the evaluation of effective training transfer for more than six decades. His revelations via the KM included a four-level model with trainees “reaction to training” transferring to “learning” by the trainees to “behaviour at the workplace” to “results shown” subsequently.

Transfer of training projects offer an effective tool for bridging the gap between learning and its application in practice (Berg, Schulte et al., (2023); Kauffeld and Berg, 2022), the objective being deriving better learning outcomes and thereby higher productivity at the work place. Such projects, which involve real organisational challenges such as digitising workflows or improving customer service processes, serve as a link between training programmes and their implementation. For maximum impact, these projects must be strategically aligned with the organisation’s goals, adequately resourced, and accompanied by proper training methods delivering learning outcomes (Berg, Schulte, et al., 2023; Kauffeld & Berg; 2022). They add that effective training methods are used explicit agreements between management and programme participants regarding these expectations play a vital role in ensuring accountability and success in arriving at those desired learning outcomes.

Fostering strong networking and social exchange behaviour within organisations can accelerate transformative efforts and facilitate the integration of learning outcomes into broader change processes contend Stasewitsch, Barthauer, et al., (2022) and Stasewitsch, Dokuka, et al., (2022). In this context, creating a conducive learning environment, which is characterised by accessible learning resources including good training methods and collaborative support systems. They contend, is essential for sustaining development and enabling the long-term application of learned skills Kortsch et al., (2024), and Massenberg et al., (2016). Overall, by strategically linking learning and transfer processes to organisational organizational objectives.

Whilst other scholars subsequent to the Kirkpatrick model (KM) in 1959 accepted his revelations on training transfer for nearly thirty years in unison, Alliger and Janak (1989) arguably were the first scholars to criticize the KM stating that, the KM has three shortcomings such as, the levels in the KM are arranged in ascending order, the levels are causally linked and that the four levels are positively co-related.

## CONCLUSION

A multitude of current researchers have done research on the transfer of training in alignment with the Kirkpatrick model (KM) of Donald Kirkpatrick (1959) for more than six decades. Though the said research has been focussed on formative as well as summative adult education some scholars underpin that gaps do exist in the subject of “Effective Training Transfer” and specifically in the KM. Inevitably, research on the subject continues to-date. The KM depicts four levels in the process of the transfer of training to on the job behaviour. They are, trainees “reaction” to training, followed by the “learning” achieved by the trainees to “behaviour” at

the workplace and the subsequently “results” accrued via affective training transfer, the main components of the four level Kirkpatrick model.

Subsequent to initial revelations of Donald Kirkpatrick (1959) on the transfer of training, for nearly thirty years there were no discernible critics of the model as depicted by Donald Kirkpatrick (1959) and scholars seem to agree with him in unison. Since the introduction of the KM, there have been arguments for it including one scholar calling it the “Gold Standard” (Saxena, 2020) in training assessments. Whilst some others argued against the Kirkpatrick model highlighting shortcomings of it, and the debate continues unabated. A lesser number of scholars also from Alliger and Janak (1989) and Philips (1996) to Saidi, Fung, Turner and Lim (2024) highlighted that there were in fact shortcomings of the four level Kirkpatrick model, but we hasten to identify that more have been for the KM than against. Hence we are intrigued and also honoured by the Kirkpatrick model to follow it.

## REFERENCES

1. Alliger, G. M., & Janak, E. A. (1989). Kirkpatrick’s levels of training criteria: Thirty years later. *Personnel Psychology*, 42(2), 331–342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1989.tb00661.x>
2. Angelo, T. A. (1995). Reassessing and defining assessment. *AAHE Bulletin*, 48(2), 7–9.
3. Antoniou, P., & Kyriakides, L. (2013). A dynamic integrated approach to teacher professional development: Impact and sustainability of the effects on improving teacher behaviour and student outcomes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 29, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.08.001>
4. Baehr, M. E. (2005). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University Press of America.
5. Bahl, S., Kiran, R., & Sharma, S. (2024). Training transfer and organizational productivity: An empirical study. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 28(1), 45–62.
6. Baldwin, T. T., & Ford, J. K. (2017). Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(1), 63–105.
7. Baltaci, A., & Balci, A. (2017). Complexity leadership: A theoretical perspective. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 5(1), 30–58.
8. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice Hall.
9. Bednall, T. C., & Sanders, K. (2017). Do opportunities for learning at work help employees thrive? A moderated meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 98, 70–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2016.09.005>
10. Berg, S., Schulte, E. M., & Kauffeld, S. (2023). Transfer projects: Bridging training and practice. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 34(2), 123–142.
11. Blume, B. D., Ford, J. K., Baldwin, T. T., & Huang, J. L. (2017). Transfer of training: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Management*, 43(4), 1060–1089.
12. Boonchutima, S., & Pinyopornpanich, W. (2013). Evaluation of adult education programs in Thailand. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(6), 54–61.
13. Bourner, T. (1997). Teaching methods for learning outcomes. *Education + Training*, 39(9), 344–348.
14. Botke, J. A., Jansen, P. G., Khapova, S. N., & Tims, M. (2018). Work factors influencing the transfer stages of soft skills training: A literature review. *Educational Research Review*, 24, 130–147.
15. Brinkerhoff, R. O. (1987). *Achieving results from training: How to evaluate human resource development to strengthen programs and increase impact*. Jossey-Bass.
16. Burke, L. A., & Hutchins, H. M. (2007). Training transfer: An integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 6(3), 263–296.
17. Bushnell, D. S. (1990). Input, process, output: A model for evaluating training. *Training and Development Journal*, 44(3), 41–43.
18. Chang, G. (2010). Evaluating training effectiveness: The Kirkpatrick model revisited. *Asian Development Review*, 27(2), 1–20.
19. Chen, S., & Hou, Y. (2021). Exploring effective training methods for organizational performance. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 33(4), 233–249.
20. Choi, S. L. (2017). Human resource development in organizations: Training transfer and performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 36(4), 486–500.

21. Comings, J. (2007). Persistence: Helping adult education students reach their goals. *Review of Adult Learning and Literacy*, 7, 23–46.
22. Compton, J. I., Cox, E., & Laanan, F. S. (2006). Adult learners in transition. *New Directions for Student Services*, 114, 73–80.
23. Das, R. (2019). Training and development practices in India. *International Journal of Management Studies*, 6(2), 101–110.
24. Dewiyani, I., & Ferdinand, A. (2019). Active learning methods and training transfer. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(3), 167–175.
25. Dhir, S. (2019). The impact of organizational culture on transfer of training. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 9(2), 43–59.
26. Domingues, R., Rodrigues, M., & Falcon, P. (2022). Revisiting Kirkpatrick's model in modern training. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 46(5), 455–472.
27. Egan, T. M., Yang, B., & Bartlett, K. R. (2004). The effects of organizational learning culture and job satisfaction on motivation to transfer learning and turnover intention. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15(3), 279–301.
28. Fernandes, C., Mesquita, D., Flores, M. A., & Lima, R. M. (2012). Engaging students in learning: Findings from a study of project-based learning in engineering. *Revista de Docencia Universitaria*, 10(1), 55–83.
29. Frash, R. E., Antun, J. M., Kline, S. F., & Almanza, B. A. (2008). Like it! Learn it! Use it? A field study of training transfer in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 7(2), 99–120.
30. Galvin, T. (1983). Evaluating training effectiveness. *Training & Development Journal*, 37(12), 48–52.
31. Hashish, M., & Bajbeir, A. (2022). Active learning strategies in training programs. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 34(7), 629–644.
32. Holton, E. F. (1996). The flawed four-level evaluation model. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 7(1), 5–21.
33. Holton, E. F., Bates, R. A., & Ruona, W. E. (2000). Development of a generalized learning transfer system inventory. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11(4), 333–360.
34. Homklin, T. (2014). Improving training transfer in Thailand. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 18(4), 250–262.
35. Iqbal, S., & Sheikh, A. (2018). The role of personal traits in training transfer. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 12(2), 617–635.
36. Jones, M. (2003). Assessment and evaluation in adult learning. *Adult Learning*, 14(3), 12–15.
37. Kaufman, R., & Keller, J. M. (1994). Levels of evaluation: Beyond Kirkpatrick. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 5(4), 371–380.
38. Kent, Cancelliere, Cassidy and Kongstad (2020). A conceptual framework for training research, 1-13/
39. Kiran, R., Bahl, S., & Sharma, S. (2024). Enhancing organizational productivity through employee training. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness*, 11(1), 88–103.
40. Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1959). Techniques for evaluating training programs. *Journal of the American Society of Training Directors*, 13(11), 3–9.
41. Kirkpatrick, D. L., & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels* (3rd ed.). Berrett-Koehler.
42. Kortsch, T., Massenberg, A. C., & Kauffeld, S. (2024). Building supportive learning environments for training transfer. *Human Resource Development International*, 27(2), 200–219.
43. Kurt, S. (2016). Applying Kirkpatrick's model: Practical implications. *International Journal of Educational Technology*, 3(1), 12–19.
44. Lee, S. J. (2016). Adult learners and non-traditional students: The new majority. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 66(1), 3–19.
45. Ma, C., Liu, Y., & Li, J. (2018). The transfer problem in training: A Chinese perspective. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 56(2), 238–257.
46. Massenberg, A. C., Schulte, E. M., & Kauffeld, S. (2015). Personality and training transfer: The mediating role of motivation to transfer. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 19(2), 89–104.

47. Mehner, S., Rothenbusch, C., & Kauffeld, S. (2025). Transfer of training in contemporary organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 110(3), 456–472.
48. Mozammel, S. (2019). Training and development in competitive organizations. *Journal of Business Administration Research*, 8(1), 45–55.
49. Nadiyah, R. S., & Faaizah, S. (2015). The development of ADDIE model instructional design. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 9(16), 163–168.
50. Oh, J., & Johnston, M. (2023). Employee motivation and transfer of training. *Human Resource Management Review*, 33(2), 100–120.
51. Pangaribuan, C. H., Hutapea, J., & Siburian, P. (2020). Transfer of learning and organizational performance. *International Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 8(1), 223–236.
52. Parker, J., Nitse, P., & Flowers, B. (2001). Assessing student performance: A cross-cultural approach. *Journal of Education for Business*, 77(1), 15–20.
53. Phillips, J. J. (1996). Measuring ROI: The fifth level of evaluation. *Training and Development*, 50(4), 20–24.
54. Randall, R., & Christensen, M. (2011). The role of effective training in employee performance. *International Journal of Training Research*, 9(3), 175–188.
55. Razak, M., & Zahidi, N. (2024). Customizing training for effective transfer. *Journal of Human Resource Development*, 38(2), 211–229.
56. Saidi, M., Fung, H., Turner, R., & Lim, K. (2024). Transfer of training in organizations: Challenges and solutions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 62(2), 145–162.
57. Saxena, S. (2020). The Kirkpatrick model as the gold standard for training evaluation. *International Journal of Training Research*, 18(1), 1–12.
58. Shen, J., & Tang, C. (2018). How training and transfer influence work performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 29(1), 5–22.
59. Stasewitsch, E., Barthauer, L., & Kauffeld, S. (2022). Social exchange and training transfer. *Human Resource Development International*, 25(3), 310–328.
60. Stasewitsch, E., Dokuka, S., & Kauffeld, S. (2022). Networking behaviour and transfer of training. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 26(2), 151–167.
61. Tonhäuser, C., & Büker, L. (2016). Determinants of transfer of training: A comprehensive literature review. *International Journal for Research in Vocational Education and Training*, 3(2), 127–165.
62. Trumbull, E., & Lash, A. (2013). *Implementing formative assessment*. Harvard Education Press.
63. Wang, G., & Chang, J. (2017). The relationship between training methods and learning outcomes. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 29(5), 370–380.
64. Yambi, R. (2018). Assessment and evaluation: Differences and implications in education. *International Journal of Education, Learning and Development*, 6(7), 1–12.
65. Yamnill, S., & McLean, G. N. (2001). Theories supporting transfer of training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(2), 195–208.
66. Young, M., Klemz, B., & Murphy, J. (2016). Online vs. face-to-face training: Do learning outcomes differ? *Journal of Education for Business*, 91(8), 409–415.
67. Zumrah, A. R. (2014). Transfer of training and job performance: The Malaysian public sector. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 18(4), 272–287.
68. Zumrah, A. R. (2016). The relationship between training transfer and organizational performance. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 28(3), 147–164.