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Six employee characteristics (conscientiousness, self-efficacy, motivation to learn, learning goal orientation, performance goal orientation, instrumentality) and one work environment characteristic (transfer of training climate) were captured for 130 trainees in a large industrial company in an attempt to predict training effectiveness (training grade, supervisor evaluation of the application of training). The results strongly support the predicted links, although not all the predictor variables contributed a statistically significant share of the explained variance of the training outcomes. Motivation to learn and learning goal orientation were found to contribute most to predicting training outcomes. The implications of the results are discussed and the limitations of the study are noted, along with suggested avenues for future research.

1. Effects of trainee characteristics on training effectiveness

The constant pressure to maintain superiority in the marketplace engenders the need to constantly upgrade employee skills and knowledge and to improve positive work-related attitudes (Tannenbaum, 1997). The method most commonly used to attain these goals is training. In economic terms, training represents a major outlay for American companies, with estimates of more than $55 billion spent annually for this purpose by firms with 100 employees or more (Arthur, Bennett, Edens, & Bell, 2003). This is thought to be money well spent. Davis and Yi (2004) report, for example, that Motorola estimates that every dollar spent on training generates $30 in productivity gains within 3 years. Given the paramount importance and substantial cost of training, it is not surprising that both companies and researchers are interested in identifying the factors likely to affect training effectiveness.

Among the factors that have been singled out as predictors of training outcomes are both individual characteristics, such as self-efficacy, goal orientation, and motivation to learn, and work environment properties, such as transfer of training climate (e.g., Gist, Stevens, & Bavetta, 1991; Mathieu, Tannenbaum, & Salas, 1992; Towler & Dipboye, 2001). Insufficient research, however, has been devoted to investigating the unique and combined effects of these two types of predictors, particularly in real organizational settings (Holladay & Quinones, 2003). This study was therefore designed to build on and extend previous research by studying the unique and combined effects of six trainee characteristics and one work environment variable on training effectiveness in a large industrial company.
1.1. Training effectiveness

A recent meta-analysis of training effectiveness reveals that two of the most relevant measures of training success are learning outcomes and post-training job performance (Arthur et al., 2003). The authors contend, however, that despite the fact that these measures are conceptually related, empirical investigations have only partially succeeded in producing evidence of this link (Alliger, Tannenbaum, Bennett, Traver, & Shotland, 1997; Colquitt, LePine, & Noe, 2000). It may be that each of the two criteria captures a different facet of training effectiveness, or that each is affected by different factors. For instance, actual job performance may be more susceptible to organizational factors than training performance, or the post-training environment may not generate appropriate opportunities for the learned material, skills, or competencies to be demonstrated. In either of these circumstances, empirical findings of training effectiveness would differ depending on the measure used. Consequently, this study incorporated two effectiveness-of-training measures: (a) training grade (as a measure of the learning outcome of training) and (b) supervisor evaluation of post-training performance (as an estimate of actual on-the-job performance following completion of the training program). This was merely a precautionary step, as there is no reason to believe that any conceptual difference exists between the two measures.

1.2. Trainee characteristics

The literature suggests that certain trainee characteristics, relating either to personality or to motivation, influence training outcomes to a greater extent than others. The following attributes, all of which have been shown to impact training outcomes, were chosen for this study.

1.2.1. Conscientiousness

Individuals high on conscientiousness are more dependable, well-organized, persevering, and motivated to excel on the job. Moreover, they tend to set themselves higher standards of performance and to be more committed to them. Conscientiousness has been found to be related to overall performance in a wide range of jobs (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Salgado, Viswesvaran, & Ones, 2001; Zhas & Seibert, 2006), and trainees high on conscientiousness tend to attain higher training outcomes than those low on this personality trait (Barrick, Stewart, & Piotrowski, 2002; Colquitt & Simmering, 1998).

1.2.2. Self-efficacy

This attribute is defined as the individual’s belief that he/she can successfully meet training requirements and master training-program contents (Gist et al., 1991; Stevens & Gist, 1997). It has consistently proven to be positively linked to training performance (Mathieu & Martineau, 1997; Mathieu, Martineau, & Tannenbaum, 1993), most probably because it plays a motivational role, affecting the amount of effort applied to task performance.

1.2.3. Motivation to learn

This term refers to the intention to invest high levels of consistent effort in a particular training program. Several studies suggest that acquisition is influenced by the motivation to learn (Mathieu & Martineau, 1997; Tziner, Haccoun, & Kadish, 1991), but this contention has thus far received only limited empirical support, perhaps because motivation is not easily measurable.

1.2.4. Learning goal orientation

According to Seijts, Latham, Tasa, and Latham (2004) and Seijts and Latham (2005), those driven by a learning goal orientation seek challenging tasks that provide them with the opportunity to acquire and master new skills and expand competencies. Hence, they can also be expected to devote more attention to training programs that enable them to develop their abilities.

1.2.5. Performance goal orientation

Individuals high on performance goal orientation seek to demonstrate competence and have a strong desire to impress others. Unlike those high on learning goal orientation, for whom the learning process itself is the reward, people scoring high on performance goal orientation are rewarded by external recognition for the attainment of goals. This would lead us to expect the two goal orientation types to be inversely related to training effectiveness. Although the results are not unequivocal, various studies do seem to indicate that learning goal orientation is associated with higher training scores than performance goal orientation (VandeWalle, Cron, & Slocum, 2001; Fisher & Ford, 1998). However, research is yet to be conducted on the link between goal orientation and performance during and after training.

1.2.6. Instrumentality of training

This term refers to the individual’s perception that completion of training will lead to valued outcomes, such as a sense of accomplishment, greater chance of promotion, or monetary rewards. Campbell and Kuncel (2001) maintain that there is a reasonable body of evidence indicating that the magnitude of training instrumentality affects trainee achievements.
1.3. Work environment characteristic: transfer of training climate

Work environment characteristics have also been found to influence the effectiveness of the learning process in training, and the extent to which the capabilities acquired in training are applied in the actual job setting. One of the primary environmental factors is transfer of training climate, defined as the trainee’s perception of the degree to which there will be support for using on the job what has been acquired in training. Research clearly supports the proposition that a favorable transfer climate enhances training attainment and subsequent job performance (Tracey, Tannenbaum, & Kavangh, 1995; Tziner et al., 1991).

Although each of these variables has been studied individually, no previous comprehensive investigation has examined their combined and relative contribution to training effectiveness in a real setting. This study sought to fill this gap. On the basis of the above definitions and previous findings, it was hypothesized that the trainee personality characteristics of conscientiousness and self-efficacy, the motivational characteristics of motivation to learn, learning goal orientation, performance goal orientation, and instrumentality, and the environmental characteristic of transfer of training climate, would all be linked to training scores and to post-training evaluated job performance. All the employee and work environment variables were expected to produce positive correlations with the outcome variables, except for performance goal orientation, which would yield a negative correlation.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

Data were collected from 130 male employees of a large industrial power company who held a variety of technical and operational jobs. All of them attended a two-month in-house training program aimed at maintaining and upgrading technical–professional knowledge. Mean age of the participants was 37.48 (SD = 7.54) and mean tenure with the company was 10.45 years (SD = 6.35). In terms of education, 46.2% had completed high school, 43.8% had some academic training, and 10% held a university degree.

2.2. Procedure

A questionnaire designed to measure the trainee and environmental variables was administered to the participants about a week after commencement of the training program. In addition, they were asked to note their full date of birth and the name of their immediate supervisor. This information was used as a code to match each questionnaire with the grade obtained by the respondent at the end of the course, thereby maintaining anonymity for purposes of the study. (No two respondents shared the same date of birth and the same supervisor.) The final grade was as an objective numerical score on a scale from 1 to 100 reflecting the level of mastery of the course contents.

About 3 weeks after completion of the program, the supervisors were asked to assess the degree to which each trainee made use of the skills developed during training. The same code was used to match these evaluations with the participants’ final grades and questionnaires.

3. Instruments

3.1. Dependent variables

3.1.1. Training grade

The participant’s mark out of 100 on the final training course examination, which assessed the knowledge he had acquired in the program (M = 85.45; SD = 9.75).

3.1.2. Supervisor evaluation of post-training job performance

Ten items designed to obtain the supervisor’s assessment of the extent to which the employee applied the knowledge and skills he acquired during the training program. The items related to issues such as the degree to which the trainee tried to improve his performance, to use new work techniques and knowledge, to change existing work procedures, to persuade colleagues and superiors at work to modify customary work procedures, etc. Scores were marked on a six–point scale ranging from 6 (to a large degree) to 1 (to a small degree), with high scores indicative of greater use of the knowledge and skills acquired in training, in the assessment of the supervisor. This measure yielded an internal consistency of \( \alpha = .88 \) (M = 4.3; SD = .80).

3.2. Independent variables

Conscientiousness was assessed using nine items drawn from the first items in this construct in the NEO Five–Factors Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992). A high score on this scale reflects a high degree of conscientiousness. In this study, internal consistency was \( \alpha = .86 \) (M = 5.14; SD = .57).

Self-efficacy was gauged by means of nine items designed to assess the extent to which the trainee believed he had the necessary competencies to successfully meet the training requirements, for example: ‘I believe I am capable of absorbing the material taught in this program,’ ‘I feel confident I can succeed in this program,’ ‘I am capable of performing the training assignments.’ A high score indicates a high level of perceived self-
efficacy. The internal consistency of the measure was found to be \( \alpha = .90 \) (\( M = 5.06; SD = .59 \)).

Motivation to learn was assessed by means of 10 items, such as: ‘I am exerting considerable effort to obtain a high grade in this program,’ ‘I am devoting a considerable amount of time to my training assignments,’ and ‘I have set high achievement goals for myself in this program.’ A high score indicates a strong motivation to learn. An internal consistency of \( \alpha = .93 \) (\( M = 4.48; SD = .91 \)) was found for this measure.

Learning goal orientation was measured by means of nine items, for example: ‘The opportunity to learn new things is important to me,’ ‘I like doing challenging work,’ ‘It is important to me to make the most of my skills.’ A high score indicates a high level of learning goal orientation. The internal consistency of the measure was found to be \( \alpha = .83 \) (\( M = 5.29; SD = .46 \)).

Performance goal orientation was measured by 10 items, including: ‘The things I enjoy the most are the things I do best,’ ‘I enjoy performing tasks which I know I will do well,’ and ‘I feel smart when I do things without making mistakes.’ A high score is indicative of a high level of performance goal orientation. This measure yielded an internal consistency of \( \alpha = .87 \) (\( M = 4.36; SD = .78 \)).

Instrumentality of training was tapped by means of 10 items, for example: ‘I feel that successful completion of the training program will help me to get higher monetary rewards,’ ‘I trust and believe that succeeding in this training program will enhance my chances of promotion.’ A high score indicates that the training course has a high instrumentality value for the trainee. The internal consistency found here was \( \alpha = .88 \) (\( M = 3.96; SD = .87 \)).

Transfer of training climate was assessed by means of 10 items, such as: ‘I can count on the support I will get at work when I try to apply the skills acquired in training.’ In my work unit, the utilization of newly acquired skills is valued highly,’ and ‘Back at work I anticipate being assigned tasks which require that I apply the knowledge I acquired in the training program.’ A high score on this measure is indicative of a work environment supportive of the transfer of training. This measure yielded an internal consistency of \( \alpha = .85 \) (\( M = 4.62; SD = .76 \)).

The final questionnaire measuring the independent variables of trainee and work environment characteristics therefore consisted of 57 statements. Participants indicated their response to each statement on a six-point scale ranging from 6 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). Each participant was assigned a score for each of the seven variables equal to his total score on all the items relating to that variable.

4. Results

Pearson’s correlations were performed among all the study variables. The results of this analysis appear in Table 1.

The correlation coefficients in Table 1 reveal that all our hypotheses were confirmed. In addition, a strong correlation was found between training grade and supervisor evaluation. Studies typically report a correlation around .45 between training scores and post-training job performance ratings, often attributing the relatively moderate magnitude of this association to deficiencies in the training program. Our investigation, however, found a correlation of .705 between the two measures of training effectiveness, perhaps indicating that a better job was carried out here in attuning the training program to actual job requirements.

The trainee’s personality characteristics yielded significant correlations with both success on the final

| Table 1. Descriptive statistics and Pearson’s correlations among study variables (N = 130) |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                 | Mean              | SD                | Conscientiousness     | Self-efficacy                  | Transfer of training climate | Performance goal orientation | Learning goal orientation | Motivation to learn | Instrumentality grade | Training grade (0–100) | Supervisor evaluation |
| Conscientiousness              | 5.135             | 0.574             | Self-efficacy         | 5.064                         | 0.593                         | 0.331***                      | 0.411**                      | 0.539**                      | 0.465**                      | 0.782**                      | 0.910                     |
| Transfer of training climate   | 4.616             | 0.757             | 0.467**               | .547**                       |                                |                               |                               |                               |                               | 3.969                      | 0.627                     |
| Performance goal orientation   | 4.356             | 0.783             | 0.093 (NS)            | .407**                       | .218**                        |                                |                               |                               |                               | 85.45                      | 0.432                     |
| Learning goal orientation      | 5.287             | 0.463             | 0.473**               | .627**                       | .465**                        | .210**                        |                               |                               |                               | 4.320                      | 0.799                     |
| Motivation to learn            | 4.481             | 0.910             | 0.324**               | .689**                       | .462**                        | .358**                         | .487**                       |                               |                               | 85.45                      | 0.432                     |
| Instrumentality                | 3.969             | 0.872             | 0.072 (NS)            | .453**                       | .514**                        | .245**                         | .272**                       | .689**                       |                               | 85.45                      | 0.432                     |
| Training grade                 | 85.45             | 9.753             | 0.292**               | .661**                       | .530**                        | .411**                         | .530**                       | .758**                       | .576**                       | 85.45                      | 0.432                     |

Note: **p < .01. NS, not significant.
exam and supervisor’s evaluation of his successful application of what he had learned. The higher the trainee’s conscientiousness, the higher his final training grade ($r = .292$, $p = .001$) and the higher his rating on the supervisor evaluation ($r = .395$, $p = .000$). Similarly, higher self-efficacy was associated with higher training grade ($r = .661$, $p = .000$) and higher supervisor evaluation ($r = .509$, $p = .000$).

Four variables were used to examine motivational features of the trainee: motivation to learn, learning goal orientation, performance goal orientation, and instrumentality. These variables also produced significant correlations in the expected directions with the two measures of training effectiveness. Higher motivation to learn, learning goal orientation, and instrumentality were all associated with higher training grades ($r = .758$, $p = .000$; $r = .530$, $p = .000$; $r = .576$, $p = .000$, respectively), as well as with higher supervisor evaluation ($r = .609$, $p = .000$; $r = .539$, $p = .000$; $r = .433$, $p = .000$, respectively). On the other hand, higher performance goal orientation yielded negative correlations with training grade ($r = -.441$, $p = .000$) and supervisor evaluation ($r = -.330$, $p = .000$).

To ensure that no multi-collinearity effect existed among these four motivational characteristics, a Cronbach’s $\alpha$ test was performed and displayed the very low $\alpha = .308$. Moreover, while the correlation coefficients between the four variables are significant, they are not high, further reconfirming the lack of a multi-collinearity bias.

Finally, the work environment characteristic of transfer of training climate was also found to correlate positively with the two measures of training effectiveness. The higher the trainee perceived the transfer of training climate, the higher his training grade ($r = .530$, $p = .000$) and the higher the supervisor evaluation of his on-the-job application of the training program ($r = .503$, $p = .000$).

To investigate the unique and combined contributions of the independent variables on training effectiveness, two hierarchical regression models were examined. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 2.

Model 1 tested the multivariate effect on the trainee’s final grade, and revealed that the personality characteristic of self-efficacy had a significant direct effect on grade ($\beta = .259$; $p = .001$) and contributed most to the total explained variance ($\Delta R^2 = 43.7\%$ out of $R^2 = 61.2\%$). Surprisingly, conscientiousness was not found to have a significant effect on grade. Of the motivational variables, only motivation to learn produced a significant effect ($\beta = .561$; $p = .001$), contributing the minor proportion to the explained variance ($\Delta R^2 = 13.4\%$ out of $R^2 = 61.2\%$). The organizational characteristic of the transfer of training climate did not show a significant direct effect on grade, although an indirect relationship was found via motivation to learn ($\beta = .642$; $p = .000$).

Model 2 tested the multivariate effect on supervisor evaluation. Here, both conscientiousness and self-efficacy were significant in the first steps of the regression, but lost their significance when additional variables were entered. In the final step of the regression, self-efficacy showed no significant direct relationship to supervisor evaluation ($\beta = -.072$; $p = .490$), but contributed very highly to the explained variance ($\Delta R^2 = 25.9\%$ out of $R^2 = 48.5\%$). Moreover, it had a positive indirect effect via motivation to learn ($\beta = .740$; $p = .000$). Conscientiousness displayed borderline significance ($\beta = .157$; $p = .054$) and contributed the minor proportion to the explained variance ($\Delta R^2 = \text{out of } R^2 = 48.5\%$).

With respect to motivation, motivation to learn ($\beta = .376$; $p = .001$), learning goal orientation ($\beta = .259$; $p = .004$), and performance goal orientation ($\beta = -.170$; $p = .024$) all displayed a significant effect on supervisor evaluation, contributing to the explained variance ($\Delta R^2 = 7.3\%$; $\Delta R^2 = 3.7\%$; $\Delta R^2 = 2.2\%$, respectively, out of $R^2 = 48.5\%$). No significant effect was found for instrumentality. Nor did the environmental characteristic of the transfer of training climate produce a significant direct effect on supervisor evaluation, although it had a significant indirect effect via motivation to learn ($\beta = .454$; $p = .000$).
5. Discussion

This investigation examined the direct influence of six employee characteristics (conscientiousness, self-efficacy, motivation to learn, learning goal orientation, performance goal orientation, instrumentality) and a work environment characteristic (transfer of training climate) on two training outcomes (training grade, supervisor evaluation of post-training performance) in a real organizational setting. Having previously been investigated individually, the seven independent variables are all assumed to impact on the value of employee training. Our aim here was to discover the relative contribution of these diverse dimensions by examining their unique and combined effects on training effectiveness.

Conscientiousness was found to have a direct effect on supervisor evaluation, a finding consistent with the claim that conscientious people tend to be organized and systematic and to accurately assess the demands of a task. They therefore have confidence in their abilities, enabling them to perform better than people low on conscientiousness (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Salgado, 1997). Contrary to expectations, however, no significant effect for conscientiousness on the final training grade was found, despite the familiar contention that conscientious individuals, who display traits such as perseverance and diligence, invest greater efforts in training programs and therefore achieve greater success (McCrae & Costa, 1987). However important conscientiousness may be, it is possible that in the context of training it has less effect on performance than other personal qualities or than motivation.

Revealing the opposite pattern, the second personality characteristic, self-efficacy, yielded a significant effect on training grade but not on supervisor evaluation. The effect on training grade is consistent with an earlier study, which reported that trainees high on self-efficacy displayed high performance levels that were reflected in the final grade (Maurer & Pierce, 1998). The fact that this characteristic did not show a direct significant effect on supervisor evaluation is surprising, as it has previously been found to have positive direct links to work performance (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). In our study, the effect of self-efficacy on performance was mediated by motivation to learn. It is possible that self-efficacy enhances the motivation to learn, which in turn leads the trainee to acquire more knowledge, skills, and competencies and to develop superior work strategies. If this is the case, then motivation to learn would exert a closer impact on performance than on self-efficacy.

Indeed, this study found a significant positive effect for motivation to learn on both training grade and supervisor evaluation. It is reasonable to assume that trainees with a high motivation to learn (as part of the effect of other personality and situational variables) invest greater efforts in the course and therefore are more successful in acquiring new skills and work methods than trainees low on motivation. These employees may logically be expected to bring their improved work competencies back with them to the workplace, allowing them to perform better and thereby achieve higher supervisor evaluations than trainees low on motivation.

Goal orientation also produced the expected pattern of results in Model 2 (supervisor evaluation), with a significant positive effect found for learning goal orientation and a significant negative effect for performance goal orientation. The effect of learning goal orientation on performance could be accounted for by the desire of people high on this trait to master new skills and discover better performance strategies that will ultimately result in better performance attainments. On the other hand, trainees high on performance goal orientation would focus attention on how to impress others, that is, on the outcome of performance rather than on its actual level. As supervisor evaluations relate to the quality of attainments, those who have invested efforts in developing the competencies needed to perform better (i.e., learning goal orientation) would be expected to rate higher than employees driven by the needs of impression management (i.e., performance goal orientation), and the two goal orientations should correlate inversely with performance ratings (Seijts & Latham, 2005; Seijts et al., 2004).

Although studies relying on the Expectancy Theory (Lawler & Suttle, 1973; Vroom, 1964) have demonstrated that the perception of the value of training is related to success, this was not borne out this study. Instrumentality did not produce a significant effect either on the training grade or on supervisor evaluation of the application of training on the job.

Nor was a significant direct effect found for transfer of training climate on either of the measures of training effectiveness, although previous studies have shown that employees in organizations with a climate that encourages the application of training invest greater efforts in applying their newly acquired knowledge and skills in the workplace (Ford, Quinones, Sego, & Sorra, 1992; Tziner et al., 1991). This study, however, did find an indirect significant effect for this variable, mediated by a motivation to learn, on both training grade and supervisor evaluation. This rather surprising result might be explained by the fact that variables such as motivation to learn and goal orientation were not included in the investigations that reported a positive effect for transfer of training climate. These variables may very well capture most of the unique significant contribution of a positive climate. On the other hand, a high learning goal orientation and motivation to learn might shield trainees from an unfavorable, non-supportive transfer climate, giving them the strength to overcome the obstacles it places in their path. In both cases,
the transfer of training climate would exert its effect on the two measures of training effectiveness through the mediation of motivation to learn.

In addition to advancing research in the field, the results of this study may prove useful for improving both the internal outcomes of training courses (measured by final grade) and their application in the workplace (measured by supervisor evaluation). The consistent findings of the investigation highlight the importance of promoting learning goal orientation and motivation to learn in order to attain better training outcomes. This lends credence to the results of previous studies that suffered from a restricted framework, as they were conducted on students and employed fewer variables (Colquitt & Simmering, 1998; VandeWalle et al., 2001). It is also worth noting that our findings support Arthur et al.’s (2003) contention that the estimated effectiveness of training may vary with the outcome measure used. As proved to be the case in our study, the variables found uniquely related to one measure of effectiveness are not necessarily the same as those uniquely associated with a different measure of effectiveness (e.g., conscientiousness and goal orientation measures predicted supervisor evaluation but not training grade). Both Alliger et al. (1997) and Arthur, Tubre, Paul, and Edens (2004) would attribute this finding to the fact that the training-outcome measures captured distinct facets of the training-effectiveness construct.

Certain limitations of this study should be noted, and might be addressed in future investigations. First, data regarding the outcome variable of application of training on the job were obtained from a single source – the trainee’s immediate supervisor. Research has shown that such evaluations may be biased in different ways as a result of a variety of factors associated with the supervisors themselves, including personality traits, their personal and professional relationship with the employee, power struggles in the organization, conflicts, differing interests, etc. (Tziner, 2002, pp. 279–307). Consequently, the supervisor evaluation of the extent to which the employee applied his newly acquired knowledge and skills may not have accurately reflected the true situation in all cases. Future investigations might therefore attempt to include objective measures of the application of training as well.

Moreover, supervisor evaluations were conducted 3 weeks after completion of training and were captured only once. It is conceivable that for a short period of time immediately following the training course, employees return to work imbued with the motivation to apply their new skills. Once time has elapsed, however, circumstances may change: motivation may decline, the material learned in the course may be forgotten, the transfer of training climate may become less conducive, and so on. Indeed, the phenomenon of relapse of training has been the subject of a considerable number of studies (Burke & Baldwin, 1999; Haccoun, 1997). It would therefore be wise to obtain a repeated measure of the application of training after a longer period has elapsed.

This study focused on seven trainee and work environment variables previously found to relate to training outcomes. Nonetheless, a large number of other variables have also been reported to affect these outcomes, such as work involvement, organizational commitment, achievement orientation, locus of control, etc. Future research would thus do well to include additional predictors and training effectiveness measures to study their unique and combined contribution as well.

Given the economic implications of employee training in terms of its value and cost to the company, research that serves to promote training effectiveness is of the utmost importance. We believe this study takes us one step closer to that goal by identifying, in a real organizational setting, two factors that appear to have a stronger impact than others on training outcomes.
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