CHAPTER IV: ANALYSIS DATA AND RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter is organized into four sections. The first section presents the demographic data of the research participants, while the second section depicts the results of the exploratory factors analysis. Next, the third section explains the descriptive statistics, as well as the correlations matrix, and lastly, the fourth section describes the results of hypotheses test.

4.2 Demographic data of Respondents

The questionnaire had retrieved some demographic information from the respondents (training participants), such as gender, age, work experience and work status.

Table 4.1 shows the distribution of respondents based on gender. The total number of respondents had been 227, whereby 66.1 percent (N= 150) of them were male, and 33.9 percent (N=77) were female. The table also shows the distribution of respondents based on age. 46.3 percent (N=105) of the respondents were aged between 31 and 40 years old, 39.2 percent (N=89) were aged between 20 and 30 years old, and 13.2 percent (N=30) were between 41 and 50 years old. Nevertheless, only 1.3 percent (N=3) of the respondents were aged 51 and above. In addition, the table summarises the distribution of respondents based on work experience. Out of 227 respondents, 35.7 percent (N=81) of them had more than three years of work experience, 28.2 percent (N=64) had three years of work experience, and 22 percent (N=50) had two years of work experience. Only 14.1 percent (N=32) claimed to have one year of work experience. Moreover, the table also shows the work status characteristics of the

sample. Out of 227 participants, the majority of the participants (N=192) were involved in the work as a full time employees which represented in 84.6% of the participants, and only 35 participants were involved in the work as part time employees who represented in only 15.4% of the participants.

Table 4.1: Respondents Demographic

Characteristic	Frequency (*N*)	Percentage (100%)
Gender		
Male	150	66.1
Female	77	33.9
Age		
20-30	89	39.2
31-40	105	46.3
41-50	30	13.2
50 and above	3	1.3
Work experience		
One year	32	14.1
Two years	50	22.0
Three years	64	28.2
More than three years	81	35.7
Work status		
Full time	192	84.6
Part time	35	15.4

4.3 Exploratory Factor Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis is a technique within factor analysis, whereby the overarching goal is to identify the underlying relationships between the measured variables (Norris and Lecavalier, 2010). The first step in conducting an exploratory factor analysis is to examine the suitability of the data for factor analysis. According to Pallant (2011) and Leech, Barret, and Morgan (2005), the data are considered suitable for factor analysis when the correlation matrix shows at least some correlations at 0.30 or greater, the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity shows statistically significant value ($p < 0.05$), and the value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin is 0.50 and greater. If the data have fulfilled these requirements, the second step is to determine the number of components (items) to be extracted based on the eigenvalue. Only components with an eigenvalue of 1 and above are considered for further analysis. The eigenvalue can be found in the Total Variance Explained table. Next, the third step is to look at the component matrix table to examine the items loadings on each factor. In fact, only items with loading greater than 0.30 will be considered for the next step. Moreover, the communalities table is presented to provide information concerning variance in each item. Low value (i.e. less than 0.30) could indicate that the item does not fit well with the other items in its component. Below are the results of explore factor analysis for all variables in the study (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: The Result of Exploratory Factor Analysis

Items	Factor Loading (Communalities)								
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9
MTL1	.701(.492)								
MTL2	.800(.640)								
MTL3	.578(.335)								
MTL4	.718(.516)								
MTL5	.608(.370)								
SE1		.768(.590)							
SE2		.587(.345)							
SE3		.659(.434)							
SE4		.669(.447)							
SE5		.629(.395)							
SE6		.552(.305)							
SE7		.645(.415)							
JS1			.891(.794)						
JS2			.891(.794)						
CR1				.792(.627)					
CR2				.830(.689)					
CR3				.785(.616)					
OTP1					.692(.479)				
OTP2					.728(.531)				
OTP3					.710(.505)				
OTP4					.729(.532)				

OLC1						.665(.443)			
OLC2						.686(.471)			
OLC3						.767(.589)			
OLC4						.709(.503)			
OLC5						.717(.514)			
OLC6						.654(.428)			
OLC7						.638(.406)			
PD1							.837(.701)		
PD2							.906(.821)		
PD3							.857(.735)		
PD4							.868(.754)		
PD5							.864(.747)		
MTT1								.691(.447)	
MTT2								.701(.492)	
MTT3								.815(.665)	
MTT4								.771(.594)	
VIGOR									.921(.847)
DEDICATION									.860(.740)
ABSORPTION									.921(.848)
Reliability (α)	.706	.762	.736	.720	.701	.815	.917	.726	.883
Eigen value	2.352	2.932	1.588	1.931	2.046	3.354	3.758	2.228	2.436
% of variance	47.039	41.884	79.420	64.377	51.154	47.916	75.152	55.692	81.200
KMO	.729	.799	.500	.675	.727	.845	.873	.696	.722

Bartlett's test	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

Note: F1 = Motivation to learn; F2 = Self-efficacy; F3 = Job satisfaction; F4 = Content relevance; F5 = Opportunity to perform; F6 = Organizational learning culture; F7 = Power distance; F8 = Motivation to transfer; F9 = Work engagement; KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin

Table 4.2 shows the results of exploratory factor analysis for the variables (Motivation to learn, self-efficacy, job satisfaction; content relevance, opportunity to perform, organizational learning culture, power distance, motivation to transfer, work engagement) of this study. The table shows that the value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) for all variables are above 0.50, while the result for Bartlett's Test of Sphericity for all variables are statistically significant ($p<0.05$). These results provide evidence to support the appropriateness of the data for factor analysis. Following the appropriateness of the data for factor analysis, the next step is to determine the number of components that shows eigenvalue 1.0 and above. Table 4.2 shows the eigenvalue for each variable together with the percentage of variance. For example, the eigenvalue 2.352 were identified for variables motivation to learn that explained 47.039 per cent of variances. In addition, the communalities value for each item (please refer to the value inside the bracket) under each variable of this study displayed values greater than 0.3. This means all the items had been proven to fit well with each other in its component (variable). Moreover, Table 4.2 also shows the loading value for each item under each variable of this study. All items exhibited loading value more than 0.30. This means the items were strong to measure the variables of this study. Finally, the Table shows the Cronbach alpha value for each variable, which meet the acceptable value (>0.70).

Table 4.3: Summary of Exploratory Factors Analysis

Variable	Original Item	Final Item
Motivation to learn	- 10 items (Mtl1, mtl2, mtl3, mtl4, mtl5, mtl6, mtl7, mtl8, mtl9, mtl10) - 5 (mtl6, mtl7, mtl8, mtl9, mtl10) items have been deleted due to cross loading	5 items (Mtl1, mtl2, mtl3, mtl4, mtl5)
Self-efficacy	- 8 items (Se1, Se2, Se3, Se4, Se5, Se6,Se7,Se8) - 1 (Se1) item has been deleted due to cross loading.	7 items (Se2, Se3, Se4, Se5, Se6,Se7,Se8)
Job satisfaction	- 3 items (Js1, Js2, Js3) - 1 item (Js2) has been deleted due to cross loading.	2 items (Js1, Js3)
Content relevance	3 items (Cr1, Cr2, Cr3)	3 items (Cr1, Cr2, Cr3)
Opportunity to perform	- 6 items (Otp1, Otp2, Otp3, Otp4, Otp5, Otp6) - 2 items (Otp4, Otp6) have been deleted due to cross loading.	4 items (Otp1, Otp2, Otp3, Otp5)
Organizational learning culture	7 items (Olc1, Olc2, Olc3, Olc4, Olc5, Olc6, Olc7)	7 items (Olc1, Olc2, Olc3, Olc4, Olc5, Olc6, Olc7)
Power distance	5 items (Pd1, Pd2 Pd3, Pd4, Pd5)	5 items (Pd1, Pd2 Pd3, Pd4, Pd5)
Motivation to transfer	4 items (Mtt1, Mtt2, Mtt3, Mtt4)	4 items (Mtt1, Mtt2, Mtt3, Mtt4)
Vigor	- 6 items (We1, We4, We8, We12, We15,We17) - 1 item (We1) has been deleted due to cross loading.	5 items (We4, We8, We12, We15,We17)

Dedication	5 items (We2, We5 We7, We10, We13)	5 items (We2, We5 We7, We10, We13)
Absorption	6 items (We3, We6, We9, We11, We14, We16)	6 items (We3, We6, We9, We11, We14, We16)
Work engagement	3 items (Vigor dedication, Absorption)	3 items (Vigor dedication, Absorption)

4.4 Mean, standard deviation, and correlation between variables

Table 4.4 shows the mean (*M*), standard deviation (SD) and the correlation of the research variables. The mean score of the variables ranged from 2.32 to 4.32, while the standard deviation score ranged from 0.46 to 0.81. The correlation between the variables had been positive, except for the relationship between variable power distance and all variables, which portrayed negative relationship. Moreover, the correlation between the variables ranged from -.234 to .605, which is less than .90, suggesting less probability in terms of multicollinearity (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007).

Table 4.4: Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix

Variable	*M*	SD	MTL	SE	JS	CR	OTP	OLC	PD	MTT	WE
MTL	4.07	.52	1								
SE	4.06	.51	.367**	1							
JS	4.04	.81	.546**	234**	1						
CR	4.25	.59	.496**	.418**	.605**	1					
OTP	3.96	.60	.409**	.360**	.490**	.533**	1				
OLC	4.02	.53	.292**	.496**	.290**	.422**	.505**	1			
PD	4.21	.55	-.173**	-.088	-.183**	-.154*	-.081	-.073	1		
MTT	4.32	.56	.429**	.431**	.449**	.547**	.502**	.447**	-.234**	1	
WE	3.89	.46	.192**	.431**	.190**	.272**	.323**	.416**	.230**	.281**	1

Note: M = Mean; SD = Standard deviation; MTL = Motivation to learn; SE = Self-efficacy; JS = Job satisfaction; CR = Content relevance; OTP = Opportunity to perform; OLC = Organizational learning culture; PD = Power distance; MTT = Motivation to transfer; WE = Work engagement; ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

4.5 The result of multiple regression to test Hypothesis 1 to 8

Table 4.5: The Result of Multiple Regressions

Variable	Motivation to transfer (β)	Work engagement (β)
Motivation to learn	0.124*	0.037**
Self-efficacy	0.147*	0.186***
Job satisfaction	0.133*	0.040**
Opportunity to perform	0.178**	0.050***
Organizational learning culture	0.131*	0.173***
Content relevance	0.221**	0.074***
Power distance	0.132*	0.055***
Motivation to transfer	-	0.079***

Note: β = Standardized Coefficients Beta Value; * = $p < 0.05$; ** = $p < 0.01$; *** = $p < 0.001$

Table 4.5 explains the effect of independent variables (power distance, organizational learning culture, motivation to learn, self-efficacy, job satisfaction, opportunity to perform, content relevance) on motivation to transfer. The Table shows that the effect of all independent variables on motivation to transfer are positive and significant. For example, motivation to learn has a positive (β = 0.124) and significant ($p < 0.05$) relationship with the motivation to transfer. Based on the results in the Table 4.5, the hypothesis 1 to 7 are supported.

In addition, Table 4.5 explains the effect of independent variables (power distance, organizational learning culture, motivation to learn, self-efficacy, job satisfaction, opportunity to perform, content relevance) on work engagement. The Table shows that the effect of all independent variables on work engagement are positive and significant. For example, self-efficacy has a positive (β = 0.186) and significant ($p <$ 0.001) relationship with the work engagement. Moreover, the Table also shows that

the effect of motivation to transfer on work engagement are positive (β = 0.079) and significant ($p < 0.001$), which support the hypothesis 8 of this study.

4.6 The results of hierarchical regression analysis to test hypothesis 9 to 15

4.6.1 Hypothesis 9: Motivation to transfer is a mediator between motivation to learn and work engagement

The previous Table 4.5 shows that motivation to learn has a positive (β = 0.037) and significant ($p < 0.01$) relationship with the work engagement (*meet requirement of Step 1 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). The previous analysis (see Tables 4.5) also showed that the relationship between motivation to learn and motivation to transfer is positive (β = 0.124) and significant ($p < 0.05$) (*meet requirement of Step 2 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). In addition, the previous analysis also (see Table 4.5) found that the relationship between the motivation to transfer and work engagement is positive (β = 0.079) and significant ($p < 0.001$) (*meet requirement of Step 3 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). Based on these findings, there is a possibility for motivation to transfer to mediate the relationship between motivation to learn and work engagement (Baron and Kenny, 1986; Mackinoon, Fairchild, and Fritz, 2007).

An additional analysis was conducted to determine if the mediation effect of motivation to transfer on the relationship between motivation to learn and work engagement is of full mediation or partial mediation. The results (see Table 4.6) show that the relationship between motivation to learn and work engagement is positive but not significant (ΔR^2 for Model 2 = 0.006, p > 0.05) when the mediator (motivation to transfer) was controlled. This means that there is a full mediation effect of motivation

to transfer in the relationship between motivation to learn and work engagement (*meet requirement of Step 4 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*).

Table 4.6: The Result from hierarchical regression analysis

Predictor	Work engagement (β)	Adjust R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1			
Motivation to transfer	0.079	0.075	
Model 2			
Motivation to transfer, Motivation to learn	0.085	0.077	0.006

Note: β = Standardized Coefficients Beta Value; Adjust R^2 = Adjust R Square; ΔR^2 = R Square Change

4.6.2 Hypothesis 10: Motivation to transfer is a mediator between self-efficacy and work engagement

The previous Table 4.5 shows that self-efficacy has a positive (β = 0.186) and significant ($p < 0.001$) relationship with the work engagement (*meet requirement of Step 1 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). The previous analysis (see Tables 4.5) also showed that the relationship between self-efficacy and motivation to transfer is positive (β = 0.147) and significant ($p < 0.05$) (*meet requirement of Step 2 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). In addition, the previous analysis also (see Table 4.5) found that the relationship between the motivation to transfer and work engagement is positive (β = 0.079) and significant ($p < 0.001$) (*meet requirement of Step 3 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). Based on these findings, there is a possibility for motivation to transfer to

mediate the relationship between self-efficacy and work engagement (Baron and Kenny, 1986; Mackinoon, Fairchild, and Fritz, 2007).

An additional analysis was conducted to determine if the mediation effect of motivation to transfer on the relationship between self-efficacy and work engagement is of full mediation or partial mediation. The results (see Table 4.7) show that the relationship between self-efficacy and work engagement is positive and significant (ΔR^2 for Model 2 = 0.118, $p < 0.001$) when the mediator (motivation to transfer) was controlled. This means that there is a partial mediation effect of motivation to transfer in the relationship between self-efficacy and work engagement (*meet requirement of Step 4 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*).

Table 4.7: The Result from hierarchical regression analysis

Predictor	Work engagement (β)	Adjust R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1			
Motivation to transfer	0.079	0.075	
Model 2			
Motivation to transfer, Self-efficacy	0.197	0.190	0.118***

Note: β = Standardized Coefficients Beta Value; Adjust R^2 = Adjust R Square; ΔR^2 = R Square Change
*** = $p < 0.001$

4.6.3 Hypothesis 11: Motivation to transfer is a mediator between job satisfaction and work engagement

The previous Table 4.5 shows that job satisfaction has a positive (β = 0.040) and significant ($p < 0.01$) relationship with the work engagement (*meet requirement of Step 1 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). The previous analysis (see Tables 4.5) also showed that the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation to transfer is positive (β = 0.133) and significant ($p < 0.05$) (*meet requirement of Step 2 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). In addition, the previous analysis also (see Table 4.5) found that the relationship between the motivation to transfer and work engagement is positive (β = 0.079) and significant ($p < 0.001$) (*meet requirement of Step 3 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). Based on these findings, there is a possibility for motivation to transfer to mediate the relationship between job satisfaction and work engagement (Baron and Kenny, 1986; Mackinoon, Fairchild, and Fritz, 2007).

An additional analysis was conducted to determine if the mediation effect of motivation to transfer on the relationship between job satisfaction and work engagement is of full mediation or partial mediation. The results (see Table 4.8) show that the relationship between job satisfaction and work engagement is positive and significant (ΔR^2 for Model 2 = 0.018, $p < 0.05$) when the mediator (motivation to transfer) was controlled. This means that there is a partial mediation effect of motivation to transfer in the relationship between job satisfaction and work engagement (*meet requirement of Step 4 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*).

Table 4.8: The Result from hierarchical regression analysis

Predictor	(β)	Work engagement Adjust R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1			
Motivation to transfer	0.079	0.075	
Model 2			
Motivation to transfer, Job satisfaction	0.097	0.089	0.018*

Note: β = Standardized Coefficients Beta Value; Adjust R^2 = Adjust R Square; Δ R^2 = R Square Change
* = $p < 0.05$

4.6.4 Hypothesis 12: Motivation to transfer is a mediator between content relevance and work engagement

The previous Table 4.5 shows that content relevance has a positive (β = 0.074) and significant ($p < 0.001$) relationship with the work engagement (*meet requirement of Step 1 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). The previous analysis (see Tables 4.5) also showed that the relationship between content relevance and motivation to transfer is positive (β = 0.221) and significant ($p < 0.01$) (*meet requirement of Step 2 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). In addition, the previous analysis also (see Table 4.5) found that the relationship between the motivation to transfer and work engagement is positive (β = 0.079) and significant ($p < 0.001$) (*meet requirement of Step 3 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). Based on these findings, there is a possibility for motivation to transfer to mediate the relationship between content relevance and work engagement (Baron and Kenny, 1986; Mackinoon, Fairchild, and Fritz, 2007).

An additional analysis was conducted to determine if the mediation effect of motivation to transfer on the relationship between content relevance and work engagement is of full mediation or partial mediation. The results (see Table 4.9) show that the relationship between content relevance and work engagement is positive and significant (ΔR^2 for Model 2 = 0.020, $p < 0.05$) when the mediator (motivation to transfer) was controlled. This means that there is a partial mediation effect of motivation to transfer in the relationship between content relevance and work engagement (*meet requirement of Step 4 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*).

Table 4.9: The Result from hierarchical regression analysis

Predictor	Work engagement		
	(β)	Adjust R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1			
Motivation to transfer	0.079	0.075	
Model 2			
Motivation to transfer, Content relevance	0.099	0.091	0.020*

Note: β = Standardized Coefficients Beta Value; Adjust R^2 = Adjust R Square; ΔR^2 = R Square Change
* = $p < 0.05$

4.6.5 Hypothesis 13: Motivation to transfer is a mediator between opportunity to perform and work engagement

The previous Table 4.5 shows that opportunity to perform has a positive (β = 0.050) and significant ($p < 0.001$) relationship with the work engagement (*meet requirement*

of Step 1 in Baron and Kenny, 1986). The previous analysis (see Tables 4.5) also showed that the relationship between opportunity to perform and motivation to transfer is positive (β = 0.178) and significant ($p < 0.01$) (*meet requirement of Step 2 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). In addition, the previous analysis also (see Table 4.5) found that the relationship between the motivation to transfer and work engagement is positive (β = 0.079) and significant ($p < 0.001$) (*meet requirement of Step 3 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). Based on these findings, there is a possibility for motivation to transfer to mediate the relationship between opportunity to perform and work engagement (Baron and Kenny, 1986; Mackinoon, Fairchild, and Fritz, 2007).

An additional analysis was conducted to determine if the mediation effect of motivation to transfer on the relationship between opportunity to perform and work engagement is of full mediation or partial mediation. The results (see Table 4.10) show that the relationship between opportunity to perform and work engagement is positive but not significant (ΔR^2 for Model 2 = 0.009, $p > 0.05$) when the mediator (motivation to transfer) was controlled. This means that there is a full mediation effect of motivation to transfer in the relationship between opportunity to perform and work engagement (*meet requirement of Step 4 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*).

Table 4.10: The Result from hierarchical regression analysis

Predictor	(β)	Work engagement Adjust R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1			
Motivation to transfer	0.079	0.075	
Model 2			
Motivation to transfer, Opportunity to perform	0.088	0.080	0.009

Note: β = Standardized Coefficients Beta Value; Adjust R^2 = Adjust R Square; ΔR^2 = R Square Change

4.6.6 Hypothesis 14: Motivation to transfer is a mediator between organizational learning culture and work engagement

The previous Table 4.5 shows that organizational learning culture has a positive (β = 0.173) and significant ($p < 0.001$) relationship with the work engagement (*meet requirement of Step 1 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). The previous analysis (see Tables 4.5) also showed that the relationship between organizational learning culture and motivation to transfer is positive (β = 0.131) and significant ($p < 0.05$) (*meet requirement of Step 2 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). In addition, the previous analysis also (see Table 4.5) found that the relationship between the motivation to transfer and work engagement is positive (β = 0.079) and significant ($p < 0.001$) (*meet requirement of Step 3 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). Based on these findings, there is a possibility for motivation to transfer to mediate the relationship between organizational learning

culture and work engagement (Baron and Kenny, 1986; Mackinoon, Fairchild, and Fritz, 2007).

An additional analysis was conducted to determine if the mediation effect of motivation to transfer on the relationship between organizational learning culture and work engagement is of full mediation or partial mediation. The results (see Table 4.11) show that the relationship between organizational learning culture and work engagement is positive and significant (ΔR^2 for Model 2 = 0.105, $p < 0.001$) when the mediator (motivation to transfer) was controlled. This means that there is a partial mediation effect of motivation to transfer in the relationship between organizational learning culture and work engagement (*meet requirement of Step 4 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*).

Table 4.11: The Result from hierarchical regression analysis

Predictor	Work engagement		
	(β)	Adjust R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1			
Motivation to transfer	0.079	0.075	
Model 2			
Motivation to transfer, Organizational learning Culture	0.184	0.177	0.105***

Note: β = Standardized Coefficients Beta Value; Adjust R^2 = Adjust R Square; ΔR^2 = R Square Change
*** = $p < 0.001$

4.6.7 Hypothesis 15: Motivation to transfer is a mediator between power distance and work engagement

The previous Table 4.5 shows that power distance has a positive (β = 0.055) and significant ($p < 0.001$) relationship with the work engagement (*meet requirement of Step 1 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). The previous analysis (see Tables 4.5) also showed that the relationship between power distance and motivation to transfer is positive (β = 0.132) and significant ($p < 0.05$) (*meet requirement of Step 2 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). In addition, the previous analysis also (see Table 4.5) found that the relationship between the motivation to transfer and work engagement is positive (β = 0.079) and significant ($p < 0.001$) (*meet requirement of Step 3 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*). Based on these findings, there is a possibility for motivation to transfer to mediate the relationship between power distance and work engagement (Baron and Kenny, 1986; Mackinoon, Fairchild, and Fritz, 2007).

An additional analysis was conducted to determine if the mediation effect of motivation to transfer on the relationship between power distance and work engagement is of full mediation or partial mediation. The results (see Table 4.12) show that the relationship between power distance and work engagement is positive but not significant (ΔR^2 for Model 2 = 0.001, $p > 0.05$) when the mediator (motivation to transfer) was controlled. This means that there is a full mediation effect of motivation to transfer in the relationship between power distance and work engagement (*meet requirement of Step 4 in Baron and Kenny, 1986*).

Table 4.12: The Result from hierarchical regression analysis

Predictor	Work engagement (β)	Adjust R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1			
Motivation to transfer	0.079	0.075	
Model 2			
Motivation to transfer, Power distance	0.080	0.072	0.001

Note: β = Standardized Coefficients Beta Value; Adjust R^2 = Adjust R Square; Δ R^2 = R Square Change

4.7 Summary of the findings

Table 4.13: Summary of the findings

No.	Hypotheses	Analysis results
H1	Motivation to learn is positively related to motivation to transfer	Supported (Positive and significant)
H2	Self-efficacy is positively related to motivation to transfer	Supported (Positive and significant)
H3	Job satisfaction is positively related to motivation to transfer	Supported (Positive and significant)
H4	Content relevance is positively related to motivation to transfer	Supported (Positive and significant)
H5	Opportunity to perform is positively related to motivation to transfer	Supported (Positive and significant)

H6	Organizational learning culture is positively related to motivation to transfer	Supported (Positive and significant)
H7	Power distance is positively related to motivation to transfer	Supported (Positive and significant)
H8	Motivation to transfer is positively related to work engagement	Supported (Positive and significant)
H9	Motivation to transfer is a mediator between motivation to learn and work engagement	Supported (full mediation)
H10	Motivation to transfer is a mediator between self-efficacy and work engagement	Supported (partial mediation)
H11	Motivation to transfer is a mediator between job satisfaction and work engagement	Supported(partial mediation)
H12	Motivation to transfer is a mediator between content relevance and work engagement	Supported (partial mediation)
H13	Motivation to transfer is a mediator between opportunity to perform and work engagement	Supported (full mediation)
H14	Motivation to transfer is a mediator between organizational learning culture and work engagement	Supported (partial mediation)
H15	Motivation to transfer is a mediator between power distance and work engagement	Supported (full mediation