



TRANSFER OF TRAINING: WRITTEN SELF-GUIDANCE TO INCREASE SELF-EFFICACY AND INTERVIEWING PERFORMANCE OF JOB SEEKERS

AMANDA SHANTZ AND GARY P. LATHAM

Subsequent to training IT professionals (n = 35) in skills for performing effectively in a selection interview, 16 were randomly assigned to a transfer of training intervention, written self-guidance (WSG). This methodology is based on social cognitive and self-persuasion theories. The results showed that WSG resulted in significantly higher ratings from an interviewer than did those in the control group. Self-efficacy for interviewing skill mediated the relationship between WSG and performance. A content analysis of the WSG letters showed that the use of self-affirming and self-relevant statements was positively related to performance in the selection interview. © 2012 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

Keywords: training and development, self-efficacy

A perennial issue facing organizations is the transfer of training problem (Baldwin & Ford, 1988). Specifically, employees frequently fail to apply the knowledge and skills they learned during training to their jobs (Blume, Ford, Baldwin, & Huang, 2010; Latham, 1988; Latham & Crandall, 1991). Consequently, monetary investments in trainees frequently yield deficient results. Thus, transfer of training continues to be an important concern for human resource managers in

the twenty-first century (Baldwin, Ford, & Blume, 2009; Saks & Belcourt, 2006).

At least two theories suggest frameworks for designing an intervention that overcomes the transfer of training problem. Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory stresses the importance of self-efficacy for effectively applying the skills acquired in a training program on the job. Perceived self-efficacy refers to "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to manage prospective situations.

Correspondence to: Amanda Shantz, School of Human Resource Management, York University, 4700 Keele Street, Toronto, ON M3J 1P3, Canada, Phone: 416.736.5806, Fax: 416.736.5188, E-mail: shantza@yorku.ca

Human Resource Management, September–October 2012, Vol. 51, No. 5. Pp. 733–746

© 2012 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

Published online in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com).

DOI:10.1002/hrm.21497

Efficacy beliefs influence how people think, feel, motivate themselves, and act" (Bandura, 1995, p. 2). The theory states that high self-efficacy is necessary for a trainee to choose to exert effort and persist in doing so to overcome obstacles and setbacks to performing a task effectively. Among the ways this theory specifies that self-efficacy can be increased is persuasion by a significant other, especially oneself. Similarly, Aronson's (1999) self-persuasion theory states that among the most powerful sources of persuasion is oneself. This is because the persuader is someone that most people believe is trustworthy—namely, themselves. Self-

The purpose of the present experiment was to examine the effectiveness of written self-guidance (WSG) using a sample of unemployed IT professionals in the United Kingdom.

persuasion involves language and references to the salient aspects of the person's message.

Several studies have demonstrated that interventions designed to increase a trainee's self-efficacy leads to transfer of training (e.g., Frayne & Latham, 1987; Latham & Budworth, 2006; Morin & Latham, 2000). A practical limitation to these techniques is that they require hours, if not days, to implement effectively. The purpose of the present experiment was to examine the effectiveness of written self-guidance (WSG) using a sample of unemployed IT professionals in the United Kingdom. This new technique is based on the two theo-

retical frameworks described above. WSG can be conducted in 20 minutes; hence, it is highly efficient.

The present experiment was designed to contribute to the extant transfer of training literature in at least four ways. First, leading research voices in the field of training have made what amounts to a clarion call for theory-driven interventions on the transfer of training problem (e.g., Baldwin et al., 2009; Haccoun & Saks, 1998; Saks & Belcourt, 2006). The present field experiment sought evidence that WSG leads to higher performance than that which occurs in the absence of this training technique. Second, the sample used to assess the effectiveness

of WSG was composed of unemployed professionals with an authentic and important training objective, to be re-employed. They were not college students in a contrived laboratory setting. Third, the present study examined a possible mediator that explains the effect of WSG on transfer of training, self-efficacy. Finally, the present study examined, through a content analysis, the written elements of WSG that influenced interview performance.

Transfer of Training through an Increase in Self-Efficacy

Research has revealed a number of factors that influence training transfer. A meta-analysis (Blume et al., 2010) and enumerative reviews (Baldwin et al., 2009; Haccoun & Saks, 1998) identified the use of self-efficacy enhancing methods as an effective methodology to influence trainees to use what they learned during training on the job. Self-efficacy is a significant predictor of a trainee's learning and subsequent performance (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001; Tannenbaum, Mathieu, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 1991). This is because self-efficacy influences the goals that employees choose for themselves, and it influences the persistence with which employees attempt new and difficult tasks (Bandura, 1986, 1995). Moreover, empirical research shows that self-efficacy explains the positive effects of training on job attitudes, attendance, and performance (e.g., Gist, Stevens, & Bavetta, 1991; Latham & Frayne, 1989; Mathieu, Martineau, & Tannenbaum, 1993).

Among the transfer of training interventions developed to increase transfer of training is relapse prevention (Marx, 1982). Trainees describe in writing situations where they anticipate problems transferring one or more aspects of their training to the job, and then, with the aid of a trainer, brainstorm ways to overcome those challenges (Machin, 2002). However, evidence of the effectiveness of relapse prevention is mixed. Tziner and Haccoun (1991) found some support, whereas Gaudine and Saks (2004), Burke and Baldwin (1999), Burke (1997), and Wexley and Baldwin (1986) found little support.

Furthermore, no study, to our knowledge has shown that training in relapse prevention increases self-efficacy in an organizational setting.

At least three self-management techniques, adapted from clinical psychology, have been shown to be an effective way of increasing self-efficacy and alleviating the transfer of training problem. Frayne and Latham (1987) adapted Kanfer's (1980) methodology whereby unionized state government workers set specific goals for job attendance, self-monitored their behavior, and self-administered rewards/punishment for good attendance or lack thereof. Their job attendance increased significantly relative to the control group. When the control group was subsequently trained, job attendance increased to the level of the experimental group (Latham & Frayne, 1989). Morin and Latham (2000) adapted Richardson's (1967) visualization technique whereby first-line supervisors closed their eyes and imagined themselves applying the skills taught in training for communicating with union leaders. Specifically, participants spent one day in training for communication skills, and subsequent to that, four one-hour transfer of training sessions that included 30 minutes of mental imagery each. Six months after the final transfer of training session, the participants who engaged in mental imagery had higher self-efficacy and exhibited better communication skills with members of the union executive committee than did those in the control group.

Meichenbaum's (1977) methodology for changing dysfunctional to functional self-talk was used successfully to enable displaced managers to become re-employed (Millman & Latham, 2001), Native North American high school students to obtain jobs (Latham & Budworth, 2006), and Muslim women over the age of 40 to overcome employment discrimination in Turkey in obtaining jobs (Yanar, Budworth, & Latham, 2008). In brief, this technique involves verbal self-guidance (VSG), whereby trainees systematically record their dysfunctional self-statements (e.g., "no one is going to hire someone my age"), a trainer overtly models for trainees

ways of changing dysfunctional to functional self-statements (e.g., "with all my experience and wisdom, I know I can impress interviewers"), and trainees practice this skill overtly and then covertly.

The intervening variable in these three self-management techniques was found to be self-efficacy, building on previous research that has shown the explanatory role of self-efficacy (e.g., Latham & Budworth, 2006). However, an arguable limitation of each of these techniques is that training in self-management requires days, if not weeks, to be effective. The purpose of the present experiment was to examine whether another self-management technique, one that requires no more than 20 minutes to administer, is an effective transfer of training intervention. This technique, written self-guidance, is nothing more than a self-persuasive letter on ways a trainee intends to apply the knowledge and skills learned in a training program to the job.

Written Self-Guidance

WSG is similar to those used in the aforementioned training techniques in that all of them have trainees consider ways in which they will use their acquired skills post-training. In addition, they include ways to promote self-efficacy. However, WSG does not require trainees to consider how they will overcome obstacles in the transfer of training, nor does it involve rewarding oneself for positive behavior. Instead, the technique is focused on the successful attainment of a goal by asking participants to write a self-affirming letter to themselves regarding the training content that was most relevant to them. This procedure differs from writing a reflection paper, developing an action plan, or writing a course summary because it requires the trainees to write motivational letters directed at the self.

The present study included a content analysis to identify the elements of WSG

Written self-guidance is nothing more than a self-persuasive letter on ways a trainee intends to apply the knowledge and skills learned in a training program to the job.

that influenced subsequent performance. This was done in order to increase understanding of how to most effectively deploy this transfer of training intervention in the future.

Three hypotheses, based on social cognitive (Bandura, 1986, 2001) and self-persuasion (Aronson, 1999) theories, were tested. First, trainees who write a self-persuasive letter on the application of skills they learned in a training program perform significantly better than those randomly assigned to a control group. Second, subsequent to training, self-efficacy is significantly higher in the WSG condition than it is in the control group. Third, self-efficacy explains (medi-

ates) the relationship between the independent and dependent variables—namely, WSG and an individual’s performance in a selection interview. Because this transfer of training intervention is a novel one, we took an inductive approach (Stemler, 2001) to content analyzing the letters to determine whether specific characteristics of WSG affected performance positively. Hence, no hypothesis was formulated.

Method

Context

The experiment was conducted at a job placement organization in the United Kingdom that offers unemployed IT professionals training and job placement services. These services include training in interviewing skills to enable trainees to obtain a job. Unemployment in the United Kingdom in the time period when

this study was conducted had reached a five-year high at 6.5 percent (Office for National Statistics, 2009). The unemployment rate among IT workers was 4.8 percent. Further, the number of job advertisements in this industry was in decline (Best, 2009).

Sample

The participants were 35 IT professionals who were seeking employment. Twenty-four trainees were between the ages of 22 and 28, nine were between the ages of 29 and 35, and two were 36 years and older. Thirty-three participants were male. These trainees participated in this field experiment on a voluntary basis. The participants were randomly assigned to the WSG (*n* = 16) or the control group (*n* = 19).

Procedure

Over a period of 11 weeks, the participants attended four one-day training sessions on ways to secure a permanent job within the IT industry. One half-day was dedicated to interviewing skills where the trainees interviewed one another in dyads and then provided each other with feedback. Immediately following the training program, participants in the WSG group were invited to spend approximately 20 minutes writing a self-persuasive letter explaining the most effective skills and techniques that they intended to use to be successful in a job interview. Specifically, the trainees were asked to write a letter to themselves (i.e., “Dear Self”) that would remind them of the components of the training that were most important to them, and to do so in self-affirming, positive ways. The trainees were informed that they should not worry about spelling or grammar, and that no one but the researcher would be privy to their letter. The letters were then collected by the researcher. The participants in the control group read a review of the material covered in the training program.

Five weeks after the training had taken place, the participants in the experimental and control groups were given a handout, prior to a mock interview, that reminded them of what they had been taught in the training session. In addition, the trainees in the experimental group read their respective letters. All the participants then completed a measure of their self-efficacy immediately prior to the interview.

Mock interviews were used because it would not be possible to hold conditions

The present study included a content analysis to identify the elements of WSG that influenced subsequent performance. This was done in order to increase understanding of how to most effectively deploy this transfer of training intervention in the future.

constant in actual interviews conducted in multiple organizations. Furthermore, it is unlikely that all the employers would allow the researchers into the interview setting.

Measures

Interview Performance

A human resource manager, who was blind to the hypotheses and conditions, evaluated interviewee responses from 1 to 5, where 1 = very poor and 5 = very good, on a Likert-type scale. All of the participants were asked the same questions, of which 15 were open-ended (e.g., "Tell me about yourself"), two were patterned behavioral questions (e.g., "Tell me the circumstances when you were in control of a big project or task. What exactly did you do?"), and four were situational (e.g., "If a user phoned you and said the printer would not print, what would you say?"). The overall performance score for each trainee was the arithmetic mean of the scoring of the responses to the interview questions. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the 21 questions was .84.

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy for the participants' interviewing skills was measured using five questions, each on a seven-point Likert-type scale (Latham & Budworth, 2006; Saks & McCarthy, 2004). Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with the following statements: (1) "I feel confident that I have prepared for the interview," (2) "I feel confident in my ability to persuade an interviewer that I am a good candidate for the job," (3) "I feel confident that I can market my skills to an interviewer," (4) "I am confident that I can impress an interviewer during the interview," and (5) "I am confident that I can get my points across clearly during an interview." The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for this measure of self-efficacy was .90.

The participants were also asked whether they had been previously trained in interviewing skills (yes/no), the number of times

they interviewed for jobs in the past, and the extent to which they prepared for this interview.

Results

Means, standard deviations, and correlations among all variables are presented in Table I. The percentage of participants who were previously trained in interviewing skills did not differ by experimental condition [$\chi^2(1, N = 35) = 1.28, p = .26$]. Those in the experimental ($M = 3.63, SD = 1.31$) and control group ($M = 3.52, SD = 1.26$) also did not differ with regard to the number of times they had been interviewed in the past [$t(33) = .23, p = .82$]. The experimental group ($M = 2.37, SD = .96$) also did not differ in the extent to which they reported preparing for the job interview compared to the control group [$M = 2.26, SD = 1.04; t(33) = .33, p = .75$]. Finally, the participants did not differ significantly by age in the experimental or control group [$\chi^2(1, N = 35) = 1.86, p = .39$].

The average word count of the letters written by the trainees was 144 ($SD = 48.31$, range = 83–242). An example of a letter written by a trainee can be found in Appendix A.

The participants' age, gender, whether they had been previously trained in interviewing skills, the number of times interviewed in the past, and the extent to which they prepared for the interview were used as control variables for testing the three hypotheses. A univariate analysis of variance showed that participants in the WSG group ($M = 3.41, SD = .49$) performed significantly better in the interview than those in the control group [$M = 3.0, SD = .58; F(5, 29) = 3.26, p < .05, d = .56$]. Hence, the first hypothesis was supported.

The trainees in the WSG group ($M = 5.53, SD = .80$) reported a significantly higher level of self-efficacy than those in the control group [$M = 4.48, SD = .96; F(5, 29) = 3.36, p < .05, d = 1.11$]. Thus, the second hypothesis was accepted.

Baron and Kenny (1986) argued that to establish mediation, the independent variable must affect the dependent variable, the independent variable must affect the

T A B L E I Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations among All Variables

| | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|--|----------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|-------|------|------|-------|------|------|
| 1. Age | n/a | n/a | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Gender | n/a | n/a | -.05 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. No. of times interviewed | 3.57 | 1.27 | .10 | .02 | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Typical preparation time for interview | 2.30 | .99 | .14 | .21 | .04 | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Trained before in interviewing skills | 26 = yes | n/a | -.29 | .11 | .29 | .16 | | | | | | | |
| 6. Self-efficacy | 4.96 | 1.02 | .20 | .14 | .45** | .20 | .41* | | | | | | |
| 7. Condition (experimental group = 1) | 16 = 1 | n/a | -.19 | -.02 | .04 | .05 | .19 | .52** | | | | | |
| 8. Interview performance | 3.19 | .57 | .18 | .19 | .40* | .18 | .32 | .61** | .36* | | | | |
| 9. Statements regarding what to do (n = 16) | 4.84 | 2.86 | .18 | -.07 | -.41 | .23 | -.31 | .16 | n/a | .36 | | | |
| 10. Statements regarding how to act (n = 16) | 3.0 | 2.13 | .04 | -.37 | -.25 | .27 | -.31 | -.13 | n/a | .19 | .68** | | |
| 11. Self-affirming statements (n = 16) | 2.13 | 1.98 | .08 | .15 | .03 | -.36 | .26 | .18 | n/a | .51* | .01 | -.37 | |
| 12. Self-relevant statements (n = 16) | 3.03 | 2.17 | .23 | .13 | -.22 | .27 | .30 | .31 | n/a | .57* | .46 | .01 | .59* |

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level.

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level.

mediator variable, and when the dependent variable is regressed on both the independent and the mediator variables, the mediator remains significant.

The results demonstrate that the first and second conditions were met. That is, the participants in the WSG condition performed significantly better, and reported significantly higher levels of self-efficacy, than participants in the control condition. To fulfill the third condition, interview performance was analyzed, using as regressors the experimental/control condition and scores for self-efficacy. The overall model was significant [$F(6, 28) = 5.6, p < .05, R^2_{adj} = .30$]. Consistent with the third hypothesis, the WSG was no longer significant in this model [$t(6, 28) = .76, p > .05$], but self-efficacy remained significant [$t(6, 28) = 1.96, p < .05$]. The results of a Sobel test show that the mediator significantly carried the influence of the independent variable to the dependent variable (Sobel's statistic was 1.66, $p < .05$). Therefore, self-efficacy mediated the relationship between WSG and interview performance.

Content Analysis

To determine what written elements influenced a trainee's interview performance, a content analysis of the 16 letters was conducted. Because WSG is a novel technique, we used "emergent coding" (Stemler, 2001), whereby two people independently reviewed the letters and generated a set of features that formed a checklist. The two researchers (the first author and another PhD-qualified individual who was not involved in this experiment) compared notes and reconciled any differences.

Two PhD students, who were unaware of the purpose of the study, subsequently coded the letters along the four dimensions. The first dimension was the frequency with which trainees informed themselves of what to do to prepare for, or actually do, in an interview (e.g., "offer examples during the interview," "research the organization"). The second category referred to statements regarding how the person should act (e.g.,

"maintain eye contact"). The third category referred to self-affirming statements (e.g., "I will be successful," "I am a great communicator"). The final category related to the personalization of the letters, or the extent to which the letters were tailored to the individual, rather than general statements about how to do well in an interview (e.g., "I need to tell the interviewer about my experiences. I need to say that I've dealt with loads of angry customers!" "I've got exceptional experience that makes me stand out from others, such as a degree in IT and the 16-week intern with [name of organization] as a Helpdesk assistant"). The interrater reliability estimates of the categories were .93, .90, .97, and .88, respectively.

Because of the exploratory nature of the content analysis, and the lack of statistical power due to the small sample size ($n = 16$), regressions in this part of the analysis were conducted without using control variables in order to determine whether the frequency of statements regarding (1) what to do, (2) how to behave, (3) self-affirmation, and (4) self-relevant information were related to performance in the interview. The results revealed that information on what a person should do during an interview or how to act were not significantly related to performance. However, the use of self-affirming statements [$F(1, 15) = 4.89, p < .05, R^2_{adj} = .21; t = 19.28, p < .05$], and statements that were specific to the self [$F(1, 15) = 2.23, p < .05, R^2_{adj} = .27; t = 16.44, p < .05$], were positively related to performance in the selection interview.

Discussion

Key Findings and Theoretical Implications

This experiment is a response to the call for research on theoretically derived interventions

The participants in the WSG condition performed significantly better, and reported significantly higher levels of self-efficacy, than participants in the control condition.

designed to increase transfer of training using actual employees (e.g., Baldwin et al., 2009; Blume et al., 2010; Haccoun & Saks, 1998). The present findings revealed that WSG improved the interview performance of actual employees, IT professionals. That self-efficacy is the explanatory mechanism for the effect of WSG is consistent with the findings from previous studies, which showed that self-efficacy explained the transfer of training as a result of VSG (e.g., Latham & Budworth, 2006; Yanar et al., 2008). Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory states, and the present data show, that self-efficacy can be increased by persuasion by a significant other. The present data support Aronson's (1999) theory that the self is a powerful source of persuasion.

The number of general statements about what to do or how to behave during an interview did not lead to a higher level of performance. Only self-affirming and specific self-relevant statements were related to high performance in the interview.

However, in those previous studies, the interventions used to increase a person's self-efficacy took considerable time. For instance, Latham and Budworth's (2006) training on VSG took 7.5 hours, and Frayne and Latham's (1987) training in self-management took 12 hours to complete. This is comparable with the training times in other studies on self-management conducted in an organizational context (e.g., Brown, 2003; Brown & Latham, 2006; Millman & Latham, 2001). The WSG used in the present study required only 20 minutes from a trainee, yet the effects were comparable with those obtained in previous experiments on VSG.

The present study went beyond the identification of a mediator by content analyzing the WSG letters. Doing so identified the characteristics of WSG that increased an individual's performance in the interview. The number of general statements about what to do or how to behave during an interview did not lead to a higher level of performance. Only self-affirming and specific self-relevant statements were related to high performance in the interview.

Practical Implications

The practical significance of the present study is that it shows the benefit of WSG for transfer of training. Trainers should stress to trainees the importance of writing letters that emphasize positive messages that contain specific information and examples relevant to oneself. A guide for trainers on how to conduct WSG is found in Appendix B. To prevent the WSG letters from being lost by trainees, trainers should retain the letters and redistribute them to the trainees just before the trainees are presented with an opportunity to demonstrate the learned skill on the job.

WSG is a relatively straightforward, low-cost, low-time-consuming, yet effective transfer of training method. Nevertheless, the present findings do not suggest that WSG alone is a panacea for the transfer of training problem. Moderating variables need to be identified. WSG is unlikely to be effective if supportive leadership is lacking, or if there is little or no opportunity to use the knowledge and skills acquired during training (Baldwin & Ford, 1988). Blume et al. (2010) found that transfer climate was one of the most important elements of the work environment for predicting transfer of training. This suggests that training professionals should focus on developing a positive transfer climate when using WSG. The positive effect of WSG might be more pronounced when organizational-level factors are in strategic alignment with training and transfer objectives. Elangovan and Karakowsky (1999) suggested transfer of training is contingent on the organization's reward structure, and the extent to which the organizational culture supports change and development.

Not only might organizational-level factors influence the effectiveness of WSG, previous research has also shown that trainee motivation influences transfer outcomes. In the present study, the trainees were unemployed. They volunteered for this training in order to find a job. Research is needed to determine whether WSG will motivate less motivated individuals. Festinger's (1957) cognitive dissonance theory suggests that it might.

The generalizability of the present findings on WSG for transferring skills acquired in training to using Excel, shooting a penalty kick, or grilling a pork chop is not known. These skills vary along a continuum of “open” versus “closed.” The former are tied to learning principles and the latter to acquiring a specific skill (Yelon & Ford, 1999). WSG may be more appropriate in training programs designed to foster open skills, where there is no one correct way to act or perform the newly acquired skill. Training modules in interviewing skills, leadership development, or conflict management are examples of training programs in open skills.

One of the most historically prominent issues with selection interviewing is low validity, the ease with which interviewers can be misled, and the insidious nature of various biases (e.g., Macan, 2009). The results of the present study and similar others (e.g., Latham & Budworth, 2006) may elicit the question of whether higher interview performance necessarily represents higher job performance. Barrick, Shaffer, and DeGrassi (2009) found that “what you see in the interview may not be what you get on the job”; however, this relationship was moderated by the structured nature of the interview. Structured interviews mitigate the effects of impression management strategies used on the part of interviewees (Latham & Sue-Chan, 1999).

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

A limitation of the present experiment is that only one interviewer evaluated the trainees’ performance. Hence, inter-observer reliability could not be calculated. However, the interviewer was provided with a structured interview and a scoring guide that was generated by the organization, thereby minimizing rating errors (Campion, Palmer, & Campion, 1997). Further, the interviewer had worked in her present role as a human resource manager for seven years.

A further limitation is that it is unknown whether self-efficacy was increased immediately after WSG, whether it increased after

the interviewees read what they had written immediately prior to the interview, or whether it increased in both instances. Future research should establish at what stage(s) self-efficacy increases, and control for levels of self-efficacy prior to the training program.

Although self-efficacy was shown to mediate the relationship between WSG and performance, it explained only a modest portion of the variance. Research is needed on self-efficacy “for what?” Was it the organization of one’s thoughts prior to the interview, confidence in responding to difficult interview questions, remaining poised under the pressure of the interview, or something else? Working memory has no known limitations when dealing with information retrieved from long-term memory (Ericsson & Kintsch, 1995). By increasing self-efficacy, WSG may lighten the cognitive load so as to increase performance in a selection interview. Future research should investigate this potentially interesting line of research.

Future research should also investigate the possible main and interaction effects of a WSG and VSG intervention. Research is also needed on the enduring effects of these two self-guidance methods. Including VSG and WSG in one treatment package may prove to be a more effective transfer of training strategy than using either technique alone.

Conclusion

The results of this experiment suggest that WSG is a transfer of training technique that appears to be effective for enabling people to perform effectively in a selection interview. WSG is relatively quick to administer and straightforward for people to complete. By devoting only 20 minutes at the end of a training program, trainers can increase the self-efficacy of trainees, and increase their performance, especially in an interview setting. This finding is important given the high rate of unemployment among professionals in Europe (Eurostat, 2010).

Future research should establish at what stage(s) self-efficacy increases, and control for levels of self-efficacy prior to the training program.

AMANDA SHANTZ is an assistant professor in the School of Human Resource Management at York University. Her research interests include motivation, work engagement, leadership, and HRM practices. Her work has been published in several peer-reviewed journals.

GARY P. LATHAM is the Secretary of State Professor of Organizational Effectiveness in the Rotman School of Management at the University of Toronto. He is a past president of the Canadian Psychological Association and the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology and a fellow of the Academy of Management, the American Psychological Association, American Psychological Society, Canadian Psychological Association, and the Royal Society of Canada. He received the awards for Distinguished Contribution to Psychology as a Profession and as a Science from the Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology. He is also the recipient of the Scholarly Practitioner and the Heneman Career Achievement Award from the Academy of Management Human Resource Division.

References

- Aronson, E. (1999). The power of self-persuasion. *American Psychologist*, 54, 875–884. doi: 10.1037/h0088188
- Baldwin, T.T., & Ford, J. K. (1988). Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(4), 63–105. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1988.tb00632.x
- Baldwin, T.T., Ford, J. K., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Transfer of training 1988–2008: An updated review and new agenda for future research. In G. P. Hodgkinson & J. K. Ford (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 24, pp. 64–88). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 1–26. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173–1182. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173
- Barrick, M. R., Shaffer, J. A., & DeGrassi, S. W. (2009). What you see may not be what you get: Relationships among self-presentation tactics and ratings of interview and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1394–1411. doi: 10.1037/10016532
- Best, J. (2009). IT unemployment rate hits five-year high. ZDNet News. Retrieved from <http://www.zdnet.co.uk/news/it-at-work/2009/08/07/it-unemployment-rate-hits-five-year-high-39709641/>
- Blume, B. D., Ford, J. K., Baldwin, T.T., & Huang, J. L. (2010). Transfer of training: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Management*, 36, 1065–1105. doi: 10.1177/0149206309352880
- Brown, T. C. (2003). The effect of verbal self-guidance training on collective efficacy and performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 935–964. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00245.x
- Brown, T. C., & Latham, G. P. (2006). The effect of training in verbal self-guidance on the performance effectiveness of participants in a MBA program. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 38(1), 1–11.
- Burke, W. W. (1997). Leadership development. In L. Bassi & D. Russ-Eft (Eds.), *What works: Retaining and development practices* (pp. 1–25). Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.
- Burke, W. W., & Baldwin, T. T. (1999). Workforce training transfer: A study of the effect of relapse prevention training and transfer climate. *Human Resource Management*, 38, 227–241. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-050X(199923)38:3<227::AID-HRM5>3.0.CO;2-M
- Campion, M. A., Palmer, D. K., & Campion, J. E. (1997). A review of structure in the selection interview. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 655–702. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1997.tb00709.x
- Elangovan, A. R., & Karakowsky, L. (1999). The role of trainee and environmental factors in transfer of training: An exploratory framework. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 20, 268–275. doi: 10.1108/01437739910287180

- Ericsson, K. A., & Kintsch, W. (1995). Long term working memory. *Psychological Review*, 102, 211–245.
- Eurostat. (2010). Employment down by 0.2% in the euro area and by 0.3% in the EU27. Retrieved from http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/2-15032010-AP/EN/2-15032010-AP-EN.PDF
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Frayne, C. A., & Latham, G. P. (1987). Application of social learning theory to employee self-management of attendance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 387–392.
- Gaudine, A. P., & Saks, A. M. (2004). A longitudinal quasi-experiment on the effects of posttraining transfer interventions. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15(1), 57–76. doi: 10.1002/hrdq.1087
- Gist, M. E., Stevens, C. K., & Bavetta, A. G. (1991). Effects of self-efficacy and post-training intervention on the acquisition and maintenance of complex interpersonal skills. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 837–861. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00701.x
- Haccoun, R. R., & Saks, A. M. (1998). Training in the 21st century: Some lessons from the last one. *Canadian Psychology*, 39(1–2), 33–47. doi: 10.1037/h0086793
- Kanfer, F. H. (1980). Self-management methods. In F. H. Kanfer & A. P. Goldstein (Eds.), *Helping people change: A textbook of methods* (2nd ed., pp. 334–389). New York, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Latham, G. P. (1988). Human resource training and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 39, 545–582. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.39.020188.002553
- Latham, G. P., & Budworth, M. (2006). The effect of training in verbal self-guidance on the self-efficacy and performance of Native North Americans in the selection interview. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 516–523. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2005.11.005
- Latham, G. P., & Crandall, S. (1991). Organizational and social factors. In J. E. Morrison (Ed.), *Training for performance* (pp. 255–286). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Latham, G. P., & Frayne, C. A. (1989). Self-management training for increasing job attendance: A follow-up and a replication. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 411–416.
- Latham, G. P., & Sue-Chan, C. (1999). A meta-analysis of the situational interview: An enumerative review of reasons for its validity. *Canadian Psychology-Psychologie Canadienne*, 40(1), 56–67.
- Macan, T. (2009). The employment interview: A review of current studies and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19, 203–218.
- Machin, M. A. (2002). Planning, managing, and optimizing transfer of training. In K. Kraiger (Ed.), *Creating, implementing, and managing effective training and development* (pp. 263–301). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Marx, R. D. (1982). Relapse prevention for managerial training: A model for maintenance of behavior change. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 443–441.
- Mathieu, J. E., Martineau, J. W., & Tannenbaum, S. I. (1993). Individual and situational influences on the development of self-efficacy: Implications for training effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(1), 125–147. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00870.x
- Meichenbaum, D. (1977). *Cognitive-behavior modification: An integrative approach*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Millman, Z., & Latham, G. P. (2001). Increasing re-employment through training in verbal self-guidance. In M. Erez, U. Kleinbeck, & H. K. Thierry (Eds.), *Work motivation in the context of a globalizing economy* (pp. 87–98). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Morin, L., & Latham, G. P. (2000). The effect of mental practice and goal setting as a transfer of training intervention on supervisor's self-efficacy and communication skills: An exploratory study. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49, 566–578.
- Office for National Statistics (2009). *Labour market statistics*. Newport, UK: Office for National Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/pdfdir/lmsuk0309.pdf>
- Richardson, A. (1967). Mental practice: A review and discussion: Part I. *Research Quarterly*, 38, 95–107.
- Saks, A., & McCarthy, J. (2004). Interview self-efficacy scale. Unpublished manuscript.
- Saks, A. M., & Belcourt, M. (2006). An investigation of training activities and transfer of training in organisations. *Human Resource Management*, 45, 629–648. doi: 10.1002/hrm.20135
- Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2001). The science of training: A decade of progress. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 471–499. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.471
- Stemler, S. (2001). An overview of content analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(17). Retrieved from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=17>
- Tannenbaum, S. I., Mathieu, J. E., Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (1991). Meeting trainees' expectations: The influence of training fulfilment on the development of commitment, self-efficacy, and motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 759–769. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.76.6.759

- Tziner, A., & Haccoun, R. R. (1991). Personal and situational characteristics influencing the effectiveness of transfer of training improvement strategies. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 64, 167–177.
- Wexley, K. N., & Baldwin, T. T. (1986). Posttraining strategies for facilitating positive transfer: An empirical exploration. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 503–520.
- Yanar, B., Budworth, M., & Latham, G. P. (2008). The effect of verbal self-guidance training for overcoming employment barriers: A study of Turkish women. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 58, 586–601. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00366.x
- Yelon, S. L., & Ford, J. K. (1999). Pursuing a multidimensional view of transfer. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 12(3), 58–78. doi: 10.1111/j.1937-8327.1999.tb00138.x

APPENDIX A

Example of a WSG Letter

Dear Self,

I know I have been trying to look for a job without much success. Interestingly, today I attended a career development seminar and I learned plenty of interview techniques that I want to apply because I think this is what I am lacking in my job search.

When I go for the interviews, I need to make sure I research the company well, and dress up smartly. When I speak, I must make sure that I am enthusiastic, and emphasize my points, and I can feel free to use hand gestures. When sitting on the chair, I won't swing or play with anything such as my pen, etc.

While answering the questions, I need to make sure that I give some examples from previous experience. When talking about my interests, I need to tell them what I have done to promote my interests.

I will explain my weaknesses if asked, but I will always turn it around and let them know what I am doing now to improve them. When asked about what I will do in a few years' time, I will not give an ambitious answer, I will say something like I want to get more certifications, learn more about my job role, and build trust with my employer.

I need to smile and have eye contact with the interviewer and speak clearly and confidently. Before I answer, I need to think, otherwise it will be an impulse-based answer. I know that I can do this interview well.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX B

Instructions for Implementing WSG Transfer of Training

Step 1: Trainer reviews key learning points from the training session with trainees.

Step 2: Trainer distributes a lined sheet of paper to each trainee. Written at the top of the sheet is “Dear Self.”

Step 3: Trainer instructs trainees to write a letter to self that is a reminder of the components of the training that are most important to that individual, and to do so in self-affirming, positive ways. The trainer emphasizes that the purpose is not to summarize all of the information presented during the training session; rather, it is to personalize the training material in a self-directed letter. The trainer encourages the trainees to include self-relevant statements.

Step 4: Trainer is available for questions or concerns during the letter-writing process.

Step 5: Trainer collects the letters and redistributes prior to the transfer task.

Copyright of Human Resource Management is the property of John Wiley & Sons, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.