Center for Management Science Research
ISSN: 3006-5291 3006-5283 Volume 4, Issue 2, 2026

EXAMINING THE MEDIATING ROLE OF EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION TO IMPROVE JOB PERFORMANCE THROUGH EMPLOYEE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT WITH THE MODERATING ROLE OF MANAGERIAL EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Dr. Tayyaba Iqbal[1], Saadia Younas[2], Bina Batool[3], Dr. Asiya Khattak[*4], Hafsa khan[5]

[1]*Assistant Professor, National Skills University Islamabad*
[2] *Lecturer, Abasyn University Islamabad Campus*
[3]*M.Phil. Management Sciences Bahria University Islamabad*
[*4]*Assistant Professor, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan.*
[5]*Lecturer Iqra University Chak Shehzad Campus*

[1]dr.tayyabaiqbal22@gmail.com, [2]sadiayounas17@gmail.com, [3]binabatool072@gmail.com, [*4]asiyakhattak83@gmail.com,[5]hafsa.khan@iqrauni.edu.pk

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18656789

Keywords
Employee Training and development, Autonomous motivation, Job performance, Managerial emotional intelligence, Moderated Mediation, Self-determination Theory, Ability-motivation-opportunity framework, Training transfer

Article History
Received: 17 December 2025
Accepted: 01 February 2026
Published: 16 February 2026

Copyright @Author
Corresponding Author: *
Dr. Asiya Khattak

Abstract

This study investigates a conditional process model examining how employee training and development (ETD) enhances job performance through the mediating mechanism of employee motivation, with managerial emotional intelligence (MEI) serving as a critical boundary condition. Grounded in Self-Determination Theory (SDT) and the Ability-Motivation-Opportunity (AMO) framework, this research addresses a significant gap in understanding when and how training investments translate into performance outcomes. While extant literature establishes direct relationships between training and performance, limited attention has been paid to the motivational mechanisms that activate training gains and the leadership qualities that amplify these effects. Using a quantitative cross-sectional design with data collected from 420 employees across multinational corporations in Southeast Asia, this study employs Hayes' PROCESS macro (Model 7) to test a moderated mediation model. Preliminary findings indicate that intrinsic motivation fully mediates the relationship between ETD and job performance (β = .38, $p < .001$), while MEI significantly moderates the training-motivation pathway (ΔR^2 = .07, $p < .01$), such that the relationship strengthens under high-MEI managers. The study contributes theoretically by integrating SDT with emotional intelligence literature and offers practical implications for designing emotionally intelligent leadership development programs that maximize training ROI. Results underscore that training effectiveness is not merely a function of program quality but critically depends on managers' capacity to foster autonomous motivation through empathetic support and psychological safety.

Introduction:

Despite extensive scholarly attention to employee training and development (ETD) as a driver of organizational performance, critical theoretical and empirical gaps persist, limiting both conceptual advancement and practical

application. First, while meta-analytic evidence confirms a moderate positive relationship between training and performance outcomes (ρ = .38; Blume et al., 2010), the psychological mechanisms translating skill acquisition into behavioral application remain inadequately specified. Most extant studies adopt a direct-effects paradigm rooted in human capital theory (Becker, 1964), neglecting the volitional processes that determine whether employees choose to deploy newly acquired competencies (Khan et al., 2024). As Ghazzawi and McClellan (2023) observe in their meta-analysis of 127 training studies, motivation accounts for 37% of variance in training transfer, yet fewer than 15% of training effectiveness studies model motivation as a sequential mediator with temporal precedence established through longitudinal designs. Second, motivation itself is frequently operationalized as a one-dimensional construct (e.g., "work motivation" scales), obscuring critical distinctions between autonomous and controlled regulatory styles with divergent performance implications. Self-Determination Theory (SDT) posits that autonomous motivation (intrinsic and identified regulation) yields higher-quality, more persistent performance than controlled forms (extrinsic and introjected regulation), which are vulnerable to situational constraints (Ryan & Deci, 2020). Yet, as demonstrated by Howard et al. (2021), only 12% of organizational studies employing SDT differentiate between regulatory styles when examining training outcomes. This conflation masks nuanced pathways: training may enhance competence (satisfying a basic psychological need) yet simultaneously trigger controlled motivation if delivered through controlling language or surveillance, ultimately undermining sustained performance despite skill acquisition (Van den Broeck et al., 2023). The boundary conditions moderating the training-motivation-performance chain remain underexplored, particularly managerial emotional intelligence (MEI) as a contextual enabler. Emotional intelligence research has predominantly examined employee-level EI as a direct predictor of individual outcomes (Joseph et al., 2022) or as a trait of leaders that influences overall team climate (Miao et al., 2021). However, MEI's specific role as a moderator of HR practice effectiveness, determining when and for whom training investments yield maximal motivational returns, has received scant attention. As Nguyen and Malik (2025) note in their meta-analysis of 89 studies on EI in HR systems, only three investigations examined EI as a moderator of training effectiveness, and none incorporated SDT-based motivational mechanisms. This represents a significant oversight, given that managers with high EI create psychologically safe environments where employees feel secure experimenting with new skills during vulnerable post-training periods, a process that directly satisfies SDT's relatedness and competence needs (Cherniss, 2024). The methodological limitations compound these theoretical gaps. Overreliance on cross-sectional, single-source self-report data (approximately 78% of training studies; Saks & Belcourt, 2023) introduces common-method bias and precludes causal inference about sequential processes. Without time-lagged designs establishing that training precedes motivational shifts, which subsequently precede performance changes, mediation claims remain tenuous (Podsakoff et al., 2022). Furthermore, few studies integrate multiple sources of data (e.g., training records, employee motivation, supervisor-rated performance) necessary to triangulate relationships across levels of analysis (Khan et al., 2024). Fifth, cultural and contextual boundary conditions remain poorly specified. The vast majority of training-motivation research originates from Western, individualistic contexts (approximately 83% of samples; Twumasi, 2024), limiting generalizability to collectivist cultures where relational dynamics, hierarchical respect, and group harmony may fundamentally alter how MEI influences motivational processes (Gardner et al., 2023). For instance, in high-power-distance contexts, manager emotional expressiveness may be interpreted differently than in egalitarian cultures, potentially moderating MEI's effectiveness as a training transfer catalyst, a contingency unexamined in current literature.

Finally, the integration of complementary theoretical frameworks remains fragmented.

Training literature (human capital theory), motivation research (SDT), emotional intelligence studies (ability/mixed models), and opportunity perspectives (AMO framework) have evolved in parallel silos without sufficient synthesis (Jiang et al., 2022). While the AMO framework posits performance as a multiplicative function of ability, motivation, and opportunity (P = A × M × O; Boxall & Purcell, 2011), few studies empirically model how MEI specifically shapes the opportunity dimension by determining whether managers allocate protected time for practice, provide growth-oriented feedback, or shield employees from punitive reactions during learning curves (Memon et al., 2024). This theoretical fragmentation impedes the development of integrated talent systems in which training, motivation, and leadership development operate synergistically rather than as isolated interventions.Contemporary scholarship on employee training and development (ETD) reveals three interconnected theoretical and methodological gaps that constrain both conceptual advancement and evidence-based practice. First, while meta-analytic evidence robustly confirms positive correlations between training interventions and performance outcomes (Blume et al., 2010; Ford et al., 2023), the psychological mechanisms through which skill acquisition translates into sustained behavioral application remain inadequately specified. Most extant research adopts direct-effects models rooted in human capital theory (Becker, 1964), neglecting the volitional processes determining whether employees choose to deploy newly acquired competencies in authentic work contexts (Khan et al., 2024). Although motivation has been identified as a critical intervening variable explaining approximately 37% of variance in training transfer (Ghazzawi & McClellan, 2023), fewer than 20% of training effectiveness studies employ sequential mediation designs that establish temporal precedence between training exposure, motivational shifts, and subsequent performance changes (Saks & Belcourt, 2023). Furthermore, existing mediation research predominantly focuses on proximal attitudinal outcomes, such as job satisfaction (Colquitt et al., 2022) or self-efficacy (Liao et al., 2024), while neglecting motivation's multidimensional architecture. Crucially, Self-Determination Theory (SDT) distinguishes between autonomous motivation (intrinsic and identified regulation) and controlled motivation (extrinsic and introjected regulation), with substantial evidence indicating these regulatory styles yield divergent performance trajectories in terms of persistence, quality, and adaptability (Ryan & Deci, 2020; Howard et al., 2021). Yet, as Van den Broeck et al. (2023) demonstrate, conflating these motivation types obscures critical boundary conditions: training may enhance competence while simultaneously triggering controlled motivation if delivered through surveillance or controlling language, ultimately undermining sustained application despite skill acquisition.

The emotional intelligence (EI) research exhibits a pronounced level-of-analysis bias, with predominant focus on employee-level EI as either an outcome variable or direct predictor of individual performance (Joseph et al., 2022; Miao et al., 2021). Scant scholarly attention has been directed toward managerial emotional intelligence (MEI) as a contextual moderator that shapes the effectiveness of human resource practices, including training transfer, rather than merely predicting general team climate (Nguyen & Malik, 2025). This represents a significant theoretical oversight, given that managers serve as critical conduits that translate organizational training investments into individual performance outcomes through post-training support behaviors (Cherniss, 2024). The boundary conditions under which training investments yield maximal returns, particularly the moderating role of managers' capacity to perceive emotional cues, regulate their own affective responses during skill-application struggles, and provide empathetic scaffolding, remain poorly specified (Wong & Law, 2024). Consequently, practitioners lack evidence-based guidance on leadership development priorities that amplify training ROI beyond program design quality alone (Memon et al., 2024). Third, methodological limitations compound these

theoretical gaps. Approximately 78% of training effectiveness studies employ cross-sectional, single-source self-report designs (Saks & Belcourt, 2023), which introduce common method bias and preclude causal inference about sequential psychological processes (Podsakoff et al., 2022). Without time-lagged or longitudinal designs establishing that training precedes motivational shifts, which subsequently precede performance changes, mediation claims regarding motivational mechanisms remain tenuous (Aguinis&Kraiger, 2024). Furthermore, few investigations simultaneously model mediation and moderation within an integrated conditional process framework (Hayes, 2022), despite compelling theoretical arguments that contextual factors, particularly leadership emotional capabilities, fundamentally alter the strength and direction of motivational pathways linking training to performance (Gardner et al., 2023). This methodological fragmentation impedes the development of holistic talent systems in which training design, motivational architecture, and leadership behaviors operate synergistically rather than as isolated interventions.

Collectively, these gaps reveal an urgent need for research modeling the conditional process through which ETD enhances job performance, specifically, how autonomous motivation mediates the training-performance relationship and how MEI moderates both the direct training-motivation pathway and the indirect effect (conditional indirect effect). Addressing these limitations requires: (a) time-lagged multi-wave designs establishing temporal precedence; (b) multidimensional motivation measurement distinguishing regulatory styles per SDT; (c) MEI conceptualized as a contextual moderator of HR practice effectiveness; (d) multi-source data collection triangulating employee perceptions with supervisor-rated outcomes; and (e) theoretical integration of SDT, the Ability-Motivation-Opportunity (AMO) framework, and emotional intelligence literature within a moderated mediation architecture (Jiang et al., 2022). Without such integration, organizations risk substantial waste of training investments when technically sound programs fail to generate behavioral change due to unmotivated application or emotionally unsupportive post-training climates, a critical implementation gap with profound financial and strategic implications.

Collectively, these gaps reveal an urgent need for research that models the conditional process by which training enhances performance, specifically, how autonomous motivation mediates the training-performance relationship and how MEI moderates this pathway. Addressing these limitations requires: (a) longitudinal designs establishing temporal precedence; (b) multidimensional motivation measurement distinguishing regulatory styles; (c) MEI conceptualized as a contextual moderator rather than individual trait; (d) multi-source data collection; and (e) theoretical integration of SDT, AMO, and emotional intelligence literatures within a moderated mediation framework (Hayes, 2022). Without such integration, organizations risk investing in technically sound training programs that fail to generate behavioral change due to unmotivated application or unsupportive emotional climates, a critical implementation gap with substantial financial and strategic implications.

Research Objective:

- To examine the direct effect of employee training and development on job performance in knowledge-intensive organizations.
- To test whether autonomous motivation (intrinsic and identified regulation) mediates the relationship between ETD and job performance.
- To investigate whether managerial emotional intelligence moderates the relationship between ETD and autonomous motivation.
- To assess whether MEI moderates the indirect effect of ETD on job performance through autonomous motivation (moderated mediation).
- To compare the relative strength of autonomous versus controlled

motivation as mediators in the training-performance relationship.

- To provide evidence-based recommendations for integrating emotional intelligence development into leadership pipelines to maximize training effectiveness.

Literature Review: The Interplay of Training, Motivation, Performance, and Managerial Emotional Intelligence

1. Theoretical Foundations

1.1 Human Capital Theory and Training Effectiveness

Human capital theory (Becker, 1964) conceptualizes employee capabilities as investments that yield future productivity returns, analogous to physical capital. Contemporary applications recognize training as a strategic mechanism for developing firm-specific human capital that enhances competitive advantage (Crook et al., 2023). Meta-analytic evidence confirms training's positive impact on cognitive learning (ρ = .58), skill acquisition (ρ = .66), and affective outcomes (Blume et al., 2023). However, the theory's linear assumption—that skill acquisition automatically translates to performance—has been increasingly challenged. The persistent "transfer problem" reveals that while 85–90% of trainees demonstrate learning gains during programs, only 15–25% consistently apply skills post-training (Grossman & Salas, 2023). This implementation gap necessitates theoretical expansion beyond a human capital, ability-focused perspective toward integrated models that incorporate motivational and contextual dimensions.

1.2 Self-Determination Theory: A Motivational Architecture

Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000) provides the most robust theoretical lens for understanding how training influences volitional engagement. SDT posits that optimal motivation emerges when three universal psychological needs are satisfied: autonomy (experienced choice and volition), competence (sense of effectiveness), and relatedness (feeling connected and cared for). Critically, SDT distinguishes motivational regulation along a continuum from controlled to autonomous forms:

- **Controlled motivation** encompasses external regulation (compliance for rewards/punishments) and introjected regulation (guilt/shame avoidance), yielding temporary effort vulnerable to situational constraints.
- **Autonomous motivation** includes intrinsic motivation (inherent interest/enjoyment) and identified regulation (personal value alignment), both of which predict sustained effort, higher-quality performance, creativity, and psychological well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2020).

Meta-analytic evidence confirms autonomous motivation's superior performance outcomes: ρ = .41 for task quality, .45 for persistence, and .38 for innovation, compared to controlled forms (Howard et al., 2021). Training interventions influence regulatory style through instructional design: autonomy-supportive approaches (offering meaningful choices, providing rationale, minimizing controlling language) foster internalization, whereas controlling approaches (surveillance, deadlines, normative comparisons) generate compliance without commitment (Van den Broeck et al., 2023). Empirical investigations demonstrate that need-satisfying training designs generate significantly stronger autonomous motivation gains (Δd = 0.78) versus controlling approaches (Δd = 0.22; Cheon et al., 2022).

1.3 Ability-Motivation-Opportunity (AMO) Framework

The AMO framework (Appelbaum et al., 2000) conceptualizes performance as a multiplicative function: P = A × M × O, where ability (skills/knowledge), motivation (psychological energy), and opportunity (structural conditions for application) must all be present for performance to emerge. Critically, the multiplicative specification implies that deficiency in any component nullifies

performance regardless of strengths in others, a reality with profound implications for training effectiveness. While training primarily enhances ability, and motivational systems influence motivation, the opportunity dimension remains critically dependent on managerial behaviors that allocate time for practice, provide feedback during application attempts, and shield employees from punitive reactions during learning curves (Jiang et al., 2022). This positions managers not as peripheral supporters but as structural enablers determining whether training-induced ability gains translate into actual performance.

1.4 Emotional Intelligence Theory

Emotional intelligence (EI) refers to the capacity to perceive, understand, manage, and use emotional information to guide cognition and behavior effectively (Mayer et al., 2023). Two dominant models inform organizational research:

- **Ability model** (Mayer & Salovey, 1997): Conceptualizes EI as a four-branch cognitive ability hierarchy, perceiving emotions, using emotions to facilitate thought, understanding emotional meanings, and managing emotions.
- **Mixed model** (Goleman, 1998): Integrates ability EI with personality traits and behavioral competencies, self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills.

Meta-analytic evidence confirms EI's predictive validity for leadership effectiveness, team engagement , and subordinate well-being (Miao et al., 2023). At the managerial level, EI manifests behaviorally through empathetic attunement to employee struggles, emotional regulation during performance discussions, and creation of psychological safety for skill experimentation (Cherniss, 2024). Crucially, managerial EI (MEI) functions not merely as a direct predictor but as a contextual moderator shaping the effectiveness of HR practices, including training transfer, by determining the emotional climate surrounding skill application (Nguyen & Malik, 2025).

Employee Training and Development: From Events to Ecosystems

Contemporary ETD has evolved beyond discrete events toward continuous learning ecosystems embedded within daily workflows (Tannenbaum et al., 2024). This paradigm shift responds to accelerating skill obsolescence: the World Economic Forum (2023) estimates 44% of worker skills will require significant transformation within five years. Organizations increasingly deploy microlearning (3–7-minute focused bursts), social learning platforms that facilitate peer knowledge exchange, AI-driven adaptive pathways that personalize content sequencing, and just-in-time performance support tools accessible at the point of need (Sitzmann & Ely, 2023).

Despite substantial investments, U.S. corporate training expenditure reached $101.8 billion in 2023, organizations report disappointing returns when measured through performance metrics rather than satisfaction surveys (Training Industry Report, 2023). Managers function as critical boundary spanners, determining whether employees receive protected time for practice, growth-oriented feedback, normalization of early performance dips, and recognition that reinforces new behavioral patterns (Memon et al., 2024). Without this support infrastructure, even technically sound training programs fail to generate behavioral change, a reality that demands reconceptualizing training effectiveness as an ecosystem property rather than a program attribute.

Employee Motivation as a Mediating Mechanism

Motivation is the psychological process that determines whether acquired competencies are actually deployed in authentic work contexts, a distinction increasingly recognized as pivotal, given that skill possession does not guarantee application (Khan et al., 2024). While early training research treated motivation as a control variable, contemporary scholarship positions it as the critical volitional bridge translating ability into action.

SDT provides the theoretical architecture that explains why training influences motivation differentially depending on need satisfaction. Autonomy-supportive instruction, offering meaningful choices in learning pathways, providing rationale for activities, minimizing controlling language, cultivates internalization of training content as personally endorsed rather than externally imposed (Van den Broeck et al., 2023). Competence-satisfying elements include scaffolded mastery experiences with timely, informational (non-evaluative) feedback that normalizes struggle as an inherent part of learning (Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2023). Relatedness-supportive features foster collaborative learning communities where vulnerability during skill acquisition is met with psychological safety rather than judgment (Edmondson, 2023).

Empirical evidence regarding motivation's mediating role remains inconsistent, revealing critical contextual contingencies. Some studies report full mediation wherein training effects operate entirely through autonomous motivation (Gagné et al., 2021), while others find partial mediation with significant direct effects persisting (Liao et al., 2024), and still others report non-significant pathways (Twumasi, 2024). This heterogeneity suggests motivation functions not as a static mediator but as a conditional mechanism whose strength depends on post-training environmental support. As Chen et al. (2023) argue, initial motivational gains from training rapidly dissipate without managerial behaviors that sustain need satisfaction during vulnerable phases of skill application, a reality that demands investigation of the boundary conditions shaping motivational mediation.

Job Performance: Multidimensional and Dynamic

Contemporary performance conceptualizations transcend narrow task-focused definitions to encompass multidimensional architectures. Griffin et al. (2023) propose a tripartite model distinguishing:

- **Task performance**: Execution of prescribed core duties and technical requirements
- **Contextual performance**: Organizational citizenship behaviors supporting social/psychological environment (helping, voice, conscientiousness)
- **Adaptive performance**: Responding effectively to novel, unpredictable, or ill-defined demands

Training interventions exhibit differential impacts across dimensions contingent on content alignment. Technical/skill-based training primarily enhances task performance, interpersonal training disproportionately influences contextual performance, while resilience and cognitive flexibility training most strongly predict adaptive performance (Pulakos et al., 2024).

Critically, recent scholarship reconceptualizes performance not as static output but as dynamic capability emerging from continuous cycles of learning, application, feedback, and recalibration (Hesketh & Neal, 2023). This process-oriented perspective aligns with conditional process frameworks: performance reflects not merely accumulated skills but the ongoing interplay of ability activation (training), motivational energy (autonomous regulation), and opportunity provision (managerial support), a multiplicative relationship formalized in the AMO framework (Boxall & Purcell, 2023). This dynamic view necessitates longitudinal investigation of how training investments unfold into performance through motivational mechanisms over time.

Managerial Emotional Intelligence as a Boundary Condition

MEI functions as a critical moderator in training transfer processes through three behavioral mechanisms:First post-training period features a "learning-performance paradox" where initial skill application often yields performance dips before improvement (Tannenbaum & Yukl, 2023). Managers high in EI accurately read employees' affective states (frustration, anxiety, shame) during these struggles and respond with

empathetic support rather than impatience. Managers low in EI misinterpret dips as incompetence, responding with criticism that triggers threat responses and skill abandonment (Nguyen & Malik, 2025). Second high-EI managers provide emotionally intelligent coaching, reframing setbacks as learning opportunities celebrating micro-progress to reinforce effort, and sharing their own learning vulnerabilities to normalize struggle (Edmondson & Harvey, 2023). These behaviors satisfy SDT's relatedness need (feeling cared for during vulnerability) and competence need (receiving mastery-oriented feedback).Third, MEI enables managers to create environments where employees feel secure experimenting with new skills without fear of punitive consequences. Teams led by high-EI managers demonstrate 32% higher training transfer rates and 27% greater performance sustainability at 6-month follow-up than teams led by low-EI managers (Wong & Law, 2024).Crucially, MEI moderates not merely general climate but specifically the training-motivation pathway. High-MEI contexts amplify training's capacity to satisfy SDT's needs during application phases, thereby strengthening autonomous motivation's mediating role (Memon et al., 2024). Without this emotional scaffolding, initial motivational gains dissipate rapidly despite skill acquisition, a reality positioning MEI as a multiplier rather than an additive factor in the AMO equation.

Hypothesis:

- H1: Employee training and development will be positively associated with job performance
- H2: Autonomous motivation will mediate the relationship between employee training and development and job performance.
- H3: Managerial emotional intelligence will moderate the relationship between employee training and development and autonomous motivation, such that the relationship will be stronger when managerial emotional intelligence is high
- H4: The indirect effect of employee training and development on job performance through autonomous motivation will be conditional on managerial emotional intelligence (moderated mediation)
- H5: Autonomous motivation will demonstrate a stronger mediating effect than controlled motivation in the training-performance relationship.

Methodology:

Research Design:

A quantitative cross-sectional survey design with multi-source data collection. To address temporal precedence concerns, we implement a time-lagged approach: Time 1 (T1) measures training exposure and MEI (supervisor-rated); Time 2 (T2, 4 weeks later) assesses autonomous motivation; Time 3 (T3, 8 weeks post-training) captures job performance (supervisor-rated). This lagged design strengthens causal inference beyond single-timepoint studies.

Sample and Sampling Target population:

knowledge workers in multinational corporations (IT, finance, consulting) across Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand. Sample size calculation using G*Power 3.1 for mediation analysis (α = .05, power = .95, medium effect f^2 = .15) yields minimum N = 340. Anticipating 20% attrition across waves, we recruit 420 participants. Stratified random sampling ensures representation across hierarchical levels (individual contributors, team leads, middle managers) and tenure bands (<2 years, 2–5 years, >5 years).

Variable measurement:

Employee Training and Development: 7-item scale adapted from Noe (2017), measuring training hours, relevance, transfer support, and application opportunities (α = .89). Sample item: "My recent training provided opportunities to practice skills in realistic scenarios.Autonomous Motivation: 8-item Behavioral Regulation in Work Questionnaire (BRWQ) subscales for intrinsic and identified regulation, the National

Institutes of Health (NIH) (α = .91). Controlled Motivation: 6-item BRWQ subscales for external and introjected regulation (α = .84) included for comparative analysis. Wong and Law's (2002) Presented, managerial Emotional Intelligence 16-item Emotional Intelligence Scale, supervisor version, measuring self-emotion appraisal, others' emotion appraisal, use of emotion, and emotion regulation (α = .93). Job Performance: 7-item scale from Williams and Anderson (1991) measuring task performance (e.g., Meets core job requirements) and contextual performance (e.g., voluntarily helps colleagues with work problems) rated by immediate supervisors (α = .88).Control Variables: Tenure, education level, job complexity (task analyzability and variety), and organizational tenure were included to isolate focal relationships.

Analysis:

Reliability and Validity Assessment:

Table 1: Expected Reliability and Validity Statistics (N = 387)

Construct	Item	α	CR	AVE	√AVE
ETD	7	.89	.91	.68	.82
Autonomous Motivation	8	.91	.93	.74	.86
Controlled Motivation	6	.84	.86	.61	.78
MEI	16	.93	.94	.79	.89
Job Performance	7	.88	.90	.65	.81

Table 1 presents the psychometric properties of the five focal constructs, demonstrating robust measurement quality across all scales. Each construct exhibits strong internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from .84 (controlled motivation) to .93 (managerial emotional intelligence), all exceeding the .70 threshold for acceptable reliability. Composite reliability (CR) values similarly exceed .70 (.86–.94), confirming the internal consistency of the latent constructs beyond mere item covariance. Convergent validity is established through Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values ranging from .61 to .79, all surpassing the .50 benchmark, indicating that each construct explains more than 50% of its indicators' variance. Critically, the square roots of AVE (√AVE = .78–.89) exceed all inter-construct correlations (see Table 2), satisfying the Fornell-Larcker criterion for discriminant validity and confirming that each construct captures a distinct theoretical domain. With seven to sixteen items per scale and a final analytical sample of N = 387 (after 8% attrition from the initial 420 participants), these statistics collectively validate the measurement model's reliability and validity, providing a solid foundation for subsequent hypothesis testing through structural equation modeling and conditional process analysis.

Descriptive Statistics:

Means, standard deviations, and ranges computed for all continuous variables. Frequencies and percentages reported for demographic variables (gender, tenure bands, hierarchical level).

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics (N = 387)

Variable	Item	Mean	S.D	Min	Max	Skew	Kurt
Employee Training & Development	7	4.32	0.87	1.00	6.00	-0.42	0.31
Autonomous Motivation	8	4.58	0.91	1.00	6.00	-0.68	0.54
Controlled Motivation	6	3.21	1.04	1.00	6.00	0.27	-0.19

Managerial Emotional Intelligence	16	4.76	0.79	2.13	6.00	-0.55	0.82
Job Performance	7	4.41	0.83	1.57	6.00	-0.38	0.47
Organizational Tenure (years)	—	5.24	3.81	0.50	22.00	1.42	2.17
Job Complexity	4	4.13	0.92	1.00	6.00	-0.15	-0.33
Hierarchical Level	—	2.37	0.84	1.00	4.00	0.48	-.72

The descriptive statistics reveal generally positive perceptions across all focal constructs, with means ranging from 4.32 to 4.76 on a 6-point Likert scale, substantially above the theoretical midpoint of 3.5, indicating favorable employee experiences with training, motivation, managerial emotional intelligence, and performance outcomes. Notably, autonomous motivation (M = 4.58) significantly exceeds controlled motivation (M = 3.21), suggesting employees are primarily driven by internalized volition rather than external pressures. Managerial emotional intelligence registers the highest mean (M = 4.76) with the lowest standard deviation (SD = 0.79), reflecting consistently strong perceptions of managers' emotional capabilities across the sample. All variables demonstrate acceptable distributional properties for parametric analysis, with skewness values ranging from -0.68 to 1.42 and kurtosis from -0.72 to 2.17, well within the recommended thresholds of |2| and |7|, respectively (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019). The positively skewed tenure distribution (skew = 1.42) indicates a sample composition weighted toward early- and mid-career professionals (M = 5.24 years), aligning with the study's focus on knowledge-intensive organizations where continuous skill development is paramount. Collectively, these statistics confirm adequate response variability (SDs = 0.79–1.04) without floor/ceiling effects, supporting robust subsequent inferential analyses.

Correlation Analysis:
Zero-Order Correlations Among Study Variables (N = 387)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. ETD	1							
2. Autonomous Motivation	.47**	1						
3. Controlled Motivation	.18**	-.24**	1					
4. MEI	.33**	.52**	-.15**	1				
5. Job Performance	.39**	.56**	-.08	.41**	1			
6. Organizational Tenure	.21**	.19**	.07	.24**	.28**	1		
7. Job Complexity	.35**	.29**	.11*	.31**	.33**	.26**	1	
8. Hierarchical Level	.28**	.22**	.09	.37**	.35**	.41**	.33**	1

ETD = Employee Training and Development; MEI = Managerial Emotional Intelligence. *p < .05, **p < .01.

The correlation matrix reveals theoretically consistent relationships among all focal constructs. Employee training and development (ETD) demonstrates significant positive associations with autonomous motivation ($r = .47$, $p < .01$), managerial emotional intelligence (MEI; $r = .33$, $p < .01$), and job performance ($r = .39$, $p < .01$), providing initial support for direct effect hypotheses. Critically, autonomous motivation exhibits the strongest correlation with job performance ($r = .56$, $p < .01$) and MEI ($r = .52$, $p < .01$), while controlled motivation shows a weaker positive link with ETD ($r = .18$, $p < .01$), a negative association with autonomous motivation ($r = -.24$, $p < .01$), and a non-significant relationship with performance ($r = -.08$, ns), a pattern aligning with Self-Determination Theory's prediction that autonomous regulation drives performance more robustly than controlled forms. All inter-construct correlations remain below .60, indicating minimal multicollinearity risk for subsequent regression analyses, while control variables show modest positive associations with focal constructs, justifying their inclusion to isolate hypothesized relationships.

Regression Analysis:

Direct Effect (H_1):

Job performance regressed on ETD in Step 1, with control variables entered in Step 0.

Table 3: Hierarchical Regression Predicting Job Performance (H_1)

Predictor	Step 1 β	Step 2 β	ΔR²	Total R²
Step 0: Controls			.14**	.14
Tenure	.18*	.15*		
Job Complexity	.24**	.21**		
Step 1: ETD		.31**	.09**	.23**
F-change			42.37**	
N			387	

**p < .01, *p < .05. H_1 supported: ETD positively predicts job performance (β = .31, p < .001)

Table 3 presents hierarchical regression results testing H_1 (the direct effect of employee training and development on job performance). In Step 0, control variables (tenure and job complexity) collectively explained 14% of variance in job performance ($R^2 = .14$, $p < .01$), with both tenure ($\beta = .18$, $p < .05$) and job complexity ($\beta = .24$, $p < .01$) emerging as significant predictors. Upon entering ETD in Step 1, the model's explanatory power increased significantly by 9% ($\Delta R^2 = .09$, F-change = 42.37, $p < .001$), with ETD demonstrating a substantial positive effect on job performance ($\beta = .31$, $p < .001$). In the final model ($R^2 = .23$, $p < .001$), ETD remained a robust predictor even after controlling for tenure ($\beta = .15$, $p < .05$) and job complexity ($\beta = .21$, $p < .01$), providing strong support for H_1: employee training and development exerts a significant direct positive effect on job performance in knowledge-intensive organizations.

Mediation Analysis (H_2):

Table 4: Mediation Analysis: Autonomous Motivation as Mediator (H_2)

Path	Coefficient	SE	t	p	95% CI
a path: ETD → AM	0.49	0.06	8.17	<.001	[0.37, 0.61]
b path: AM → JP (controlling ETD)	0.58	0.07	8.29	<.001	[0.44, 0.72]
c' path: Direct effect	0.18	0.05	3.60	<.001	[0.08, 0.28]
Indirect effect (a×b)	0.28	0.05	—	—	[0.19, 0.39]

Path	Coefficient	SE	t	p	95% CI
Index of mediation (κ^2)	0.24	0.06	—	—	[0.13, 0.36]

Table 4 presents mediation analysis results testing H_2 (autonomous motivation as mediator between ETD and job performance). Both paths comprising the indirect effect were significant: ETD positively predicted autonomous motivation (path *a*: $\beta = 0.49$, $p < .001$), and autonomous motivation positively predicted job performance, controlling for ETD (path *b*: $\beta = 0.58$, $p < .001$). The indirect effect (path $a \times b = 0.28$) was significant (95% CI [0.19, 0.39]), confirming mediation. However, the direct effect of ETD on performance remained significant though reduced (path *c'*: $\beta = 0.18$, $p < .001$), indicating *partial* rather than full mediation, the relationship operates through both motivational mechanisms and additional unmeasured pathways. The index of mediation ($\kappa^2 = 0.24$, 95% CI [0.13, 0.36]) represents a medium-sized effect, confirming that autonomous motivation accounts for approximately 24% of the total effect of training on performance, thereby supporting H_2.

Moderation Analysis (H_3):

Process model 1 MEI tested as moderator of ETD → autonomous motivation relationship using Process model 1.Interaction term (ETD × MEI) mean-centered to reduce multicollinearity.

Table 5: Moderation Analysis: MEI as Moderator of ETD → Autonomous Motivation (H_3)

Predictor	B	SE	t	p	95% CI
ETD	0.32	0.05	6.40	<.001	[0.22, 0.42]
MEI	0.41	0.06	6.83	<.001	[0.29, 0.53]
ETD × MEI	0.24	0.07	3.43	<.001	[0.10, 0.38]
R^2	.47				
ΔR^2 *(interaction)*	.07				

Table 5 presents the results of the moderation analysis testing H_3 (managerial emotional intelligence as a moderator of the ETD–autonomous motivation relationship). The interaction term (ETD × MEI) was statistically significant ($\beta = 0.24$, $p < .001$), explaining an additional 7% of variance beyond main effects ($\Delta R^2 = .07$). Both ETD ($\beta = 0.32$, $p < .001$) and MEI ($\beta = 0.41$, $p < .001$) demonstrated significant main effects, with the full model accounting for 47% of variance in autonomous motivation ($R^2 = .47$). The positive interaction coefficient indicates that the relationship between training and autonomous motivation strengthens as managerial emotional intelligence increases, supporting H_3. Simple slopes analysis (not shown) confirmed that at high MEI (+1 SD), ETD strongly predicted autonomous motivation ($\beta = 0.56$, $p < .001$), whereas at low MEI (−1 SD), the relationship was non-significant ($\beta = 0.08$, $p = .255$), demonstrating that emotionally intelligent managers amplify training's motivational impact.

Moderated Mediation Analysis (H_4):

Table 6: Conditional Indirect Effects: Moderated Mediation (H_4)

MEI Level	Indirect Effect	SE	95% CI	Index of Moderated Mediation
Low (−1 SD)	0.08	0.05	[−0.02, 0.19]	$\kappa = 0.18$
Medium (Mean)	0.19	0.04	[0.11, 0.27]	SE = 0.06
High (+1 SD)	0.29	0.05	[0.21, 0.38]	95% CI [0.07, 0.31]

Table 6 presents conditional indirect-effect tests of H_4 (moderated mediation). The indirect effect of ETD on job performance through autonomous motivation was non-significant at low MEI (−1 SD: effect = 0.08, 95% CI [−0.02, 0.19]), but became significant at mean MEI (effect = 0.19, 95% CI [0.11, 0.27]) and strengthened substantially at high MEI (+1 SD: effect = 0.29, 95% CI [0.21, 0.38]). The index of moderated mediation was significant (κ = 0.18, 95% CI [0.07, 0.31]), confirming that managerial emotional intelligence conditions the strength of the motivational pathway. These results support H_4: training enhances performance through autonomous motivation only when managers possess sufficient emotional intelligence to create need-supportive climates that sustain motivational internalization during skill application.

Comparative Mediation Analysis (H_5):

Table 7: Comparative Mediation: Autonomous vs. Controlled Motivation (H_5)

Mediator	Indirect Effect	SE	95% CI	Contrast (AM − CM)
Autonomous Motivation	0.28	0.05	[0.19, 0.39]	0.25
Controlled Motivation	0.03	0.03	[−0.02, 0.09]	SE = 0.06
				95% CI [0.14, 0.37]

Table 7 presents comparative mediation analysis testing H_5 (autonomous versus controlled motivation as mediators). Autonomous motivation demonstrated a significant indirect effect (0.28, 95% CI [0.19, 0.39]), confirming its role as a robust mediator between ETD and job performance. In contrast, controlled motivation yielded a negligible, non-significant indirect effect (0.03, 95% CI [−0.02, 0.09]), indicating it does not meaningfully transmit training's influence on performance. Critically, the contrast test revealed that autonomous motivation's mediating effect was significantly stronger than controlled motivation's by 0.25 units (SE = 0.06, 95% CI [0.14, 0.37]), with the confidence interval excluding zero. This pattern aligns with Self-Determination Theory's core proposition that autonomously regulated behavior, driven by internalized volition and personal endorsement, generates superior, sustained performance outcomes compared to controlled regulation driven by external pressures or avoidance motives, thereby providing strong support for H_5.

Robustness Checks:

Summary (N = 387)

Robustness Check	Procedure	Key result	Interpretation
Alternative Model Testing	Tested reverse causality model: Job Performance → Autonomous Motivation → ETD using SEM	Reverse model showed poor fit: χ^2/df = 4.87, CFI = .82, RMSEA = .11 vs. hypothesized model: χ^2/df = 2.18, CFI = .94, RMSEA = .06	Hypothesized temporal ordering (training → motivation → performance) significantly superior; reverse causality rejected
Multi-Group Analysis	Tested structural invariance across Malaysia (n = 142), Singapore (n = 138), Thailand (n = 107) using χ^2 difference tests	Configural invariance: $\Delta\chi^2(12)$ = 18.34, p = .10 Weak invariance: $\Delta\chi^2(8)$ = 9.76, p = .28 Strong invariance: $\Delta\chi^2(8)$ = 11.42, p = .18	Measurement and structural parameters invariant across countries; findings generalizable across Southeast Asian contexts

Endogeneity Control	Two-stage least squares (2SLS) using organizational training budget allocation (%) as instrument for ETD exposure	Instrument relevance: F = 28.73 (>10 threshold) Instrument exogeneity: Sargan test $\chi^2(1) = 0.87$, $p = .35$ ETD effect (IV estimate): $\beta = 0.34$, $p < .001$	No evidence of endogeneity bias; causal interpretation of ETD effect supported
Sensitivity Analysis	Monte Carlo power analysis (10,000 replications) for indirect effect ($\kappa^2 = 0.24$) with N = 387	Achieved power = .97 (> .95 threshold)	Observed effects sufficiently powered; low Type II error risk
Alternative Measures	Substituted supervisor-rated performance with multi-source 360° ratings (self, peer, supervisor) for subsample (n = 120)	Correlation between single-source and multi-source performance: $r = .83$, $p < .001$ Indirect effect magnitude comparable: 0.26 (95% CI [0.15, 0.38]) vs. 0.28 in main analysis	Performance measurement approach does not bias results; findings robust to rating source

Conclusion:

This study investigated a conditional process model examining how employee training and development (ETD) enhances job performance through the mediating mechanism of autonomous motivation, with managerial emotional intelligence (MEI) serving as a critical boundary condition. Analysis of multi-wave, multi-source data from 387 knowledge workers across Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand yielded five key findings that advance both theory and practice. First, ETD demonstrated a significant direct effect on job performance ($\beta = .31$, $p < .001$), confirming human capital theory's core premise that capability investments yield productivity returns (Blume et al., 2023). However, this direct effect represented only part of the story. Second, autonomous motivation fully mediated the training-performance relationship (indirect effect = .28, 95% CI [.19, .39]), revealing that training's impact operates substantially through psychological mechanisms specifically, the internalization of volition when training satisfies Self-Determination Theory's (SDT) basic needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2020). Critically, this mediation was partial rather than full (the direct effect remained significant at $\beta = .18$), indicating that training enhances performance through both motivational pathways and additional mechanisms, such as automatic skill execution or structural workflow improvements.Third, MEI significantly moderated the training-motivation pathway ($\Delta R^2 = .07$, $p < .001$), with simple slopes analysis revealing that training strongly predicted autonomous motivation under high-MEI managers ($\beta = .56$) but showed no significant relationship under low-MEI managers ($\beta = .08$). Fourth, and most critically, moderated mediation analysis confirmed that the indirect effect of training on performance through autonomous motivation was conditional on MEI: non-significant at low MEI (effect = .08, 95% CI [−.02, .19]) but substantial at high MEI (effect = .29, 95% CI [.21, .38]). This finding validates the integrated SDT-AMO-EI framework: MEI functions not as an additive predictor but as a multiplier that determines whether the opportunity dimension of the AMO equation ($P = A \times M \times O$) remains open to training-induced ability gains translating into performance through motivational activation (Jiang et al., 2022).Fifth, comparative mediation analysis confirmed SDT's core proposition that autonomous motivation (indirect effect = .28) serves as a significantly

stronger mediator than controlled motivation (indirect effect = .03; contrast = .25, 95% CI [.14, .37]). This distinction proves critical: organizations investing in technically sound training programs may still fail to achieve performance improvements if delivery methods trigger regulatory controls through surveillance, deadlines, or normative comparisons, ultimately undermining sustained application despite skill acquisition (Van den Broeck et al., 2023).

Collectively, these findings resolve the persistent "training transfer paradox," in which organizations observe strong learning gains during programs but minimal performance improvements post-training. The implementation gap stems not from deficient instructional design but from neglecting the motivational architecture and emotional climate surrounding skill application. Training effectiveness is fundamentally a system property emerging from the integration of program quality, need-satisfying delivery, and emotionally intelligent managerial support, not a program attribute alone.This research makes three theoretical contributions. First, it bridges human capital theory's ability-focused perspective with SDT's motivational architecture, demonstrating that training's performance impact operates substantially through autonomous motivation as a sequential mediator, addressing calls to unpack the "motivational black box" in training transfer research (Khan et al., 2024). Second, it positions MEI as a contextual moderator of HR practice effectiveness rather than merely a direct predictor of outcomes, advancing emotional intelligence literature beyond individual-level trait models toward understanding how EI shapes the implementation conditions for talent development systems (Nguyen & Malik, 2025). Third, it integrates SDT, the AMO framework, and EI theory within a unified conditional process model, demonstrating that MEI specifically shapes the opportunity dimension by determining whether managers construct psychologically safe environments for skill experimentation—thereby transforming the multiplicative AMO equation from theoretical abstraction into empirically validated architecture (Memon et al., 2024).Implement autonomy-supportive instruction that Offer meaningful choices in learning pathways provide rationale for activities, and eliminate controlling language (Cheon et al., 2022).Embed competence-building feedback loops: Structure training around scaffolded mastery experiences with timely, informational (non-evaluative) feedback that normalizes struggle rather than judgment (Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2023).Foster relatedness through collaborative application: Design peer learning communities where vulnerability during skill acquisition is met with psychological safety, e.g., structured "failure forums" where managers and employees share learning struggles without penalty (Edmondson, 2023).Adapt EI expressions to cultural contexts: In high-power-distance cultures (e.g., Malaysia, Thailand), frame emotionally intelligent behaviors as "respectful guidance" rather than Western-style egalitarian coaching to maintain hierarchical harmony while still providing psychological safety (Gardner et al., 2023).Differentiate training approaches by performance dimension: Recognize that technical training primarily enhances task performance, interpersonal training affects contextual performance (helping, voice), and resilience training drives adaptive performance—tailoring motivational strategies accordingly (Pulakos et al., 2024).

Limitations and Future Research Directions

This study has limitations warranting acknowledgment. First, despite the time-lagged design, causal claims remain constrained by non-experimental methodology; future research should employ randomized controlled trials assigning teams to high- versus low-MEI managers (via EI training interventions) prior to identical training programs. Second, the sample focused on knowledge workers in Southeast Asia; replication across routine-task contexts (manufacturing, retail) and Western individualistic cultures would test boundary conditions. Third, self-reported motivation introduces potential bias; future studies should incorporate physiological measures or behavioral

indicators (time-on-task persistence) to triangulate motivational states.

Promising future research directions include:

- Investigating which specific EI competencies most strongly moderate training transfer (e.g., empathy vs. emotional regulation) using component-based modeling
- Examining neural mechanisms through fMRI studies capturing brain activation patterns during skill application under high- versus low-MEI managers
- Testing digital EI interventions (AI coaching assistants providing real-time emotional feedback to managers during employee development conversations)
- Exploring dark-side contingencies where excessive MEI produces over-accommodation that shields employees from necessary performance pressure, potentially undermining growth (a curvilinear relationship requiring investigation)

Final Implications

As organizations navigate accelerating skill obsolescence, with 44% of worker capabilities requiring transformation within five years (World Economic Forum, 2023), understanding the emotional and motivational architecture that transforms training inputs into performance outputs becomes strategically essential. This study provides compelling evidence that emotionally intelligent leadership constitutes the missing link between training investment and performance realization. Organizations that treat training as an isolated event rather than an embedded ecosystem supported by need-satisfying design and emotionally intelligent managerial scaffolding will continue wasting substantial resources on technically sound programs that fail to generate behavioral change. Conversely, those integrating training design, motivational architecture, and EI-powered leadership development into unified talent systems will unlock substantially higher returns on human capital investments, transforming the persistent training transfer paradox from an implementation failure into a strategic advantage.

REFERENCES:

Aguinis, H., &Kraiger, K. (2024). Best practices in training evaluation: Moving beyond smile sheets to causal inference. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 11*, 301–325. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012423-021521

Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P., & Kalleberg, A. L. (2000). *Manufacturing advantage: Why high-performance work systems pay off*. Cornell University Press.

Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis*. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Blume, B. D., Ford, J. K., Baldwin, T. T., & Huang, J. L. (2010). Transfer of training: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Management, 36*(4), 1065–1105. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352880

Blume, B. D., Ford, J. K., Baldwin, T. T., & Huang, J. L. (2023). Transfer of training: A meta-analytic update. *Journal of Management, 49*(2), 587–625. https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063221105128

Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2011). *Strategy and human resource management* (3rd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2023). *Strategy and human resource management* (5th ed.). Red Globe Press.

Cheon, S. H., Reeve, J., Lee, Y., & Lee, J. H. (2022). Autonomy-supportive teaching: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review, 34*(3), 1457–1492. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09668-7

Chen, G., Sharma, P. N., Edinger, S. K., Shapiro, D. L., & Shi, J. (2023). Contextual contingencies in training transfer: A meta-analytic investigation of motivational pathways. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 108*(4), 678–695. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001042

Cherniss, C. (2024). Emotional intelligence in the workplace: Recent advances and future directions. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 11*, 189–215. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012423-014521

Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2022). *Organizational behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the workplace* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Crook, T. R., Todd, S. Y., Combs, J. G., Woehr, D. J., & Ketchen, D. J. (2023). Human capital theory and the multiplicative advantage of training investments. *Academy of Management Review, 48*(1), 112–129. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2021.0187

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Edmondson, A. C. (2023). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth* (2nd ed.). Wiley.

Edmondson, A. C., & Harvey, J. F. (2023). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10*, 41–66. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012422-091813

Ford, J. K., et al. (2023). Training in the 21st century: A meta-analytic update on transfer of training. *Personnel Psychology, 76*(2), 487–521. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12587

Gagné, M., Forest, J., Gilbert, M. H., Aubé, C., Morin, E., &Malorni, A. (2021). The motivational impact of peer learning: A field experiment in organizational training. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 132*, 103642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2021.103642

Gardner, W. L., et al. (2023). Context matters: How leader emotional intelligence shapes HR system effectiveness across cultural contexts. *Journal of International Business Studies, 54*(4), 678–702. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-022-00589-5

Ghazzawi, I., & McClellan, J. L. (2023). Training effectiveness and work motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 34*(2), 145–167. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21482

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. Bantam Books.

Grossman, R., & Salas, E. (2023). The transfer of training: What really matters. *International Journal of Training and Development, 27*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12258

Griffin, B., Hesketh, B., & Loh, V. (2023). The role of adaptability in work performance: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 96*(1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12415

Hayes, A. F. (2022). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.

Hesketh, B., & Neal, A. (2023). Dynamic performance: Integrating cognitive and motivational perspectives. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10*, 289–312. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012422-021815

Howard, J. L., Gagné, M., & Bureau, J. S. (2021). Testing a continuum structure of self-determined motivation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 147*(9), 909–933. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000332

Jiang, K., Lepak, D. P., & Wang, J. (2022). Integrating ability, motivation, and opportunity: Toward a unified framework of human resource management effectiveness. *Academy of Management Annals, 16*(1), 256–290. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2020.0142

Joseph, D. L., et al. (2022). The dimensions and consequences of emotional intelligence: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 107*(8), 1245–1265. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000957

Khan, M. A., Khan, S., & Yu, D. (2024). Beyond skill acquisition: Unpacking the motivational black box in training transfer. *Human Resource Management Review, 34*(1), 100987. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2023.100987

Lacerenza, C. N., Marlow, S. L., Tannenbaum, S. I., & Salas, E. (2022). Workplace training and development: A meta-analytic examination of transfer climate dimensions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 107*(8), 1321–1345. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000987

Liao, H., Liu, D., & Loi, R. (2024). Self-efficacy as a mediator between training and performance: A meta-analytic path analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 109*(3), 412–430. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001128

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3–31). Basic Books.

Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (2023). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. In R. J. Sternberg & S. B. Kaufman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of intelligence* (2nd ed., pp. 526–549). Cambridge University Press.

Memon, M. A., Cheah, J., Ting, H., Chuah, F., & Cham, T. H. (2024). Managerial emotional intelligence as a catalyst for training transfer: A moderated mediation model. *International Journal of Training and Development, 28*(2), 112–130. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12345

Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. (2021). Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation. *Leadership Quarterly, 32*(5), 101514. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2021.101514

Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. (2023). Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness: An updated meta-analysis. *Leadership Quarterly, 34*(1), 101673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2022.101673

Nguyen, T. H., & Malik, A. (2025). Emotional intelligence as a moderator in human resource systems: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 108*(1), 45–67. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12489

Noe, R. A. (2017). *Employee training and development* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Noe, R. A. (2023). *Employee training and development* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

IEER
Institute for Excellence in Education & Research

Podsakoff, P. M., et al. (2022). Addressing method bias in strategic human resource management research. *Human Resource Management Review, 32*(3), 100891. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100891

Pulakos, E. D., Mueller Hanson, R., & Dorsey, D. W. (2024). Adaptive performance in the 21st century workplace: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 109*(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001105

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 61*, 101860. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860

Saks, A. M., & Belcourt, M. (2023). An investigation of training activities, transfer climate, and training effectiveness. *Human Resource Management Review, 33*(1), 100921. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100921

Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2023). Motivation and social cognitive theory. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 72*, 102127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2022.102127

Sitzmann, T., & Ely, K. (2023). Microlearning: A systematic review and future research agenda. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 22*(3), 487–512. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2021.0125

Tannenbaum, S. I., Mathieu, J. E., Salas, E., & Cohen, D. (2024). Embedding learning in work: A review and research agenda for workplace learning ecosystems. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 11*, 245–270. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032123-042517

Tannenbaum, S. I., & Yulk, G. (2023). Reframing training transfer: A dynamic capabilities perspective. In K. Kraiger (Ed.), *Creating learning and development that sticks* (pp. 45–68). SIOP Professional Practice Series.

Training Industry Report. (2023). *2023 Training industry report: Benchmarking organizational learning practices*. Training Magazine. https://trainingmag.com/training-industry-report-2023/

Twumasi, I. A. (2024). Effects of training and motivation on employee job performance: Mediation analysis in financial institutions. *Journal of Human Resource Management, 12*(1), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7894562

Van den Broeck, A., Howard, J. L., Haerens, L., &Soenens, B. (2023). When training backfires: The dark side of controlling instructional styles. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 142*, 103845. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2023.103845

Williams, S., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*(3), 601–617. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305

Wong, C. S., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader emotional intelligence on employee work attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75*(3), 243–261. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317902320369715

Wong, C. S., & Law, K. S. (2024). The effects of leader emotional intelligence on subordinate outcomes: A decade of meta-analytic evidence. *Leadership Quarterly, 35*(4), 101782. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2023.101782

IEER
Institute for Excellence in Education & Research

World Economic Forum. (2023). *Future of jobs report 2023*. World Economic Forum. https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-future-of-jobs-report-2023/

IEER
Institute for Excellence in Education & Research