Chapter 10 Conclusions

Käthe Schneider

Generally, in the empirical studies of this volume, a need for the further development of theory-based concepts with respect to ensuring and evaluating the transfer of learning in organizations is identified:

- This is manifested on the *process level* first. Coherent transfer concepts or the entire process of ensuring and evaluating the transfer of learning, which starts before a further education or training measure and ends after a measure of that kind, must be developed.
- Secondly, on the *structural level* there is a need for a process that will integrate the factors *learner, training*, and *working environment* into each specific model to foster the transfer of learning. In this connection, it is shown that the organizational context, the *working environment*, seems to be the factor that is given the least consideration in ensuring the transfer of learning.
- Thirdly, on a *didactic level*, ensuring the transfer of learning in organizations requires concepts that are valid both from a theoretical standpoint and from the perspectives of intervention and implementation. From the theoretical perspective the relevant theory that is based on the further training measure or the training must be selected. From the intervention standpoint, the targeted theoretically substantiated measure must be specified and the implementation deals with the effectiveness of the manner in which the intervention is carried out.

Securing the transfer of learning in organizations, thus, requires a complex structure that connects the *process level*, the *structural level*, and the *didactic level* to each other.

To which new research questions does a global view of the results of the studies presented lead?

In the wake of globalization, the desire to consolidate systematic, international, comparative learning transfer research on further operational and vocational training supersedes the new research topics that are to be broached: Issues with respect

170 K. Schneider

to processes for ensuring the transfer of learning and for evaluating it in accordance with both the inhibiting and conducive learning transfer factors, must be studied from a comparative perspective. The actual states must be standardized taking the respective cultural factors into account and research must be done on the extent to which cultural factors affect measures for the transfer of learning. If, as is the case with McAdams and Pals (2006), *characteristic adaptations* as contextualized particularities of human lives, such as goals, strategies and methods, for example, are influenced by culture, it can be assumed that there are culturally influenced differences in the processes for ensuring the transfer of learning.

A comparative examination of the conducive and inhibiting learning transfer factors also sheds light on the conditions of learning transfer that are dependent on culture.

Structural factors in particular can be highlighted against the background of cultural factors. The following questions arise from the research results in the studies presented, for example: How must learning transfer structures be created, so that they are compatible with culturally influenced company environments? In what way are the structures of organizations to be formalized for the purpose of ensuring the transfer of learning, if they are correlated to culturally varying dimensions like *uncertainty avoidance* (Hofstede, 2010)? Against the background of varying forms of motives the issue of the implementation of organizational cultures that are conducive to the transfer of learning are to be raised.

By means of comparative studies a more complex perspective is to be directed to the object in order to contribute to the development of culturally sensitive measures on one hand and cross-cultural measures on the other hand to foster learning transfer in organizations that are acting more and more globally.

Finally, concepts for the evaluation of learning transfer taking different cognitive paradigms and process and output orientation into account are to be developed further even against the background of the function that evaluation of further operational training should promote the learning process and the further development of an organization.

References

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

McAdams, D. P., & Pals, J. L. (2006). A new big five. Fundamental principles for an integrative science of personality. *American Psychologist*, 61(3), 204–217.