AN INVESTIGATION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CONTEXTUAL FACTORS INFLUENCING TRAINING VARIABLES
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This study represents an investigation of modeling training motivation and learning from both individual and contextual perspectives. Participants were 250 undergraduate business students who entered a remedial training class as a result of their failure to pass the previous course. The individual factor, self-efficacy, was found to correlate with learning partly through the mediation of training motivation. The contextual factor, interactional justice experienced in the class they previously failed, moderated the effect of self-efficacy on training motivation. Implications for future research and organizations are discussed.

In an era of rapid change in high technology, all indicators show that the pace of technological innovation will continue to accelerate in the future (Adler, 1991; Pulakos, Arad, & Donovan, 2000; Quiñones, 1997). In such a changing environment, in order to maintain superior performance, individuals must be able to combat new challenges. Training is one of the most important strategies for
organizations to help employees gain proper knowledge and skills needed to meet the environmental challenges (Goldstein & Gilliam, 1990; Rosow & Zager, 1988). However, organizations tend to focus heavily on the effectiveness of regular trainings to the neglect of those employees who failed to learn successfully. Well planned remedial training can serve to reduce transaction costs resulting from firing, and recurring recruitment. Therefore, it is vital to investigate what contributes to effective learning in remedial training. Nonetheless, this line of research is relatively unexplored. Our study acknowledges this gap and examines the antecedents that affect learning in remedial training, particularly with a focus on how individual and contextual variables impact on learning.

The present study makes a threefold contribution to extant research on learning in remedial training. First, while past research mainly investigates training models in regular training settings, this study aims to disentangle training frameworks in a remedial setting to respond to an increasingly important focus on remedial training and cost management. Second, while previous research has shed light on how individual variables, such as self-efficacy and training motivation, are related to learning, little is known about the format through which these individual elements affect learning. Based on social learning theory, we argue that self-efficacy will be predictive of learning partially via the mediation of trainees’ motivation. Finally, in addition to the individual difference factors, we propose, based on the organizational justice theory and person-environment (P-E) fit theory, that the contextual factor, organizational justice, will serve as a moderating effect between self-efficacy and training motivation. While past research has attempted to measure the effect of situational factors such as manager/peer support on learning outcomes (e.g., Birdi, Allan, & Warr, 1997), no studies have posited an interactional perspective for the contextual variables. Figure 1 depicts the research framework that was addressed in our study.

![Figure 1: Research framework of the study.](image)
THEORY AND HYPOTHESIS

Organizations have long recognized the substance of training programs and learning. Part of the training success hinges on trainees’ learning. In the training context, learning refers to whether trainees have learned the principles, techniques, skills, and knowledge taught which is normally measured by performance tests such as after-session examination and in-class role-playing. It is evident that learning plays a pivotal role in shaping employee behavior and performance. Although in a modest way, meta-analytic reviews also confirmed that learning could influence trainees’ transfer outcome (Alliger, Tannenbaum, Bennett, Traver, & Shotland, 1997; Cheng & Ho, 2001). Our study used social learning theory, organizational justice theory, and P-E fit theory to model how the individual factors and contextual factors are related to learning.

SELF-EFFICACY AS AN ANTECEDENT

The industrial and organizational psychologists in the training area have shown interest in how individual traits influence training proficiency (e.g., Colquitt, LePine, & Noe, 2000; Hogan & Ones, 1997). An important individual trait that may influence learning is trainees’ self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is a major component in Bandura’s (1977) social learning theory and refers to one’s belief in one’s capability to perform a specific task.

Gist (1987) argued that people who feel efficacious may set higher goals for themselves, be more persistent in combating difficulties, and eventually may learn better. In the training literature, self-efficacy has been shown to positively correlate with learning and training performance (e.g., Axtell, Maitlis, & Yearta, 1997; Cheng, 2000; Guerrero & Sire, 2001; Martocchio & Webster, 1992; Quiñones, 1995). Therefore, we hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 1** Self-efficacy will be positively related to learning; trainees with high self-efficacy will learn better than will those with low self-efficacy.

MOTIVATION AS A MEDIATOR

It is arguable that self-efficacy leads to learning efficiency through the manifestation of motivation to learn. Training motivation can be described as a specific desire on the part of the trainee to learn the content of the training program (Noe & Schmitt, 1986). Social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) offers an explanation as to why self-efficacy may relate to motivation: those who are high in self-efficacy may achieve favorable outcomes of persistence, intensity, and direction, which are the psychological processing factors of motivation (Kanfer, 1991), and thus they may be more motivated. In addition, the need-motive-value theory (Kanfer) specifies that individuals’ personality, values, and
motives create between-person differences in motivation. Hence, for instance, conscientiousness associates with training motivation due to the differing goals conscientious and unconscientious people set. Empirical studies have shown a positive relationship between self-efficacy and training motivation (e.g., Carlson, Bozeman, Kacmar, Wright, & McMahan, 2000; Colquitt et al., 2000; Noe & Wilk, 1993; Quiñones, 1995). Hence we posited that:

**Hypothesis 2** Self-efficacy will be positively related to training motivation; trainees with high self-efficacy will be more motivated to learn than will those with low self-efficacy.

There is a robust positive relationship between training motivation and learning. Training motivation can influence the willingness of an employee to attend the training program (Maurer & Tarulli, 1994; Noe & Wilk, 1993), to exert energy toward the program (Ryman & Biersner, 1975), and to transfer what they learn in the program into the job (Baldwin & Ford, 1988). Adult learning theorists (Knowles, 1984; Scheer, 1979) postulated that adults will learn only what they feel a desire to learn. Studies have shown that motivation to learn is related to learning and completion of training programs (e.g., Baldwin, Magjuka, & Loher, 1991; Hicks & Klimoski, 1987) and is likely to have a direct impact on training outcomes (Colquitt et al., 2000; Martocchio & Webster, 1992; Mathieu, Tannenbaum, & Salas, 1992; Noe, 1986; Quiñones, 1995). Colquitt et al. demonstrated that even if trainees possess the ability to learn the content of a course, they might fail to benefit from training because of low motivation. This implies that the “g-centric” approach to trainability is not sufficient and should be accompanied by a trainee’s motivation to learn. We postulated that:

**Hypothesis 3** Training motivation will be positively related to learning; trainees with high training motivation will learn better than will those with low training motivation.

Taken together, we argue that training motivation serves as a partial mediator between self-efficacy and learning. While the need-motive-value theory and the adult learning theory alluded above combine to suggest that self-efficacy may exert influences through motivation to learn, as described previously, a portion of the literature has supported the direct effect of distal variables on learning. Thus, we hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 4** Training motivation will partially mediate the relationship between self-efficacy and learning.

**Organizational Justice as a Moderator**

Organizational justice theory (Gilliland, 1994) and person-environment fit theory (Kristof, 1996) are used to explain why situational factors can interact with individual variables in predicting training motivation. Organizational justice refers to employees’ perceptions of the fairness of the outcomes of organizational
decisions (distributive justice), procedures through which the decisions are made (procedural justice), and the interactional experiences they have with the decision maker (interactional justice). Research on organizational justice investigated how employees’ fairness perceptions were related to specific organizational decisions, such as those pertaining to staffing (Gilliland), pay raises (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Greenberg, 1987), performance appraisal (Greenberg, 1986; Landy, Barnes-Farrell, & Cleveland, 1980), layoffs (Brockner & Greenberg, 1990; Konovsky & Brockner, 1993), drug testing (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991), discipline (Greenberg, 1994), and training motivation (Quiñones, 1995). Thus organizational justice serves as a situational characteristic that influence individuals’ decision making.

Past research has shown that individual and situational antecedents are related to training-related variables such as motivation and performance. It has focused merely on how the main effects of these factors influence outcome variables. For instance, Mathieu et al. (1992) examined the first order impacts of the individual characteristics (i.e., trainees’ career planning and job involvement) and the situational influences (i.e., training assignment and situational constraints such as adequacy of equipment and time allocated for task completion) had on motivation to learn. In another study Mathieu, Martineau, and Tannenbaum (1993) explored the direct relationships between individual variables (e.g., initial performance, achievement motivation)/situational constraints (e.g., extracurricular activities, other classes’ workload) and mid-course self-efficacy. In Quiñones (1995), the author attested that trainees’ perceptions of distributive and procedural justice regarding their training assignment (remedial vs. advanced) and self-efficacy were both related to motivation to learn. Research has not yet inspected how the individual and situational traits interact to influence training motivation. The current study takes a step further to investigate the interaction effect of organizational fairness perceptions and self-efficacy on training motivation. Investigating justice perceptions is crucial in the remedial training setting because fairness perceptions are formed by employees who failed in their previous training program which they will carry to their next program. Examining how these past perceptions or treatments influence trainees’ motivation and learning in their subsequent training situation will inform theories in the organizational justice and training literature.

The theory of P-E fit may also shed light on the interaction effect of justice on motivation to learn. P-E fit is grounded in the situational strength theory (Mischel, 1977). This theory describes strong situations as those in which appropriate behaviors are clear and expectations of the environment are met. The possibility of exerting the influence of an individual’s differences is low in such situations preventing interpersonal variables from predicting outcomes. Contrarily, in a weak situation when environments are unpredictable and proper
behaviors are unclear, the personality-outcome association is likely to emerge. Early work such as that of Pervin (1968) assumed that for each individual, there are situations which more or less match the characteristics of his/her personality and this agreement, in turn, resulted in higher performance, higher satisfaction, and less stress. Therefore, it is more constructive to see how an individual’s traits and situation combined to affect performance than to attribute all outcomes to individual differences. The same can be applied to explain how the interplay between self-efficacy and organizational justice affects training motivation. We proposed that organizational injustice should create a weak circumstance in which the trainees are treated without dignity, proper manners, and respect and in which the instructor does not explain the procedures thoroughly and fails to communicate details. This situation will lead to unclear expectations of behaviors and an unpredictable environment. Hence, the motivation about training of individuals with high self-efficacy will be more distinct from the motivation of those with low self-efficacy. Thus, we predicted the following:

**Hypothesis 5** Distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice will each moderate the relationship between self-efficacy and training motivation, such that the relationship will be more positive where a low level of justice exists.

**METHOD**

**PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURES**

The participants consisted of 250 undergraduate business students in eight remedial training classes offered by a business college. The remedial class provided an opportunity for the students who had failed the previous class (i.e., accounting or finance) in a regular semester to recoup the semester credits. The remedial class offered training on the same subject as the one that the students had failed and thus was lecture and classroom style; students had to pass the final examination to gain the credits. Each of the eight training classes lasted 64 to 96 hours and contained 30-50 trainees. The average age of participants was 19 years old ($SD = 1.9$); 23% were male.

At the beginning of the training program, surveys were distributed to the trainees who were assured of the confidentiality of their responses. The survey measured training motivation, trainees’ perceptions of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice of the previous course, self-efficacy, and demographic characteristics. Each trainee’s course grade was obtained at the end of the class. A total of 308 surveys were distributed and the final number of usable surveys was 250.
Variables relevant to the current study, as well as their corresponding sources of information, are described below. In addition to the following variables, the respondent’s age was collected as a control variable.

**Training motivation** Ten items adapted from Noe and Wilk (1993) were used to assess training motivation. Sample items include “I am willing to exert considerable effort in the training program in order to improve my skills” and “I believe I tend to learn more from training programs than most people.” Participants responded by using a 5-point Likert-type scale with anchors from 1= *strongly disagree* to 5= *strongly agree*. The Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of this measure was .82.

**Learning** The trainee’s actual course grade from the remedial training (on the basis of a 100-point grade scale) was obtained to assess his/her learning.

**Self-efficacy** Participants responded to an eight-item scale adapted from Noe and Wilk (1993) to assess trainee’s confidence in his/her own skills and abilities. A sample item was “I feel confident that my skills and abilities equal or exceed those of my classmates.” Participants were asked to rate how accurately each item described them on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1= *strongly disagree* to 5= *strongly agree*. The Cronbach’s $\alpha$ was .71.

**Distributive justice** Three items adapted from Leventhal (1980) and Sweeney and McFarlin (1997) were used to assess trainees’ perceived distributive justice towards the class they failed (e.g., “My own hard work will lead to recognition as a good student” and “My grade will represent a fair and accurate picture of my actual learning performance”). Participants indicated their level of agreement with each item using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1= *strongly disagree* to 5= *strongly agree*. The Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of this measure was .71.

**Procedural justice** Three items adapted from Leventhal (1980) and Sweeney and McFarlin (1997) were used to assess trainees’ perceived procedural justice towards the class they previously failed. Participants responded to these items using a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). For example, one item stated “The procedures of learning rating were free of bias.” The resulting scale reliability was $\alpha = .77$.

**Interactional justice** Seven items adapted from previous research (Bies & Moag, 1986; Donovan, Drasgow, & Munson, 1998) were used to assess trainees’ perceived fairness of their previous instructor in the class that they failed. Sample items include “The previous instructor of this course would refrain from improper remarks or comments” and “Students’ questions and problems were responded to quickly.” Participants indicated their level of agreement with each item using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1= *strongly disagree* to 5= *strongly agree*. The observed scale reliability was $\alpha = .81$. 
RESULTS

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the study variables are presented in Table 1. In general, the bivariate correlations provided confidence that the measures were functioning properly.

### TABLE 1
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG THE STUDY VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-efficacy</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Distributive justice</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Procedural justice</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interactional justice</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Training motivation</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Learning</td>
<td>65.51</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Cronbach’s alphas appear on the diagonal in parentheses.

* p < .05  ** p < .01

EXAMINATION OF TRAINING MOTIVATION AS A MEDIATOR

Hypotheses 1-4 postulated that self-efficacy would be positively related to learning and training motivation, training motivation would be positively predictive of learning, and training motivation would be the partial mediator of the relationship between self-efficacy and learning. These hypotheses were tested via Baron and Kenny’s (1986) regression procedure for testing mediation effects. Baron and Kenny specified that for a mediation effect to occur, (a) the predictor must correlate with the outcome variable, (b) the predictor must correlate with the proposed mediator, (c) the mediator must correlate with the outcome variable, and (d) the predictor must still correlate with the outcome variable when the mediator is also included in the regression equation. The analyses are shown in Table 2. In each part of the analysis, we controlled for age. Table 2 indicates that self-efficacy was a significant predictor of learning ($\beta = .36, p < .01$) and training motivation ($\beta = .51, p < .01$) and training motivation was significantly predictive of learning ($\beta = .45, p < .01$). Thus hypotheses 1-3 are supported. Furthermore, self-efficacy was still significantly correlated with learning ($\beta = .18, p < .05$), to a lesser degree, when motivation was also included in the equation, meaning that training motivation acted as a partial mediator of the relationship between self-efficacy and learning. Hence, hypothesis 4 is supported.
TABLE 2
ANALYSIS OF TRAINING MOTIVATION AS A MEDIATING VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control variable</th>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Training Motivation</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 Training Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Standardized beta weights are shown.
* $p < .05$   ** $p < .01$

TABLE 3
HIERARCHICAL REGRESSIONS PREDICTING TRAINING MOTIVATION USING DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE, PROCEDURAL JUSTICE, AND INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE RESPECTIVELY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Distributive Justice</th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
<th>Interactional Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice × Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice × Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice × Self-Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $R^2$ | .27** | .28** | .26** | .26** | .28** | .30** |
| $\Delta R^2$ | .01 | .00 | .02* |

Note: Standardized beta weights are shown.
* $p < .05$   ** $p < .01$

EXAMINATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AS A MODERATOR
Hypothesis 5 posited an interaction effect of self-efficacy and organizational justice on training motivation. This hypothesis was tested using hierarchical
multiple regression analyses. We entered age, self-efficacy, and one organizational justice at a time in step 1. Step 2 included the hypothesized interaction term. The results are presented in Table 3. Analyses revealed that interactional justice moderated the relationship between self-efficacy and training motivation ($\Delta R^2 = .02$, $p < .05$). The interaction term accounted for an additional 2% of the variance of training motivation scores. Hence, our hypothesis 5 is partially supported.

To better understand the interaction effect found, we plotted and displayed the effect in Figure 2 following procedures suggested by Cohen and Cohen (1983). In Figure 2, values for training motivation were plotted at high and low levels of interactional justice. Reliable positive relationships were found between self-efficacy and training motivation at both 1 SD above ($\beta = .32$, $p < .01$) and 1 SD below ($\beta = .59$, $p < .01$) the mean interactional justice. The slope of the line predicting training motivation from self-efficacy appears to be steeper for low interactional justice than for high interactional justice. This further supports our prediction in Hypothesis 5 with respect to interactional justice.

![Figure 2. Training motivation as a function of trainees’ self-efficacy and interactional fairness perception.](image)

**DISCUSSION**

Prior research investigating the antecedents of training motivation or learning has mainly focused on direct individual correlates. This study further scrutinized individual and contextual predictors of training outcomes. Our first finding was that the importance of delineating how individual differences predict motivation to learn and the subsequent learning in the remedial training setting was confirmed. The results supported previous findings that in the remedial setting, an individual with high self-efficacy would be more motivated to learn and achieved better training performance (e.g., Noe & Schmitt, 1986; Quiñones,
our study extended the social learning theory and called attention to carefully investigating the mechanism through which individual characteristics are correlated with learning outcomes.

Second, our study further showed that – in the remedial training – interactional justice acted as a situational component that moderated the relationship between self-efficacy and motivation to learn. Specifically, for those who perceived low interactional justice, the more self-efficacy they possessed, the more motivated they were for training. This relationship was not so apparent for those who perceived high interactional justice. This confirms our prediction of the relationship in weak situations. Moreover, this can also be explained by the idea of a deficient environment; that is, for those who experienced unfair treatment in the previous class, even low self-efficacy can generate their great motivation to learn in order to work against the unfair treatment. This idea of a deficient environment being able to lead to favorable outcomes was evidenced in George and Zhou (2001) in which the authors found that negative moods were positively related to creative performance.

**Managerial and Theoretical Implications**

The findings of this study have significant practical implications. First and foremost, organizations should increase trainees’ self-efficacy prior to the actual training program. Research has shown that self-efficacy is trainable (Karl, O’Leary-Kelly, & Martocchio, 1993). Thus the more employees are trained to believe in their ability to learn, the more they are willing to gain knowledge and the greater will be the mastery of the program. Specifically, to increase trainees’ self-efficacy, managers can inform trainees of the training attributes, training environment, content complexity, and the like. The information provided should be realistic and appropriate. Hicks and Klimoski (1987) showed that realistic information about training was more helpful for trainees’ pretraining preparations and motivations than was positive, but exaggerated, information.

The findings of this study also have significant theoretical implications. First, for the organizational justice theory, we attested that in the remedial setting, interactional justice serves as the only justice perception that influences antecedents of training motivation. Interactional justice has received more attention from organizational fairness researchers since the early 1990s when researchers began to delineate the associations between distributive, procedural, and interactional justices. While some researchers believe that these three types of justice intertwine to some extent (e.g., Greenberg, 1993; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993), others argue for the uniqueness and significance of interactional justice. In a study of events involving injustice, Mikula, Petrick, and Tanzer (1990) noted that “a considerable proportion of the injustices which were reported did not concern distributional or procedural issues in the narrow sense but referred to the
manner in which people were treated in interactional interactions and encounters” (p. 133). In the present study, we extended this line of research and showed that in remedial training, contrary to distributive and procedural justice, interactional justice moderates how self-efficacy correlates with training motivation. We believe that it is the nature of interactional justice, which focuses on sensitive interpersonal treatment (e.g., explaining the rationale for decisions, communicating details, and meeting individuals’ needs), and not the decision or procedure per se, that is crucial to how self-efficacy associates with motivation.

Second, our study also extends the P-E fit theory. Most research about P-E fit compares employees with the characteristics of their organization, group, job, coworker, and the like (Kristof, 1996). Relevant questions are whether or not the values of the person match those of the organization, whether or not the person fits the personality/demographic composition of the group, whether or not the person enjoys the job attributes, and whether or not the person is a good fit with the manager. The current study applied the idea of congruence to include the interplay between individual attitudes and organizational climate. Also, we extended the situational strength theory to include injustice as a weak situation in which the individual difference variable is allowed more variability to predict outcome variables. Thus, while prior research regarding congruence dealt with organizational settings such as organizational attraction, employee placement, and retention (Schneider, 1987), our study related fit to the arena of employee training and showed that injustice creates an environment where self-efficacy relates more positively to training motivation than justice does.

In general, this study enhances our understanding of modeling training motivation and learning. More research should be conducted to investigate how individual attributes and situational constraints are associated with training outcomes.
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