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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate an online training program designed for part-time undergraduate Desk Assistants (DAs) employed by Louisiana State University’s (LSU) department of Residence Education. The evaluation of the training program included a comparison of video and lecture versions of a training program with comparable content to determine the effectiveness across a set of four outcomes: motivation during training, motivation after training, satisfaction, and learning. Additionally, this research contributed to the understanding of the impact of technology-mediated learning in training by examining factors that may differentially benefit or challenge the effectiveness of the training delivery method. Specifically, learner characteristics and motivation to learn were measured as antecedents. Data collection included both quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative analyses focused on changes in knowledge and motivation as a result of delivery method, as well as the impact of learner characteristics on overall training effectiveness. Knowledge tests and self-report scales were used to collect quantitative information. Qualitative data was collected via survey, discussion, and behavior observation, then analyzed for themes that help to more fully clarify the role of motivation by providing data regarding the factors that benefit or challenge trainees as they go through the training program. Results suggest an advantage for video training over lecture. However, the overall effectiveness of the training program was influenced by both learner characteristics and motivation. Although new employees showed learning gains regardless of motivation, learning was correlated with motivation for returning employees, such that those with higher motivation scores demonstrated knowledge gains, whereas returning employees with poor motivation did not. Implications and interventions for improving future training based on study results are discussed.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

“Online videos are extremely dull and boring”

“Get rid of the videos”

“The videos seemed a bit redundant and confusing until we were trained at our individual front desks”

“I think it [training] definitely cleared up things that the videos couldn’t explain very well”

Cognitive psychology lauds the advantages of online training. The capabilities granted to the learner include control over pacing, the ability to pause if working memory is overloaded, and learners can self-quiz and review when needed (Artino, 2008; Rawson, O’Neil, & Dunlosky, 2011). Additionally, online training offers a convenience factor in that learning can be done as the learner’s schedule allows. Instructors can use online training to cover basic topics, then expound upon them once the basic foundation has been set. So, given all of the advantages and benefits of online learning, why are the quotations above – provided by anonymously by previous Residential Life trainees – so negative?

Online training is one of many techniques by which technology is utilized in a learning environment. Technology-mediated learning (TML) has exploded onto the education and training scene, often moving at a pace that researchers struggle to accommodate. TML is utilized in school classrooms, corporate training settings, and personal knowledge pursuits. Despite the fact that the United States spends billions on training annually and the prevalence of technology utilized in such training, recurring concerns about TML continue to resurface. Specifically, research systematically comparing TML to more traditional lecture learning delivery in an experimental format is rare in training situations. Additionally, there are repeated calls for more use of theoretical models to guide the development of TML approaches in order to more fully understand the relationships and structure of potentially influencing variables (DeRouin,
Fritzsche, & Salas, 2005; Dubois & Long, 2012; Gupta & Bostrom, 2009). Also, because much of the research done studying effective TML is conducted in classrooms under the assumption that it will generalize to corporate training, there is a need for more TML research done in workplace settings as the motivating factors for employees and students are not necessarily the same (DeRouin et al., 2005). Finally, research suggests that the technology use of this latest generation – the “digital natives” – might have repercussions for their learning preferences that would differentiate them from previous learning generations (Prensky, 2001).

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Traditional versus Technology-Mediated Learning

Research conducted over 20 years ago comparing TML versus classroom-based instruction suggest that computer-based instruction enhanced student learning (Kulik & Kulik, 1991). In more recent research, a meta-analysis procedure was utilized to examine web-based instruction (WBI) when contrasted with classroom instruction (Sitzmann, Kraiger, Stewart, & Wishe, 2006). Results revealed a trend in which WBI tended to result in more effective learning under most studied circumstances (Sitzmann et al., 2006). Again though, the majority of the research examined in guiding this study reflected a preponderance of literature based in classroom settings rather than within the workplace when looking at the effectiveness of learning with the use of technology (DeRouin et al., 2005; Dubois & Long, 2012).

TML utilized in this study involved the creation of online videos for use in the development of a new training program. The training program was designed with a specific group in mind: Louisiana State University desk assistants. The office of Residential Life at LSU agreed to the development and evaluation of a training program for the Desk Assistant (DA) position, a part-time position held by undergraduate LSU students which entails duties associated
with the reception desks located in the lobbies of residential halls across campus. Students living on campus can reside in apartment-style or traditional rooms within one of 21 buildings making up a total of 10 residential communities. Each community has at least one desk, 8 of which are staffed by DAs 24 hours a day and 2 of which are staffed from 6am until midnight. The DA position consists primarily of customer service and administrative responsibilities, with an additional emphasis on resident safety. A training program for the DAs was developed so that identical content was delivered to the trainees using video and lecture training. The training videos were presented via YouTube links, and the instructor delivering the lecture read the scripts used in creating the videos. Learning goals of the training included knowledge gains and job performance displaying appropriate behaviors described in training.

The training program was not centralized previously, with the department instead relying on supervisors in each community to train their particular employees as they saw fit. However, the goals of the newly created training program included developing and communicating department-wide standards of performance, not only to increase overall performance and accountability, but also to allow DAs to work at all desks, regardless of community. The department expected a heavy component of the new training program to rely on online technology which would allow for minimizing time spent training by the supervisors, a consistent delivery of job expectations, and convenient opportunities for review. The department recently enacted an online training program for the Resident Assistant (RA) position that proved ineffective and unpopular – as illustrated by the previously provided quotations – so there were additional expectations that efforts would go into making a DA training program that utilized effective learning research as well as effective training techniques in a technological format so
that all of the benefits of online training could be realized with none of the detriments of the previous attempts made by the department.

1.1.2 Role of Motivation

An important factor which has been shown to impact the effectiveness of training is that of learner motivation. The potential influence of this construct was used to guide the evaluation of the effectiveness of the aforementioned training program. Clark, Dobbins, and Ladd (1993), went so far as to claim that “training is doomed to fail” (p. 293) if learner motivation is lacking. Motivation is a complex construct; it can be impacted by the person, the actual training, and the workplace (Salas, Tannenbaum, Kraiger, & Smith-Jentsch, 2012; Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992). In the case of this study, motivation was conceptualized as distinct before, during, and after training, operationalized most simply as a drive to learn, an engagement with the training material, and a desire to apply learning to the job. Although the content was the same between the two delivery methods, the relationship between motivation on the part of the trainees and the effectiveness of the training delivery was of interest. Research on the topic of the relationship between motivation and delivery methods that include video and lecture training is unclear, as will be further discussed in Chapter 2.

1.1.3 Digital Natives

Finally, this study used a sample of trainees that fall within the most recent generation. One descriptor of this age group is “digital natives,” a term popularized by Marc Prensky in 2001. Digital natives, typically described as individuals born around the turn of the 21st century, are thought to have a particular affinity for technology-based interactions as they have been born into and immersed in a world where internet, mobile phones, and computers are a part of their daily lives (Prensky, 2001). Because of this familiarity with technology, more traditional
learning approaches are often described as lacking, unable to engage the interest of students who prefer more interactive, fast-paced access to knowledge-building (Prensky, 2001). However, other researchers point out that much of what is published concerning digital natives is anecdotal and “commonsensical” in nature, while research into true differences between this generation and others has failed to strongly support such differences (Bennett, Maton, & Kervin, 2008; Selwyn, 2009). Assertions by Prensky and other supporters of the digital native divide would suggest that such learners would prefer learning using an online medium, despite previous research suggesting that motivation suffers in non-traditional approaches to training. Therefore, this study was expected to shed light on at least one difference between digital natives and older generations – that of the impact of online training on learning motivation.

1.2 This Study

In order to address the aforementioned research inconsistencies, the following model was created (see Figure 1.1). The suggested relationships are based on research work establishing the influences of individual and environmental characteristics as impacting the effectiveness of training (Klein, Noe, & Wang, 2006; Mathieu, Tannenbaum, & Salas, 1992; Noe & Schmitt, 1986). Research on motivation to learn has established its role as a predictor of learning outcomes, influenced by person and environment (Colquitt, LePine, & Noe, 2000; Noe, 1986; Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992). However, the exact role of motivation as it applies to training effectiveness in online environments is not clear especially using a digital native group. Motivation has been alternatively described as a mediator between person or environment and outcome factors (Colquitt et al., 2000) and a predictor moderated by training delivery (Klein et al., 2006). Also, Klein et al. (2006) described TML as both enhancing and decreasing motivation.
In this particular study, the inclusion of both quantitative and qualitative data collection was directed at illuminating this relationship.

![Diagram showing the theoretical relationship between training delivery and learning outcomes as influenced by motivation.](image)

**Figure 1.1.** Theoretical relationship between training delivery and learning outcomes as influenced by motivation

### 1.3 Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to understand the relationship between learner motivation and the effectiveness of online versus lecture training with a digital native sample of trainees.

### 1.4 Significance of Study

This research was expected to inform TML literature by providing a comparison of factors found to impact training, such as learner motivation, which may have potentially different impacts within traditional and online learning settings. Much of the research on effective TML mirrors findings on effective delivery seen in human resource and education literature. However, contrasts between TML with traditional training within the same study in an effort to systematically examine differences shown to impact one medium in order to determine whether the relationship variables hold, are weaker, grow stronger, or if additional mediators play a role
are lacking (although see Sitzmann et al., 2006, for a meta-analysis of findings across studies; and Klein et al., 2006, for a blended method). Following a more thorough understanding of the commonalities and relationships between traditional and TML, it is likely to become apparent that existing models of learning are sufficient to design effective TML instruction (see Dubois & Long, 2012, for a similar suggestion).

Initial assessment of current TML models reveals a typology not dissimilar to approaches used in creating effective classroom or lecture learning. Research should seek to explore the similarities and differences with scientific approaches in order to determine the extent to which models are appropriate for use within TML and lecture settings. Salas et al. (2012) assert that “decisions about what to train, how to train, and how to implement and evaluate training should be informed by the best information science has to offer” (p. 74). In addition to the practical contribution of the creation of an effective student staff training program, this study addressed the research needs for systematic examination of construct relationships found in learning by providing insight into the role played by motivation to learn when content is the same but delivery options include both online and lecture formats with an employee population. Researchers seeking to understand the nomological network of trainee characteristics as influences on training effectiveness can benefit from this research as it has the potential to shed light on dimensions under which the impact on effectiveness may vary. Additionally policymakers and trainers will benefit from an evaluation of a comparison between video and lecture as it relates to a number of outcomes valued by organizations.

Finally the literature on digital natives suggests that motivation should be enhanced for online over lecture delivery due to the affinity for technology attributed to that generation. However, there is a dearth of empirical evidence to support such a pattern at this time.
1.5 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were:

1. To evaluate the role of learner characteristics in training effectiveness.
2. To identify and describe the role of digital nativism in the effectiveness of online versus lecture training.
3. To obtain and describe measures of learning and performance resulting from taking part in the DA training program.
4. To evaluate the effectiveness of online training as compared to a lecture delivery of the same information.
5. To describe the relationship between motivation and the effectiveness of online versus lecture training, as expressed by participant learning.
6. To identify opportunities for future research.

1.6 Research Questions

This study sought to address the concerns listed above through the development and evaluation of a training program, whereby a proposed model was tested using both video and lecture delivery with a student staff population. Literature utilized in the development and evaluation of this training program was taken from the following research: effective training and development in organizations, contributions to the science of learning made by cognitive psychology, optimal utilizations of e-learning and technology-mediated learning, and learning differences in digital natives. Additionally, this training program was evaluated using a number of outcomes: motivation during training, motivation after training, satisfaction, and learning. Finally, in an attempt to add to the understanding of the influence of trainee characteristics on the
effectiveness of delivery method, a model delineating the progression of motivation as influencing delivery effectiveness was tested.

The training was designed for DAs employed by LSU in the department of Residential Life. These employees were primarily undergraduate students between the ages of 18 and 23 who work at lobby desks throughout the residence halls on campus. It is a part-time position, performed both by DAs and by Resident Assistants (RAs) who are required to work a minimum number of 2 hours per week of desk duties as stipulated by their employment contract. At the time in which the training was developed, the department had no standardized training for employees learning to work at the desk, with each residence hall community teaching new employees various skills and knowledge in ways that are often inconsistent with other communities. The training was often one-on-one with a supervisor and typically occurred as the employee begins his or her first shift. In addition to creating a training program that was centralized, the department wanted to take advantage of video training for its consistency and cost-effectiveness.

Again though, although a prevalent teaching method, research examining the effectiveness of technology-mediated learning, including the use of videos, has been somewhat inconsistent (Sitzmann et al., 2006). Online learning with digital native populations is primarily conducted with student populations, with little information regarding a workplace training environment. As with more traditional lecture training, factors such as instructional design and learner characteristics play a role in impacting learning achieved through more technology-based instruction by acting on the motivation of the learners (Sitzmann, Brown, Casper, Ely, & Zimmerman, 2008). Given these findings, this research study was designed to explore the following questions:
1. How do learner characteristics impact training outcomes?
2. What are the differences in training outcomes for traditional lecture teaching methods compared to online video learning?
3. What role does motivation play in the effectiveness of training?
4. How do learner characteristics, delivery method, and motivation interact to influence learning outcomes?

The systematic evaluation of online versus lecture training, including a mixed methods exploration of the role of motivation in a digital native sample, was expected to suggest answers to the questions above.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Over four decades ago, the state of training literature was described as atheoretical and lacking empirically (Campbell, 1971). However, a review of recent studies shows that training has advanced a great deal in terms of empirical literature, the likelihood that practice is based on learning theory, and evidence-based design and delivery elements (Salas et al., 2012).

Unfortunately, the same criticisms leveled at training broadly by Campbell (1971) could now be directed at TML. Outside of the classroom, similarities and differences between TML and lecture as modes of information delivery are rarely explored systematically, and the relationship between and learning effectiveness of each is acknowledged but attributed to various aspects of the learning experience (Salas et al., 2012). The association between variables established as having an impact on the effectiveness of training in a lecture setting also needs to be empirically examined in order to advance more theoretical design of effective TML training. An emerging research front is that of technology’s role in the current generation of students and entry-level employees, often referred to as “digital natives” due to their regular interaction with technology as a learning and entertainment medium. Many of the proposed differences between these learners and previous generations are still based on conjecture and anecdotes, but their learning preferences may shed light on variations in attitudes towards TML. Finally, training research, regardless of medium, suggests the collection of multiple sources of data in order to establish training effectiveness, and the study discussed here utilized a variety of measures, both quantitative and qualitative, in determining the differences between video and lecture delivery, the role of motivation, and the impact of learner characteristics.
2.1 Effective Training

Research recommends taking an overarching perspective of training as a system, much of which should provide direction in terms of developing effective training (Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992). In addition to seeing training as part of a bigger endeavor, there are other studies that explore the importance of individual elements playing a role at the person, job, and organization level. Evidence-based suggestions stemming from this research can be used to create more intentional approaches to learning in the pre-, during, and post-stages of training. The following section reviews a sample of perspectives that could be utilized by Residential Life in developing and improving their training initiatives.

In an impressive review of recent advances in training literature, Salas et al. (2012) record, summarize, and synthesize research on what they refer to as the science of training. They assert that “(a) properly designed training works, and (b) the way training is designed, delivered, and implemented can greatly influence its effectiveness” (p. 74). Ultimately the authors go on to take findings which inform the development of optimal training approaches and create training checklists for trainers as well as suggestions for policymakers. They begin with a discussion of the importance of linking theory to practice, and likewise linking organization goals to training objectives. Salas and his colleagues (2012) briefly discuss steps taken by organizations prior to training, emphasizing needs assessment. During training, the authors remind the reader to take individual differences of learners into account, familiarize themselves with optimal instructional design, and to properly utilize technology as a tool. Finally, they underscore the essential nature of both an emphasis on transfer of training and evaluation as elements of follow-up that help to ensure training impact.
Similarly, according to Furjanic and Trotman (2000), in order to turn training into learning, one must first create a foundation by conducting a needs assessment, designing and delivering appropriate training, then evaluating training effectiveness. They also introduce what they call the LEARN process, an acronym that encompasses the needs of an adult learner, addressing aspects of training in such a way that they will ensure learning and the application of said learning. The authors stress the importance of seeing training as a big picture and treating each part of the process as vital to overall success (Furjanic & Trotman, 2000).

Extending this idea of training as part of the big picture, Mary Broad (2005) advises trainers to see organizations as systems. She urges readers to build a foundation before beginning training, highlighting the importance of both stakeholder involvement and achieving a true understanding of an organization and its needs before developing a training program. Broad also discusses how essential it is for the work environment to support learning, and to develop measures that truly capture the impact of training on learning with appropriate evaluation methods. She includes tools such as transfer templates and case studies to help trainers grasp the realities of moving what has been learned in training to performance on the job itself.

Not all training is created equal though. Just as Salas and colleagues (2012) began by asserting that “proper training works,” Arthur, Bennett, Edens, and Bell (2003) used meta-analysis to determine which factors exactly impact the effectiveness of training in organizations. The authors emphasize the importance of “a better understanding of the relationship between design and evaluation features and the effectiveness of training and development efforts” (p. 234). They reviewed literature on training effectiveness with particular focus on factors that could be under the control of practitioners and researchers. Arthur et al. (2003) found minimal support for the impact of a needs assessment, but attributed the findings to a small sample size,
hypothesizing that many researchers performed needs assessments but did not report them. However, the evaluation criteria type, whether reaction, learning, or behavior, suggested an overall effect of organizational training. Additionally, the skill or task trained and an appropriate match with delivery were found to impact the effectiveness training.

Again, while these studies are merely a sample of the work done on optimal training, each has aspects which could serve as recommendations to be utilized by the Residential Life department in the development and improvement of training programs. Due to the fact that the development of a formal training program for the DA position is still evolving, needs assessment and instructional design supported by theory and research would likely prove most useful. Such needs assessment and instructional design decisions should include information regarding learner characteristics and research on online learning (Baldwin, Ford, & Blume, 2009).

2.2 Online versus Lecture Training

Technology use, to be effective in training, needs to be guided by educational principles. Educational principles, in order to have the most impact, should be developed using research done on learning. However, research done on learning, primarily the purview of cognitive psychology, has been slow in transitioning to a foundational role for education approaches and ultimately technological use in training (although see Daniel, 2012, and Roediger & Pyc, 2012, for evidence that this trend is changing).

TML can be described in a variety of ways. Synonymous terms include e-learning, web-based instruction, and computer-based training. TML can be defined broadly as any use of technology utilized in conveying or acquiring knowledge or skills. Mediums for delivery include videos, websites, mobile phones, virtual environments, simulation games, and video conferencing, to name a few. These delivery methods aid in fact retrieval, skill practice,
organizational training, social networking, etc. Essentially, if technology is being used by a learner, this episode can be categorized as TML. Advantages of TML include flexible availability of material, savings on time and money, and allows for customization (Baldwin et al., 2009).

Just as there are a variety of technological uses for learning, there are a variety of challenges to designing TML. Among them, although arguably a challenge of training in general, a lack appropriate evaluation of effectiveness (Arthur et al., 2003) can also negatively impact optimal future training. Additionally, Chillarege, Nordstrom, and Williams (2003) described the potential negative combination of an aging workforce coupled with increased technology use, as there is typically less computer use by mature employees. Bell and Kozlowski (2002) lamented the underutilization of learner control, which, despite its potential benefits to motivation and overall performance, is often plagued by learner overconfidence and occasional inability to arrive at the learning objectives, an issue that can be compounded by ineffective TML design. Also, Baldwin et al. (2009) cautioned against assumptions that lecture material can simply be converted to training software. Finally, the rapidly changing capabilities of technology itself can create challenges.

In addition to the challenges listed above – and a host of practical considerations – Dubois and Long (2012) echoed the description of a dearth of theoretical frameworks to guide design, synthesize existing findings, and direct future research (see also, Gupta & Bostrom, 2009; Waight & Stewart, 2009). Although this study was not able to address all of the negative aspects associated with TML, an attempt to minimize a few of them will took place, specifically the use of evaluation, both to assess effectiveness and guide future research.
Conversely, research may show that TML is sufficiently different from traditional approaches to learning that unique design models may be essential, even if they do fall into categories similar to those used to group more traditional designs. It is most probable, however, that model adaptations with additional considerations that highlight subtle differences while keeping the primary similarities intact will emerge as the most appropriate guide for effective TML design and delivery.

Lecture learning also has benefits, as well. Research done with new and experienced dentists in the United Kingdom suggests that learners with little baseline knowledge benefitted from lecture delivery, although the authors cautioned against drawing strong generalizations due to the small sample size (Browne, Mehra, Rattan, & Thomas, 2004). Browne et al. (2004) suggest that the personal interaction with the instructor, social interactions with peers, and potential for relevant anecdotes and asides as explanatory tools all served as aids in the lecture format. Additionally, no technological skills are required on the part of the instructor or learners when information is presented via lecture. However, challenges in lecture settings include relying on instructor proficiency and ensuring active learner engagement (Williams & Zahed, 1996). Technological interventions such as laptops (Barak, Lipson, & Lerman, 2006) and clickers (Mayer et al., 2009) have been used to increase participation in classrooms, as well as non-technology-based strategies such as problem-based learning (Hwang & Kim, 2006) and cooperative learning (Cooper, 1995; Terenzini, Cabrera, Colbeck, Parente, & Bjorklund, 2001). Again though, much of the research examining learning effectiveness is based in the classroom, as opposed to organization training settings.
2.3 Motivation and Training

An additional factor which has been shown to impact the effectiveness of training is that of learner motivation. The hypothesized influence of this construct was used to guide the construction of the video training evaluation. Colquitt et al. (2000) used meta-analysis to examine the impact of motivation as an explanation of variance over and above that of factors such as cognitive ability on learning outcomes. Structural equation models created using surveys collected from organizational training groups showed that motivation itself is impacted by perceived job and career utility, as well as the decision to be trained, and the support of the work environment (Clark et al., 1993).

For example, person characteristics influencing motivation can include whether a learner is a working adult or a student. Students may experience from motivational benefits due to their ability to choose whether or not to take place in learning, whereas employees may engage more with training material due to its utility for their career (Dubois & Long, 2012). Again though, little empirical research has explored the impact of these potential differences.

In the case of this study, although the content was the same between the two delivery methods, motivation to learn on the part of the trainees was theorized to impact the effectiveness of the training delivery differently, as demonstrated by Figure 2.1. Several studies have suggested that motivation to learn and online delivery methods are negatively linked due to learner characteristics (Burke & Moore, 2003; Simmering, Posey, & Piccoli, 2009).

Additionally, Zvacek (1991) noted the lack of particular environmental factors as having a detrimental impact on motivation in distance education. Keller and Suzuki (2004) documented their attempts to validate a model for motivational design of instruction to overcome motivation challenges unique to online learning and confirmed that the use of e-learning design utilizing
ARCS principles (Keller 1993) led to higher motivation and positive outcomes including lower student drop-out. However, Strother (2002), in her overview of satisfaction and effectiveness of e-learning for both students and employees, claims that while learners may not perceive major differences in online versus classroom in terms of knowledge gains, motivation increases as a benefit of online learning.

2.3.1 Motivation to Learn

In 1991, Kanfer defined training motivation as consisting of three elements – direction, intensity, and persistence – with which learners behave in training situations. The research discussed in this project ascribes to this view and uses it to operationalize the approach taken to the study of motivation’s role in training effectiveness before, during, and after training. Noe and Schmitt (1986) described motivation to learn as “a specific desire on the part of the trainee to learn the content of the training program”. For the purposes of this study, motivation to learn was conceptualized as a pre-training level of motivation. In their meta-analysis of research done on training motivation, Colquitt and his colleagues noted that researchers also differentiate the impacts on motivation as originating most commonly from either individual or situational characteristics (2000).

Examples of individual characteristics shown to impact training motivation include self-efficacy (Colquitt et al., 2000), belief in the utility of training (Vroom, 1964), goal orientation
Self-efficacy is a measure that assesses an individual’s belief in his or her competence in a particular domain. Individuals high in self-efficacy display confidence in benefitting from the learning material, are likely to push themselves when learning, and are less likely to be deterred by challenges (Bandura, 1997). Therefore, individuals who score high on a measure of training self-efficacy would be likely to be motivated to take part in training, engage in learning material regardless of delivery method, and ultimately receive positive benefits from training (Salas, et al, 2012). Research on self-efficacy has been shown to influence both motivation to learn and learning outcomes in training (Chen, Gully, Whiteman, & Kilcullen, 2000; Ford, Kozlowski, Kraiger, Salas, & Teachout, 1997; Mathieu et al., 1992). Self-efficacy and motivation have also been shown to be impacted by factors such as being in a position of one’s own choosing (Patrick, Smy, Tombs, & Shelton, 2012) and the learning experience itself (Phan, 2011).

Utility beliefs, or expectancies, are generally characterized by the attitude that training will provide valuable information that, if taken advantage of, will lead to improved work performance (Vroom, 1964). It is often used by researchers to understand motivation to learn because it is theorized that a link between learning and personal benefits will motivate individuals to apply themselves to the training experience (Mathieu et al., 1992). Goal orientation theories assert that an individual will respond to a learning situation differently depending on whether he or she can be categorized as having a performance goal orientation or a learning goal orientation (Dweck, 1986, 1989). Individuals with a learning goal orientation tend to seek out opportunities to learn, whereas individuals with a performance goal orientation often prefer to demonstrate proficiency with knowledge or skills they already possess (Dweck, 1989). Researchers conceptualize goal orientation as having an impact on training due to the fact that
Trainees with a learner orientation should be more motivated to learn training content as it represents the opportunity to acquire new knowledge and skills (Klein et al., 2006).

The relationship between age and training motivation is less understood, although it is often described as a negative relationship such that older learners desire to learn appears to decrease over time (Colquitt et al., 2000; Maurer, Weiss, & Barbette, 2003). Whether that is due to the impact of aging on cognitive abilities concerning learning and memory (Poon, 1985) or fear of failure having been magnified after being seen as an expert in a particular domain of knowledge (Sterns & Doverspike, 1989), evidence suggests that younger employees are more willing to attend and engage in training (McEnrue, 1989).

Figure 2.2 demonstrates a simple conceptualization of typical models representing motivation’s relationship with training outcomes. However, other research shows weaker relationships between pre-training motivation and training outcomes. For example, Noe and Schmitt (1986) found that learning resulting from a training context was significantly influenced by job involvement rather than pre-training motivation, although the two constructs were also moderately related. Similarly, participation in training programs can be negatively impacted by environmental influences regardless of motivation levels (Tharenou, 2001).

As stated previously, much of the work examining the effects of TML on effective learning has been done in classroom contexts (DeRouin et al., 2005; Dubois & Long, 2012).
Similarly, most of the research looking at motivational influences on TML focuses on online education. For example, when comparing traditional lecture courses to parallel blended learning courses in a quasi-experimental study, motivation to learn has been shown to play a mediating role between delivery, learning, and satisfaction (Klein et al., 2006). Additionally, researchers have attempted to compare online and traditional classroom settings in terms of establishing similar roles for constructs shown to impact learning in one context. For example, studies done with military trainees using online courses have shown that instructional quality perceptions and utility perceptions are motivating to learners and contribute to course satisfaction (Artino, 2008).

This study was designed to extend the research on the relationship between motivation and instructional delivery by conducting empirical work within a workplace context. In this study, participants were expected to have relatively equivalent levels of motivation to learn as they began the training session. Before attending training, they were informed that it was a mandatory training/orientation session required before they could work actual shifts. They were randomly assigned to a group that received training via online videos or lecture, but they were not aware of this setup until they arrived for training. Therefore, motivation to learn was not expected to be impacted by condition assignment.

2.3.2 Motivation to Continue

Keller, in 1984, developed what he called the ARCS model in order to explain – and promote – motivational components of instructional materials. Keller’s model is based on the idea that motivation is changeable, and, regardless of initial levels of motivation, if instructional materials are not interesting, personally relevant, related to success, and satisfying to a student, then motivation will wane during a learning experience (Burke & Moore, 2003). Similarly, Mathieu et al. (1992) found motivation to learn and actual learning was moderated by trainee
reactions to the training program. That is, while going through the training program, if a person reacted positively to the training itself, the impact of motivation on learning would be stronger. This can be described as more of a “motivation to continue”, and a typical study would likely depict some variation of Figure 2.3 in testing a particular model of learner motivation within the instructional setting.

![Figure 2.3. Simplified relationship between actual training – content and delivery – and Motivation, adapted from Cannon-Bowers, Salas, Tannenbaum, & Mathieu (1995)](image)

An examination of literature on TML did not reveal a large number of studies examining motivational trends throughout a training process. A somewhat related study conducted by Hu and Hui (2012) looked at the role of learning engagement as it impacted outcomes of learning and satisfaction. Their work with students learning Adobe Photoshop through the use of videos suggested that the usefulness of TML was dependent on the extent to which it required learner engagement. In this instance, engagement could be likened to the “interest” aspect of the ARCS model and an argument made that less engaging materials are less likely to maintain motivation and thus result in less favorable learning outcomes. Although participants were expected to have relatively equivalent levels of motivation to learn as they began the training session, participant levels of motivation to continue were expected to diverge as they proceeded through the training session. The content was identical across the two delivery formats, necessitating a passive role for both groups of trainees- those attending the lecture and the video learners. Therefore the lecture group, especially as part of a digital native population, could find the primarily auditory
delivery in a standard classroom setting particularly bland. However, as demonstrated by a survey administered to students regarding barriers to online training, learner motivation can suffer in an online environment (Muilenburg & Berge, 2005). Given previous findings, it was possible that the online learning experience would not be seen as particularly engaging and lacking in instructor support. Therefore, motivation to continue was expected to show a decrease in learner motivation as the training proceeded, but previous research was unclear as to how to predict the impact of condition assignment.

2.3.3 Motivation to Transfer

According to Noe and Schmitt (1986), post-training motivation impacts the likelihood that learning will lead to behavior change, taking the knowledge that was gained in training and actually applying it on the job. Some authors describe motivation as “essential for training transfer” (Gegenfurtner, Veermans, Festner, & Gruber, 2009; p. 403), transfer being the application of learning described above and arguably the ultimate goal of a training program.

Gegenfurtner and colleagues conducted an integrated literature review on motivation to transfer and concluded that pre-training, during-training, and post-training elements all influence the motivation to transfer and, ultimately, actual transfer (2009). A simplified version of their model can be seen in Figure 2.4 with variables of interest to this study retained. Additionally, the Learning Transfer Inventory System (LTSI), a scale developed to help organizations determine the degree to which training has been successfully transferred is made up of subscales including trainee characteristics, motivation, work environment, and ability (Holton, Bates, & Ruona, 2000).
In their recent review of transfer literature, Baldwin et al. (2009) acknowledged both the increasing prevalence of TML use in organizations and the dearth of studies examining transfer outcomes resulting from less traditional training. Although the authors lauded the many advantages of e-learning, several of which would seem especially suited to promoting transfer, they only cited one study looking at transfer and TML (Baldwin et al., 2009). Kirkman, Rosen, Tesluk, and Gibson (2006) studied transfer when teams were trained utilizing TML, but results were mediated by factors such as technological support and team leader experience. In this study, participants were expected to have different levels of motivation to transfer as they concluded the training session. The groups involved in lecture and video should have had equivalent levels of motivation to learn as they began training, a factor that has been linked to successful transfer (Weissbein, Huang, Ford, and Schmidt, 2011). A meta-analysis by Sitzmann et al. (2006), suggests that when content and instruction is identical, learning is similar across delivery formats, especially when learners are able to choose between online and classroom based instruction. However, few studies have empirically examined motivation levels of students or trainees given no choice in the delivery format of instruction. This study was expected to inform
this gap with the use of random assignment into lecture or video conditions. Given that design impacts motivation to continue, which is then assumed to impact motivation to transfer, motivation to transfer was expected to be impacted by condition assignment. Again though, previous research was unclear as to how to predict the impact of condition assignment.

2.4 Digital Natives

As mentioned in the previous section, the trainee population taking part in this study primarily fell within the age range of 18-23, placing them in the digital native generation. Although the exact dates are mentioned with some variability, digital natives are described as having been born between approximately 1982 and 2002 (Shaw & Fairhurst, 2008). Most authors on the subject agree that there are distinctions about the digital native generation that set them apart as students, employees, and consumers, but there are differences in the degree of unique qualities ascribed (Bennett et al., 2008; Prensky, 2001; Shaw & Fairhurst, 2008).

However, the most salient characteristic attributed to individuals described as digital natives is that of a high level of comfort with the use of technology due to a lifetime of immersion in and interactions with it (Prensky, 2001). Because of this familiarity with technology, more traditional learning approaches are often described as lacking, unable to engage the interest of students who prefer more interactive, fast-paced access to knowledge-building (Prensky, 2001). However, little empirical evidence exists to support differences between digital natives and older generations. Researchers point out that much of what is published concerning digital natives is anecdotal and “commonsensical” in nature, often appearing in popular press (Bennett et al., 2008; Selwyn, 2009).

Observations by Shaw and Fairhurst (2008) into training by McDonalds reveal trends by digital natives that suggest preferences for collaboration, hands-on activities, and rapid feedback.
Other work discusses the ease with which digital natives utilize tools within the workplace such as email and blogs (Glass, 2007). Bennett (2012) points out that although digital natives are familiar with technology, they don’t necessarily optimize their learning and skill development through its use. Although little research exists on the topic, Prensky (2001) and other supporters of the digital native divide seem to suggest that members of this generation would prefer learning using an online medium, despite previous research suggesting that motivation suffers in non-traditional approaches to training (Sitzmann et al., 2006).

There is a possibility that although motivation for older generations tends to decrease in an online learning environment, the affinity for technology used to describe digital natives may suggest a different relationship. Even within the studies described above, researchers found trends that support the idea that individuals who are familiar with technology respond differently to online learning despite age. For example, when individuals choose their courses, web-based instruction is supported, in terms of positively impacting learning (Sitzmann et al., 2006), suggesting that, for those who prefer online instruction, such a setting is just as effective as a classroom. In their research on students taking online courses, Simmering and colleagues (2009) were surprised to find a lack of support for their hypothesis that motivation to learn would relate to learning. Instead, computer self-efficacy was found to impact learning, suggesting that the role of motivation was lessened when the learners were confident of their ability to utilize the online format as a viable alternative to classroom learning (Simmering et al., 2009). Therefore, this study was expected to inform the literature by examining the relationship between training delivery and learning motivation within a digital native population.
2.5 Training Development

Although this study was primarily concerned with experimental manipulation of training delivery methods with particular focus on the impact of participant motivation, it is important to note that an entirely new training program was developed. The following section describes the steps that were taken to create a program based on best practices and established approaches for creating an optimal training program.

2.5.1 Needs Assessment

Borrowing from the work of Lewin (1946) and Rummler and Brache (1992), a needs assessment for the DA training program was conducted. The needs assessment incorporated elements of the Action Research Model (Lewin, 1946) and addressed issues at the organization, task, and individual levels, as proscribed by the Human Performance Technology (HPT) approach (Rummler & Brache, 1992).

Organization-level analysis initially involves inquiry into the goals of the organization. From there, strategies regarding how training can meet these goals can be expected to lead to insights or decisions about where training is needed. In the case of LSU’s Residential Life department, organizational goals, at least in terms of the development of the student workers, are directly overseen by an Associate Director and three Assistant Directors. Previous conversations with these individuals have reflected recurring themes of concern with the inconsistency of current DA training and a desire to centralize and standardize future DA training. Additionally, the directors stressed that the goal is to move towards a more online-based training experience, but also expressed a need to systematically gauge the effectiveness of the DA training.

Task level analysis allows the needs assessment focus to shift to the job itself. In order to understand the duties and expectations of the DA position, Position Description and Position
Evaluation documents were obtained, current training delivery was observed in two separate communities (see Appendices B and C), and Residential Life employees at various levels were consulted. There were discrepancies between what was trained and the position description and evaluation documents. Specifically, although administrative and customer service topics were stressed in both training evaluation, topics such as individual development were included in the evaluation but not training, whereas topics such as policies and human resource expectations were covered in training but not evaluated. However, the employees consulted were able to describe what would be ideally included in training. Employees involved included the Desk Operations Committee, which consisted of Graduate Resident Directors (GRDs) who oversee the DA position. Also included were the Graduate Assistant for Selection, the Conduct and Judicial Officer, and several incumbent DAs. Once a list of topics was created, Assistant Directors approved the list as comprehensive.

Finally, the needs assessment must consider the individuals performing the task. Person analysis attempts to discover who needs training and what particular knowledge, skill, and abilities do they need to be effective. Because of the directors’ desire that all employees, current and incoming, be “put on the same page” due to inconsistencies in the past, all employees, both new and returning, took part in the newly created DA training program.

2.5.2 ADDIE Considerations

Training programs are typically concerned with elements captured by the acronym ADDIE: Audience, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation. Although initial development is attributed to training programs designed for the United States Army (Branson, Rayner, Cox, Furman, & King, 1975), ADDIE is typically described as a generic model for
approaching effective instructional design (Molenda, 2003). The instructional design for the DA position training was developed with these components in mind.

The Audience component calls on the researcher to consider the group to which training will be delivered. The particular audience for this training program was composed of both incoming and incumbent employees in the LSU Residential Life department performing the role of desk assistant. The DA position is a part-time, on-campus position. Employees hired for the job are all young adults (18-23 year-olds) who are also undergraduate students at LSU. They tend to utilize technology for individual and educational purposes on a regular basis. They are informed as a condition of employment that there is mandatory training, so with rare exception, all employees should take part in training. Also included in the training were RAs because their employment contract stipulates a mandatory 2 hours of desk work per week.

The needs assessment above provided information incorporated into the Design. Knowledge, skills, and abilities expressed by the department as necessary and/or desirable for employees to possess were used to develop a list of training topics. The topics were then used to develop lecture scripts for delivering content in such a way that speaker stress, pace, and content could be kept as equivalent as possible. Optimal delivery methods in terms of lecture/video, hands-on, role-playing, and group discussion were also determined.

Development stages included adapting, adopting, and creation of the individual difference measures discussed in Section 2.6. Additionally, fill-in-the-blank knowledge tests were created to assess declarative knowledge gains. Videos for delivering content online were recorded and edited using the scripts developed as a part of the design process. The content and professional appearance of the videos were approved by the AD and grad overseeing desk
operations. Finally, pilot tests were conducted with a separate group of summer employees to ensure clarity, comprehensiveness, and appropriateness of content delivery (see Section 3.5).

Implementation concerns mostly involved the selection of suitable training settings. For the trainees receiving the lecture delivery, an auditorium style classroom was reserved. However, a large computer lab was chosen as more appropriate for the trainees receiving video training. The hands-on, role-playing, and group discussion activities were planned for the communities where the employee would be working so that a small group approach could be used (see Section 3.6). Additionally, the instructor delivering the lecture version of training was coached on how to ensure a message that was consistent with the videos.

Evaluation components included both quantitative and qualitative data collection. Quantitative measures included learner characteristic scales, the declarative knowledge test, and affective reactions, specifically motivation and satisfaction scales. Qualitative information collected for evaluation purposes included surveys, group discussion, and behavior observation.

2.5.3 Challenges

Some challenges were anticipated for the enactment of the training program. Unfortunately, the training for the DA position fell on the final day of the training period for the RA position. As RAs are expected to perform DA responsibilities as part of their job description and thus will be included in the training program, there was some contamination due to content overlap. Attempts to minimize this issue included separating the new from returning employees, ensuring that the new employees did not participate in the community-specific training until after receiving lecture or video training, and strategic statements made by the instructor stressing the differences over the similarities of the two positions. Additionally, primary job position (RA or
DA) was treated as a learner characteristic variable in order to examine the influence of job type on training outcomes.

2.6 Training Outcomes

In order to evaluate the success of training, typically Kirkpatrick’s (1996) four measures of training effectiveness are utilized: reactions, learning, behavior, and organizational results. Although the diagnostic qualities of this model have been debated, and the organizational results difficult to capture (Arthur et al., 2003), the components are still heavily used in both organizations and academics and possess a certain intuitive appeal that would likely encourage the Department of Residential Life to endorse the study’s findings through their use. Additionally, to the extent that it is feasible, longitudinal data collection would be ideal, especially in regards to capturing the transfer of training to the job and the resulting impact on behavior (Baldwin et al., 2009).

2.6.1 Trainee Reactions

Data on reactions is collected immediately at the conclusion of training. Learners indicate satisfaction with the training, often rating instructor, content, delivery, etc., on self-reflection scales developed for the particular training. Admittedly, criticisms have been made regarding the relationship between reactions and learning – and thus the behavior change and organization improvement thought to result from learning. However, Sitzmann et al. (2008) described research in which reactions were related to learning outcomes, albeit through a mediated relationship involving learner engagement, and shared antecedents including trainee and situational characteristics. Additionally, her work indicated utility for reaction data in its potential to influence future affect towards training and highlight training deficiencies (Sitzmann et al., 2008).
2.6.2 Knowledge Gains

Learning outcomes were also considered an important indicator of training effectiveness in assessing whether training content was communicated to the learners. Kraiger, Ford, and Salas (1993) categorized learning into affective, declarative, and procedural outcomes. In order to demonstrate the training’s effectiveness at changing affect, measures of motivation were collected from learners. Declarative learning was assessed using knowledge tests. Procedural learning was assessed with a demonstration of acquired skills, specifically desk-related administrative tasks and behaviors discussed in training for this particular group.

2.6.3 Transfer

If training is effective, behavioral changes should result. Depending on what is of interest to the organization, a variety of objective behavioral measures could be implemented, collecting data on worker accuracy (in terms of filling out forms), sales, policy adherence, and customer service indicators related to both number addressed and quality of responses. Additionally, although qualitative in nature, subjective evaluations provided by supervisors (see Section 3.6) or co-workers can also indicate behavior changes tied to the training program.

2.6.4 Performance Improvement

Annual evaluations conducted before and after a training program is implemented can show information or learning transfer and application on the job. If an identical evaluation form is utilized prior to training and then administered to trainees who have completed training, then it is possible to determine whether training has not only transferred to the job, but also whether performance has improved as a result of the program’s institution (see Section 3.6).
2.6.5 Organizational Change

Finally, in order to determine program success, connections between training and positive organizational results need to be made. Although financial outcomes have typically been of most interest to organizations (Nguyen, Truong, & Buyens, 2010; Tharenou, Saks, & Moore, 2007), this seems less likely to be true of Residential Life as with resident satisfaction. However, some financial outcomes that might indicate training success for Residential Life include less money spent frivolously due to improper maintenance requests or less money spent on litigation due to safety violations. Additionally, HR outcomes such as improved organization climate, a stated goal of the department directors, may prove financially advantageous in terms of increasing retention and decreasing turnover and also indicate training success.

2.7 Hypotheses

Although a great deal of research comparing technology-mediated learning and traditional lecture delivery has been done using student populations in classroom settings, there is a lack of empirical work done with trainees in a workplace setting. Additionally, the role of motivation, long established as an important factor in learning, is not fully understood in its impact on the effectiveness of online learning. Finally, another component with the potential to affect online learning effectiveness is the belonging of a particular group to the current generation’s population – often referred to as a “digital native” generation. Digital natives are thought to have a propensity for and positive disposition towards technology dissimilar to much of the generations preceding them. Such factors may differentiate motivation trends seen in the digital native population from that found by previous researchers such that motivation does not suffer from the use of online information delivery but is instead enhanced by it.
To address these research deficits and examine the conceptual model shown in Figure 2.5, this study will test the following hypotheses:

H1: Pre-training motivation to learn will not be different between delivery type groups, regardless of assignment to lecture or online training delivery.

H2: To the extent that a participant identifies him or herself as a digital native, this attribute will play a role in the relationship between delivery method and motivation to continue.

H3: Delivery mode will impact participant motivation to continue, with participants taking part in lectures having lower motivation than those in the video group.

H4: Delivery mode will impact the following training outcomes -

H4a: Learning, such that participants taking part in lectures will have lower learning scores compared to those in the video group.

H4b: Motivation to transfer, such that participants taking part in lectures will have lower motivation to transfer compared to those in the video group.

H4c: Satisfaction, such that participants taking part in lectures will have lower satisfaction ratings compared to those in the video group.

H4d: Performance, such that participants taking part in lectures will have lower job performance scores compared to those in the video group.

H5: The effectiveness of training is associated with participant motivation, such that learning scores will be lower for participants with lower motivation.

H5a: Participants with lower Motivation to Learn will show smaller knowledge gains than participants with higher Motivation to Learn.

H5b: Participants with lower Motivation to Continue will show smaller knowledge gains than participants with higher Motivation to Continue.
H5c: Participants with lower Motivation to Transfer will show smaller knowledge gains than participants with higher Motivation to Transfer.

Figure 2.5. Early Conceptual Framework representing relationships between trainee attributes and learning outcomes training type within the context of the training episode.
CHAPTER 3. METHODS

3.1 Purpose

The purpose of this study was to develop – and evaluate – an online training program for undergraduate Desk Assistants (DAs) employed by LSU’s department of Residence Education to work part-time in the residence communities. There were 165 trainees, and although the number of new hires recruited each semester is not that high, both new and returning employees were required to attend training. The department decided to implement an online aspect of training that covers training basics for new hires. With this approach, face-to-face training can build off and enhance the online elements for employees new to the desk position, while at the same time acting as a review and reducing redundancy for returning employees.

An online training program was recently developed for Resident Assistants (RAs; the students who act in a supervisory role in the communities), but no formal assessment of its impact was done. Therefore, in addition to the development of the new training program for DAs, it was important to the department that a formal evaluation also be conducted. Prior research – discussed in the preceding section – as well as previous trainee assessments, strongly implicate the role of motivation as a moderator of the effectiveness of the online training program, acting on the receptiveness and engagement of the participants. This study proposed the investigation of a DA training program, comparing video to traditional training, while measuring various individual difference components thought not only to impact training but which also are easily impacted for improvement of future training. Of greatest interest within the individual difference measures were those pertaining to participant motivation because the researcher hypothesized that motivation levels are both responsible for attenuating overall
learning and vary as a function of delivery method, with online training acting as a lesser
detriment to motivation levels than traditional training.

As stated previously, the objectives of this study were:

1. To identify and describe the role of digital nativism in the effectiveness of online versus
   lecture training.
2. To obtain and describe measures of learning and performance resulting from taking part
   in the DA training program.
3. To evaluate the effectiveness of online training as compared to a lecture delivery of the
   same information.
4. To describe the relationship between motivation and the effectiveness of online versus
   lecture training, as expressed by participant learning.
5. To identify opportunities for future research.

3.2 Research Design

In order to investigate not only the knowledge gains incurred as a result of training, but
also the individual factors moderating learning, both quantitative and qualitative data collection
methods were used with a parallel mixed method research design to collect data before, during,
and after training. Qualitative and quantitative data collection were administered separately,
sometimes independently, but occasionally simultaneously, as shown in Table 3.1. Specifically,
email surveys – serving as an opportunity for qualitative data collection – occurred prior to the
training date. Both quantitative and qualitative measures were administered immediately prior to
training to examine pre-training knowledge and individual differences. During and immediately
following training, quantitative measures were collected in order to track changes in motivation
and learning throughout the training process. Additionally, a quantitative post-training
knowledge test was collected at the conclusion of training and collection of supervisor evaluations at the end of the semester was planned. Within the same time frame, qualitative data was collected using focus groups, group interviews, and behavioral observations. Although the quantitative data obtained from knowledge tests were of primary interest in determining the effectiveness of the training program, the additional data provided, both quantitative and qualitative, were expected to supplement the findings by qualifying the conditions under which training was most effective.

Table 3.1
Measurement task, type, and proposed time of collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Method</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Collection Occurs…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email Survey [anticipation of training]</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Prior to training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Pre-Test</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Beginning of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Beginning of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation Survey</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Beginning of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Native Scale</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Beginning of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (to Learn) Scale</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Beginning of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (to Continue)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>During training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Post-Test</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>End of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (to Transfer)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>End of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>End of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group [impression of training]</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>After training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Interview [impression of training]</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>After training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Observation</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>After training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial steps included an overview of the current state of training, discussions with key stakeholders on goals for improvement, and the development of guidelines for delivering an enhanced training program. Transparency concerns (Patton, 2008) were addressed by regular collaborations within the department at the AD, graduate assistant, and DA levels. Training tools were reviewed, assessment instruments collaboratively created, and input solicited from varying stakeholders. The information gained, as well as the interpretations derived from the data, was reported to the department in order to assess the effectiveness of the program and plan future improvements, especially as the roles of learner motivation and digital nativism are expounded.
Once the training program was designed and approved, plans to incorporate it into the Residential Life Department’s Fall Training began. Simultaneously, data collection instruments were developed, verified, and submitted to the LSU Internal Review Board (IRB) for approval (E#8366). In the summer, before the trainees returned for training, efforts were made to communicate the training schedule with the trainees as well as sharing the content with other members of the training team to minimize contamination through overlapping sessions. The training and primary data collection was conducted on the final day of Fall Training, August 14, 2013.

3.3 Research Question

Due to the nature of the study, the research questions can be addressed using both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Specifically, the questions – How do learner characteristics impact training outcomes? and What are the differences in training outcomes for traditional lecture teaching methods compared to online video learning? – were assessed quantitatively using knowledge gains and affective outcomes. The questions were also addressed qualitatively using discussion and behavior observations. The research question – What role does motivation play in the effectiveness of training? – was addressed quantitatively using knowledge gains. The question was also addressed qualitatively using surveys and discussion. Finally, as a result of information gathered using this mixed methodology, the study was able to more fully explain the interactive nature of learning in the Residential Life student staff by addressing the question – How do learner characteristics, delivery method, and motivation interact to influence learning outcomes? The conceptualization of antecedents, manipulation, and outcomes is represented in Figure 3.1.
3.4 Research Methodology

The data collection process included both quantitative and qualitative methodologies, both described below. Key decisions considered in choosing a mixed methods approach, as well as an overview of the proposed sequence of events for the study will be discussed.

3.4.1 Key Decisions in Choosing a Mixed Methods Design

According to Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009), a number of decisions go into the selection and implementation of mixed methods approaches to research. Specifically, a researcher must be transparent in discussing both why the mixed methods approach is optimal and how the process
of triangulating data will result in the most comprehensive conclusions. Relative importance, design, and analysis considerations are discussed in the following paragraphs. A schematic representation is illustrated in Figure 3.2.

This study took an approach such that data gathered from both quantitative and qualitative sources were interactive with one another. Because of the hypothesis that motivation plays an instrumental role in the effectiveness of training, and that it can be conveyed easier online delivery, to the detriment of face-to-face training, it was important to identify levels of motivation prior to training, regardless of delivery. Although motivation scales were able to provide useful numbers, an email survey about motivation was able to provide richer understanding of the role of motivation from the very beginning of a training process. Additionally, because the ultimate goal of this project was to provide the Department of Residential Life with guidelines for an optimal training program, surveys about motivation from the onset were intended to give direction for introducing motivation into the actual learning experience at a later implementation of training by offering insight into what motivates the population of interest even in pre-training stages.

In the next suggested mixed method decision, the researcher must determine the relative priority of the data, determining between the quantitative and qualitative information which will ultimately be given more weight in drawing conclusions. For this study, both types of data were considered equivalent. Quantitative measures were vital to this study. Individual difference measures helped to ensuring relative homogeneity in the sample prior to training as well as providing important information that might qualify learning gains irrespective of training delivery method. Additionally, quantitative measures were used to determine differences
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Figure 3.2. Data Collection and Analysis Sequence
between the groups in terms of knowledge gains. Finally, quantitative methods were hypothesized to demonstrate equality with training methods when motivation levels were controlled for statistically. However, the qualitative aspect was also informative in terms of gaining insight into whether or not motivation was playing the hypothesized attenuating role proposed by the researcher. Ascertaining personal impressions going into a training and uncovering the optimal approaches for getting buy-in or the perception of worth in a training, was the crux of the study in terms of understanding the interaction between motivation and delivery method as well as addressing it in future training. Again, scales were helpful here, especially for pre- and post-test comparisons, but interviews and open-ended questions specifically provided the insight needed for creating an effective motivational component. Additionally, behavioral observations added another measure of training effectiveness.

Mixed methods studies also must give consideration to the timing of quantitative and qualitative data collection. This study was conceptualized as multiphase. Initial qualitative measures of motivation were collected prior to training. Then, on the day of training, quantitative and qualitative measures were collected before, during, and immediately following the training delivery. Specifically, as the training program was initiated, a knowledge pre-test and individual differences measures were distributed to participants. Finally, as training wrapped up, quantitative measures of motivation to apply the learned material and training satisfaction were both gathered. The quantitative measures were expected to show if there were inherent differences in the delivery method in terms of the retention of information. However, it was expected that the qualitative measures of motivation would prove to be a moderating factor impacting retention.
Finally, procedures for mixing the quantitative and qualitative data should be discussed. First of all, the data was mixed at the level of design. In order to capture and understand the impact of variables as delivery progresses, data collection of both types needed to occur in a multiphase investigation. Similarly, the data was mixed at the level of data collection. As stated previously, quantitative data provided insight into group homogeneity, manipulation effectiveness, and training impact, but corresponding qualitative measures provided a more complete picture of factors underlying training impact. Also, the data was mixed at the level of interpretation. Learning face-to-face may be just as effective as learning via online delivery if learner characteristics are controlled for. However, the relationship between amount of learning and these antecedents required both a quantitative and qualitative perspective in order to fully understand the degree to which learning was impacted.

3.4.2 Training Day

DA training took place on August 14, 2013. There were four distinct groups of participants involved in training: new DAs, new RAs, returning DAs, and returning RAs. There were also two phases to training, split into morning and afternoon sessions. The general layout of participants and how they were assigned to training phases can be seen in Table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2</th>
<th>Training assignments based on participant type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New DAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New RAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hands-on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New DAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New RAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hands-on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Of particular interest to the study in terms of learning as an outcome were new employees, regardless of DA or RA classification. However, due to the fact that Desk Training Day fell at the end of a 10-day training program for Fall RAs, it was possible that the New RA group would have been exposed to some desk policies and procedures as a result of having been part of their overall training. Therefore, although it was likely that pre-test knowledge would differ between New RAs and New DAs, the differential effects of training delivery were still expected to be comparable.

Returning DAs and RAs also went through the training, as one of the department goals is to create consistency in training. Due to departmental preferences, data was also collected on these groups, although it was not initially expected to be included in this study. Returners, while likely to have been exposed to most of the information discussed in training, have not been given consistent training in the past. Therefore, attitudes, impressions, and even pre- to post-test knowledge change are of interest, but attributing job performance to the training program would not be appropriate given their previous experience with the position.

Finally, after discussions with key stakeholders (see section 2.5.1), a variety of topics and delivery methods were proposed for inclusion in training. These are listed in Appendix A. Topics that were considered “universal” or “department-wide” when discussed by stakeholders were chosen as those which would be optimally delivered via an online or lecture approach. Other training topics were considered more “community specific,” having to do with responsibilities unique to a particular building, desk layout, or storage locations, for example. Because these topics were not consistent across communities, they were intended to be delivered face-to-face, via demonstration and discussion. The desk position requires a particular set of skills, including customer service, website utilization, and form completion. Although most of those concepts
were introduced via video/lecture, it was decided that hands-on and role-playing approaches would provide optimal learning for such procedural needs (see Section 3.6).

Because of topic content overlap between the classroom and community learning experiences, the new employees completed the video or lecture training in the morning so as to avoid threats to internal validity due to being exposed prematurely to the to-be-learned information. The trainees were randomly assigned to one of the two training conditions. Training took place in similarly-sized rooms, although one was an auditorium in order to be conducive to lecture while the other was a computer lab. The groups containing new employees did not co-mingle with the returning employees. The video and lecture groups did not interact until after training. Scripts were designed such that content was identical, regardless of delivery. All face-to-face topics were delivered by one instructor – the graduate assistant for desk operations. Special emphasis was placed on tone and pace so that the delivery was also as similar in terms of engagement and exposure time as possible. The lecture instructor also watched the videos before training to familiarize himself with the topics and delivery style. Finally color handouts of forms discussed in the videos and screen captures of software tools were utilized as visual aids within the lecture session. An example can be seen in Appendix K.

When the trainees arrived each was handed several folders and told not to open them until instructed. Trainees in the video group received 3 folders: yellow for pre-training materials, orange for midway through training, and red for post-training materials. Trainees in the lecture group received these same 3 folders, plus a purple folder containing handouts that accompanied the lecture. Next, a brief introduction to the training took place, explaining that although there may be some overlap between RA training and Desk training, the responsibilities are different depending on the role to which one is assigned at a given moment. Additionally, the overarching
goals of the training program, namely to move towards a consistent and optimal design, were introduced as a segue into the distribution of Informed Consent (see Appendix E) and pre-test measures (see Appendices G, H, I, and J). Trainees were provided blank paper in their pre-training materials and instructed to write down any questions they may have to be addressed at the end of the day in group discussion. After the completion of the initial tests, training began. There were 15 topics covered in training, including but not limited to customer service, emergency response, and key rental procedures (the complete list of topics can be found in Appendix A). About halfway through training, an additional motivation measure (see Appendix M) was completed by the participants who were allowed to take a 10 minute break when the scale was filled out. After completing all 15 topics, final measures (see Appendices J and L) were completed and collected as the trainees were dismissed. Any technical difficulties, delivery anomalies, or aberrant behavior were noted by an observer as it occurred and are discussed in Section 3.6. After the initial session, the trainees reconvened in their particular communities for the hands-on and role-play components of training (see Section 3.6). Returning employees had a similar schedule, except that they began the day in their communities to do the hands-on and role-play aspects of training first thing in the morning and then traveled to the classrooms for the online/lecture topics following their in-hall time.

3.4.3 Quantitative Data Collection

Quantitative data was gathered in order to assess the effectiveness of training. Again, the main research question of interest to be addressed by quantitative data involves the relationship between delivery and learning – Specifically, given that the information taught is identical, how does learning, as measured by knowledge gains, compare for more traditional lecture teaching methods in contrast to online learning using videos? Learning was operationalized as declarative
knowledge and measured using pre-test and post-tests consisting of content covered by training. This data was collected on training day, both immediately preceding training and immediately after the conclusion of training. Learning was also described using observations of job performance within 90 days after training.

Additionally, in order to address the potential mediating effects of motivation, quantitative data in the form of scales measuring motivation and the other pertinent individual difference measures as discussed in Chapter 2 was collected. These scales were distributed before, during, and after training (see Table 3.1).

3.4.4 Scales and Measures

3.4.4.1 Demographics. Demographic, academic, and extra-curricular information were collected, as well as information on any previous experience in the position (see Appendix H). Such information is expected to establish nomological validity and allow for exploration of relationships between learner characteristics and training outcomes, as well as potential confounds.

3.4.4.2 Digital Native. In order to measure the degree to which participants identify as digital natives, a 16-item scale was used (Teo, 2013). The statements measure attributes such as whether participants grew up with technology, are comfortable with multitasking, regularly utilize graphics when communicating, and prefer instant gratification and rewards. A 5-point Likert-type response scale was provided prior to training, ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree (see Appendix J).

3.4.4.3 Motivation to Learn. A 5-item self-report measure composed of statements adapted from Noe and Schmitt’s (1986) Motivation to Learn Scale was used to assess participant
desire to learn and take part in training (see Appendix J). A 5-point Likert-type response scale was provided prior to training, ranging from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree*.

**3.4.4.4 Motivation to Continue.** Based on the definitions of motivation as an “intensity, direction, and persistence” in driving learning (Kanfer, 1991), as well as research demonstrating the malleability of motivation depending on learner reaction (Burke & Moore, 2003; Mathieu et al., 1992), a 10-item self-report scale was created to assess the continuing interest of leaners, as well as the perceived utility, and perceived instruction quality on the part of the learners as they were going through the training program (see Appendix M). A 5-point Likert-type response scale was provided, ranging from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree*.

**3.4.4.5 Motivation to Transfer.** Because motivation to transfer is perceived as resulting from instructional design, intrinsic attributes, and expectations about workplace environment (Gegenfurtner, Festner, Gallenberger, Lehtinen, & Gruber, 2009; Holton et al., 2000), items from two different scales were adapted to assess trainees’ desire to apply the learning in training on the job. Six items were adapted from the LTSI (Holton et al., 2000) to examine both the impact of training design as it was perceived by participants to be linked to job performance expectations and the impact of transfer effort performance expectations, or the expectations of trainees that applying what they’ve learned will positively impact their performance. Additionally, 3 items were adapted to assess intrinsic and extrinsic motivating factors such as supervisor appreciation and enjoying the challenge of applying knowledge (Gegenfurtner et al., 2009). For the 9 self-report items, a 5-point Likert-type response scale was provided at the conclusion of training, ranging from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree* (see Appendix N).

**3.4.4.6 Satisfaction.** Based on the work by Morgan and Casper (2000), who endeavored to demonstrate the multidimensionality of participant reactions, 11 self-report items were
adapted to assess trainee satisfaction with the program (see Appendix N). The items are designed to address the degree to which participants are satisfied with the instruction and utility of the training program (Morgan & Casper, 2000). A 5-point Likert-type response scale was provided at the conclusion of training, ranging from Very Dissatisfied to Very Satisfied.

3.4.4.7 Knowledge Pre- and Post-Test. A 20-item short answer quiz was developed to assess knowledge gains as a result of training involvement (see Appendix L). The knowledge gains from pre- to post-test were used to assess participant learning. The training covered 16 distinct topics, so a minimum of one item was created for each topic. There were 20 fill-in-the-blank questions, with several multi-part questions. Participants could receive a maximum score of 20 if he or she answered all parts of all questions correctly. The items were approved by the AD supervising desk operations and judged to thoroughly explore the knowledge and responsibilities expected of a DA. The same items were administered to trainees at the beginning and end of the training session.

3.4.4.8 Performance Evaluation. In order to assess the degree to which knowledge and skills were successfully retained and applied throughout the semester, the department of Residential Life has designed an 18-item Desk Assistant Performance Evaluation (see Appendix S). The evaluation divides the DA responsibilities into subsections of Communication/Customer Service, Administrative Responsibilities, and Individual Development. A 4-point response scale is used to create a performance score, including Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory. Employee supervisors were expected to administer this assessment at the end of the semester and discuss performance progress and needs with each employee individually (see Section 3.6).
3.4.5 Qualitative Data Collection

Fielding (2010) described mixed methods research as a tool for getting a more complete picture of the relationships indicated by the results. In keeping with this perspective, the combination of both quantitative and qualitative data are expected to elucidate both the simple impact on learning occurring as a result of online or traditional training and the complex interplay between individual differences and learning that results in differential outcomes. In this study, qualitative data is used to address the question – What role does motivation play in the effectiveness of the delivery method? Prior to training, brief email surveys and open-ended questions on a pre-test motivation survey were distributed to assess the general motivation levels of trainees going into training. A focus group conducted with trainees after the conclusion of training, as well as a group interview conducted post-training, were both designed to lend weight to the hypothesis that motivation differed between training groups depending on delivery method and suggest future interventions for improving motivation as it relates to training.

In addition to illuminating the role of motivation in attenuating or accentuating learning, qualitative data was intended to be used to assess the effectiveness of training.

3.4.6 Surveys and Observation

The following section describes the surveys, discussions, and observations used in the collection of qualitative data for this study. Each instrument and its purpose are briefly described below.

3.4.6.1 Email Survey. Approximately 10 days prior to training, DAs who had been hired for the upcoming semester were contacted for participation in a focus group concerning job interest, perceptions about the position, and training expectations. Four questions were developed in collaboration with the assessment team and used to explore these themes prior to training (see
Appendix G). However, as will be elaborated in Section 3.6, a focus group did not prove feasible with this particular group, and an email survey was sent instead. The email sought volunteers who were willing to briefly and honestly share their motivations for applying for the job and what they thought they would gain from training.

**3.4.6.2 Motivation Survey.** In order to further explore the role of motivation in the effectiveness of the program, a set of four open-ended questions were created to be administered in conjunction with the motivation to learn scales distributed to all participants at the beginning of training (see Appendix I). These questions are intended to understand the learners’ anticipation of training and perspective on the utility of training in general.

**3.4.6.3 Focus Group Questionnaires.** The Residential Life department invited RAs to participate in a focus group that took place approximately 6 weeks after training. Both new and returning RAs from all communities were solicited to volunteer in discussing topics that included the Faculty-in-Residence program, the RA selection process, and the recent Fall training program. Three discussion prompts with follow-up questions were developed (see Appendix O) to explain the influence of motivation on training in the RA population and solicit suggestions for improving motivation and training. Although the questions asked were not specific to the desk training, they were left broad enough to pertain to all aspects of student staff training conducted by the department.

**3.4.6.4 Group Interview.** In addition to the survey questions emailed to newly hired DAs, a focus group to be held with DAs beginning in the Fall semester was initially proposed. However, as will be elaborated in Section 3.6, not enough participants agreed to take part in the focus group. Therefore, the format of the meeting was restructured to that of a group interview, with additional questions added and more interviewer guidance planned within the interaction for
greater depth of information provided by fewer individuals. As with the email survey and focus group, the group interview was conducted with a volunteer sample of the trainee population. The group interview took place approximately three months after the conclusion of training, to allow the participants some experience provided by time on the job. The group interview questions were developed in collaboration with the assessment team in order to better understand the organizational culture in terms of how the DA position is perceived, the degree to which the employees see the value of the position, and the appreciation for the position gained as a result of training (see Appendix P). Additionally, input from the DAs participating in the interview was sought to address potential training deficiencies, recommendations for improving future training, and insight into perceived organizational support for the position.

3.4.6.5 Behavior Observation. In collaboration with the AD supervising Desk Operations, a set of behavioral and knowledge objectives demonstrating efficient training in terms of employee performance were developed (see Appendix Q). The items included demonstrations of common policies and procedures as well as knowledge of the appropriate response to less common requirements of the job. Behavior observations were conducted by the Graduate Assistant for Training & Leadership Development. They took place approximately three months after the conclusion of training. A sample of the trainee population was observed. Efforts were taken to ensure that the observed sample included at least two employees from each community who worked shifts where they were most likely to get an opportunity to apply training content to their job. Additionally, observed employees included equal numbers of video and lecture trainees.
3.4.7 Triangulation

Although triangulation is typically viewed as four distinct types: data, methodological, investigator, and theory (Denzin, 1978), this study incorporates two separate triangulation strategies. Using multiple methodologies to examine motivation allows for greater understanding of the role it plays in training effectiveness. At the same time, triangulation within methodologies is made possible through the use of a variety of data collection sources which allows for a more complete picture of the role of motivation as it relates to particular training outcomes and across particular participant groups.

3.5 Video Development

As described in Section 2.5.1: Needs Assessment, multiple stakeholders were consulted in the creation of the training topics. Additionally the scripts to be used in the training were a result of collaboration between DA supervisors, the Associate Director overseeing desk operations, and other departments within Residential Life, including Facilities and Human Resources. Each script underwent several revisions and ultimately received the approval of the Associate Director overseeing desk operations before being used for training. A brief description of each of the training topics follows.

Desk Expectations covered general policies on attendance, punctuality, customer service, professional appearance, privacy concerns, and safety. The Accountability script discussed the progressive discipline process for DAs who violate policies or fail to meet expectations, including a stress on this being a general process with certain behaviors having the potential to skip steps, even to immediate termination. Customer Service offered a brief overview of expectations for friendly demeanor, willingness to help, tone of voice (on site and on the phone), body language, and making residents feel like a priority. The Resources topic introduced the idea
that DAs, as an information resource, should be aware of and knowledgeable about LSU’s main website, the LSU A-Z Index, Res Life’s homepage, the Living on Campus Handbook, the Campus Map, and when to contact the GRD and RLC. Guest visitation times and policies, as well as expectations for the resident hosting a guest were discussed with the Guests topic. In the Overview of Desk Forms lecture and video, screen captures and brief descriptions of the following forms were provided to the trainees: Daily Log, UPD Log, RA On-call Log, Maintenance Request Log, Maintenance Employee Log, Equipment Log, Delivery Log, and Visitation Log. The FERPA/Buckley Hold introduced trainees to the Federal Education Right to Privacy Act (FERPA) and Buckley Holds, as well as describing the impact of these privacy laws on Residential Life policies regarding release of resident information. The Parents topic provided general guidelines for addressing parents, both on-site and on the phone with a focus on the balance of customer service and privacy protection. The Living on Campus (LoC) Handbook scripts provided more detailed description of the LoC Handbook and an introduction to some of the more useful topics included. The Card Swipe topic included an introduction to Blackboard and Persona, the university’s building access systems. The Key Policy script described renting keys, returning keys, the DA role in the Lock Change process, the importance of communication, and a stress on the importance of proper and responsible handling of keys. Emergency Response, as a training topic for DAs, instructed the employees to call up, observe the situation, and stay calm. The LSU Police Department (PD) scripts provided the procedures to follow when campus police are in the community. The Maximo tutorial provided an introduction to the Maximo work order website, Maintenance Request Log, and the importance of placing priority on addressing facilities issues. The When to Work tutorial provided a DAs perspective of the When to Work employee scheduling website, covering setting work preferences, viewing the schedule, trading
shifts, and requesting time off. Finally, the Human Resources script included discussion of Residential Life HR topics including but not limited to the Key Policy form, online training certifications, timesheets, hour limitations, and GPA requirements.

PowerPoint was used to create a background for each topic. Then the Camtasia Studio screen recording software was used to capture the vocalization of the approved scripts along with the accompanying PowerPoint slides. Each video was published to YouTube and viewing permission was limited to viewers with access to the appropriate links. The topics are listed in the order in which they were presented to the trainees in both the lecture and video groups. Table 3.3 contains the topics and links that were provided to the trainees in the video learning group.

Table 3.3
Training Video Topics and Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Topic</th>
<th>YouTube Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk Expectations</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/Fs2Ofq_SMv0">http://youtu.be/Fs2Ofq_SMv0</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/aPuiwUt8Bz0">http://youtu.be/aPuiwUt8Bz0</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/kqRhUEj7pX0">http://youtu.be/kqRhUEj7pX0</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/M8uij6gwFQg">http://youtu.be/M8uij6gwFQg</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/FhGtseuozvY">http://youtu.be/FhGtseuozvY</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk Forms</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/jbEE7IDW3XI">http://youtu.be/jbEE7IDW3XI</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERPA</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/_DtulOgLzo8">http://youtu.be/_DtulOgLzo8</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/ysyWc4KPqz4">http://youtu.be/ysyWc4KPqz4</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living on Campus Handbook</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/5qIPjRw-Q8A">http://youtu.be/5qIPjRw-Q8A</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card Swipe</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/8uM3Tu49Z0g">http://youtu.be/8uM3Tu49Z0g</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Policy</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/XR2ZWHeg6iY">http://youtu.be/XR2ZWHeg6iY</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/XkYQZpD4EXI">http://youtu.be/XkYQZpD4EXI</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSUPD</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/R9xRCGYIUR4">http://youtu.be/R9xRCGYIUR4</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximo</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/c4Djh8v8Z40">http://youtu.be/c4Djh8v8Z40</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When to Work</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/zaU4-yvQzyU">http://youtu.be/zaU4-yvQzyU</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td><a href="http://youtu.be/895MhIPl4wM">http://youtu.be/895MhIPl4wM</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the videos were completed they were sent to employees working the DA position over the summer for pilot testing. Employees were contacted via email and asked if they would be willing to watch the videos and provide feedback. The email explained that participation in viewing the videos would be completely voluntary. Additionally, potential volunteers were told
that the videos could be viewed during regular shifts, as opposed to on their personal time, and that the viewing the videos as part of the pilot phase would exempt them from attending the mandatory Fall training session on the same materials. They were told to expect 15 videos total and that each video would run an average of 2-4 minutes with a couple of videos running longer if the video was serving as a software program tutorial. Finally, volunteers were asked to refrain from sharing the contents of the videos with fellow employees as the videos would be utilized in the upcoming training to take place the following semester.

Four employees agreed to view the videos as part of the pilot testing phase. Each employee was working as a DA for the summer semester and all were planning to return as DAs for the Fall semester. Videos were sent via email, with no more than 5 videos attached at a time. The volunteers were asked to watch each of the videos in its entirety, specifically keeping the following questions in mind: 1) Is it thorough?, 2) Is it accurate?, 3) Is anything being left out?, 4) Is it too much? (If so, what should be cut?), and 5) Would a mid-semester hire be able to watch this and be mostly prepared to go into Day 1 of the job? Although the testing DAs had several suggestions, such as “maybe show what the save button looks like” (for the Maximo video) and “might want to show an example of what they should say when answering the phone” (for the Customer Service video), they overall found the videos to be thorough, helpful, and containing the appropriate amount of information. The complete list of comments can be found in Appendix D.

After incorporating additional edits requested by departmental entities and some suggestions from the pilot testing group, the videos were published in their final form and were viewable using the links provided in Table 3.3. Finally, as discussed in Section 3.4.2: Training Day, forms highlighted in the videos and screen captures of software program tools utilized in
the videos were used to create color handouts which served as visual aids within the lecture session (see Appendix K).

3.6 Unforeseen Circumstances

In a continuing effort to remain transparent in the description of the research conducted concerning the development, delivery, and evaluation of the LSU Residential Life desk training, this section addresses several unforeseen circumstances that impacted the study and altered the project as it was initially proposed.

3.6.1 Changes in Training Delivery

On the actual day of training, several complications arose, disrupting the training process. For example, the folders used to hold and distribute the training measures and handouts (see Section 3.4.2) were recycled office supplies, and as such had information that needed to be covered up. The lecture instructor was unaware of this situation until right as trainees arrived and was forced to try and balance checking attendance and directing employees with correcting folders. This event lead to initial disorganization and potentially impacted the amount of time the lecture learners were able to spend completing pre-training materials.

Another change to the initial plan for training day was that the researcher originally planned to observe both lecture and video groups. Unfortunately, staffing shortages instead required the presence of the researcher in a proctor position for the video group, so information regarding the impact of the early disruptions is limited to the recollections of the lecture instructor.

Due to a communication failure, the community leaders misunderstood the requirements for the in-hall portion of training. Although email and face-to-face correspondence was used to communicate the expectation that there would be 2 additional hours of training within each
community, this did not occur in the majority of the communities. Schedules were provided to all Residence Life Coordinators (RLCs) and Graduate Residence Directors (GRDs) that provided guidance in leading hands-on, role play, group discussion, and community specifics learning for the trainees. As can be seen in Sections 4.4.3: Focus Group and 4.4.4: Group Interview, this lack of training application was seen as a weakness for the training program as a whole.

Also, a handful of employees arrived to their appropriate training room, but at the incorrect time (see Section 4.2). For example, some new employees went to the returner time slot and some returning employees arrived at the classrooms first thing in the morning with the new employees. Although this would have been a concern in the case of the new employees arriving to training after in-hall time, because the in-hall training did not occur as planned, the data collected from these trainees was analyzed according to their official job designation as opposed to the group with which they received training.

Finally, a previously unknown hiring provision necessitated a second training day. Approximately 1 week before desk training, the human resources department informed the AD overseeing desk operations that any individual who had not attended LSU for at least one semester prior to employment could not officially begin working in any capacity before August 19, 2013. Because this included paid training, a second day was scheduled to training these employees. All trainees included in the second training day were DAs. Again, all trainees were randomly assigned to lecture or video so that data on training outcomes and effectiveness could be collected.

3.6.2 Changes in Training Evaluation

In addition to changes in training delivery, several logistical considerations prompted changes in the planned evaluation of the study. For the most part, evaluation changes were
brought on by lack of volunteers for qualitative data collection opportunities, missing data, and departmental changes.

Initially, 2 focus groups with newly hired DAs were planned. These focus groups instead evolved into an email survey and a group interview. For the first focus group attempt, 24 new DAs were contacted to see if they wanted to take part in a short focus group to ascertain their purpose for applying for the job and their expectations for training. Unfortunately, most recipients either did not respond or replied expressing their regret that they could not attend a focus group as they were not near campus until closer to the beginning of the semester. Given the lack of response and brief nature of the inquiry (see Appendix G), the questions were instead emailed to 23 new DAs as a survey in an attempt to gather information. One of the original emails was returned as non-deliverable, and therefore excluded from the second attempt to collect data.

Similarly, for the post-training focus group, all new DAs were invited to participate via the When2Work scheduling program that allows for mass email messages to be sent to users. When no DAs responded to the request, additional recruiting attempts were made. As performance observations were being conducted, DAs were asked by the researcher if they would be interested in joining a focus group. Although most indicated interest, they did not respond to the follow-up email providing them with the time and place for the event. Finally, 30 personalized emails were sent to qualifying DAs explaining that a focus group seeking their feedback on training would be taking place and requesting their attendance. Despite all efforts to obtain a large and diverse group of participants, only 2 DAs responded to requests to attend the focus group. Therefore, the format of the discussion was adapted to that of a group interview,
allowing for a breadth and depth and information to be collected despite the small group of participants.

An unexpected discovery resulting from examining completed data scales collected on the first training day was that, despite instructions, many trainees failed to turn over double-sided pages, often leaving the second half of the pre-motivation and post-motivation scales incomplete. Section 4.2: Data Considerations contains exact numbers on forms and scales left incomplete. Any participant who left out Motivation to Learn, Motivation to Continue, or Motivation to Transfer scales was automatically removed from all data analysis. For the second group of trainees, arrows with the phrase “see other side” were added to the bottom of any double-sided forms (see Appendices J and N) to minimize further occurrences of this nature.

Additionally, although the behavioral observations conducted on new employees were originally intended to contribute to the body of quantitative data, there were not enough observations conducted to justify generalization to the entire trainee population, especially as several observations could not be used due to participants leaving motivation scales incomplete, as discussed above. However, the information gathered was utilized qualitatively to contribute to the description of learning resulting from taking part in training. Additionally, the quantitative trends observed even with a small sample serve to highlight the potential for further research using behavior observation protocol scores as a training effectiveness outcome.

Desk Employee Evaluations (see Appendix S) are typically conducted annually, at the end of the Spring semester, by the RLC or GRD overseeing the desk. Although the department initially agreed to conduct an additional set of performance evaluations at the end of the Fall semester in order to aid the data collection process, the decision was later reversed. The evaluation form is currently undergoing an update process and was deemed misaligned with
training. Additionally, it was decided that the final weeks of the Fall semester were not favorable to conducting performance evaluations due to conflicts with academic, holiday, and community schedules.

However, not all unforeseen circumstances resulted in a loss of data. The Residential Life department conducts several focus groups with RAs each semester in order to assess employee perceptions of the position as well as gather suggestions for improvement. Although not initially part of the proposed research, the researcher was invited to utilize the focus group to explore training impressions and motivating factors related to training in the focus group sample. Because this information was not included in the original IRB approval, a modification was requested. After approval, new Consent Forms (see Appendix F) were developed, and all focus group participants signed, giving permission for their comments to be used for research purposes.

3.7 Data Analysis

Quantitative measures and qualitative measures contribute differently to the conclusions drawn from the results of this study. Again, data collected from quantitative measures will primarily address training effectiveness, but also be used to assess sample homogeneity and provide a view of varying levels of motivation. Similarly, qualitative data will be instrumental in discovering the extent to which motivation interacts with the training delivery to impact learning, while also acting as an additional measure of behavioral change. Study objectives were evaluated using the data analysis procedures outlined below.

3.7.1 Quantitative Data Analysis

1. The first objective of the study was to evaluate the role of learner characteristics in training effectiveness. In order to examine Objective 1, descriptive statistics were
collected about participant demographics (see Appendix H). The learner characteristics of gender, ethnicity, academic college, additional organization involvement, job type, and job tenure were entered into a regression model to provide an overview of any relationships with the learning outcomes. Additional analyses were also conducted to allow for examination of potential learner characteristics on the following outcome measures: motivation to learn, motivation to continue, motivation to transfer, satisfaction, and learning. Specifically, the relationships between categorical variables – ethnicity, year in school, academic school, and additional organization involvement – and training outcomes were explored using ANOVA. The relationships between dichotomous variables – gender, job type, and job tenure – were explored using independent samples t-tests.

2. The second objective of the study was to identify and describe the role of digital nativism in the effectiveness of online versus lecture training. Teo’s (2013) scales measuring Digital Native characteristics (see Appendix J) were distributed prior to training in order to create an overall mean digital native score for each participant, as well as scores for each subscale: multi-tasking, technology, immediate gratification, and graphics. Correlational analysis between digital native scores and motivation to continue was planned to determine the relationship between delivery type and motivation to continue as it might be mediated by digital learning preferences. Additionally, group differences were intended to be explored using independent samples t-tests.

3. The third objective of the study was to obtain and describe measures of learning and performance resulting from taking part in the DA training program. In order to quantitatively examine Objective 3, simple differences in learning were operationalized
as knowledge gains from the declarative knowledge test from the pre-test to post-test. Concerns about testing threat were minimal due to the same-day administration of measures. Outcome measures included the creation of a fill-in-the-blank knowledge test to be administered before and after training (see Appendix L). The test was developed using training scripts with input from the department regarding what they perceived to be critical information for effective DA job performance.

Descriptive statistics were produced to examine learning. Scoring categories included “correct”, “incorrect”, “omitted”, and “did not reach (DNR)”. These categories are based on work by Ludlow and O’Leary (1999), who described omitted and DNR responses as mutually exclusive categories. Omitted items can be thought of as being skipped. The participant leaves a response unanswered in error or decides not to answer it. In contrast, a DNR response is left unanswered due to insufficient time to complete the test (Ludlow & O’Leary, 1999). For the knowledge tests in this study, a response was considered omitted if it was followed by completed questions, whereas a response was considered DNR if no additional completed questions followed it. Examples of correct and incorrect responses are discussed in Section 4.3.2: Objective 3.

4. The fourth objective of the study was to evaluate the effectiveness of online training as compared to a lecture delivery of the same information. Motivation to continue was assessed using a 10-item Likert-type scale (see Appendix M) completed halfway through training which provided a mean score for each participant. In order to address Hypothesis 3, a hierarchical linear regression was used to establish the impact of delivery type on motivation to continue after controlling for learner characteristic covariates found with Objective 1. The regression was followed by an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to
determine the direction of delivery type advantage, again controlling for learner characteristic covariates.

Hypothesis 4 addressed the impact of delivery type on outcome variables that included motivation to transfer, satisfaction, and learning, each of which were also examined using independent samples t-tests. As discussed under Objective 2, knowledge tests were used to determine learning by calculating pre- to post-difference scores for each participant. Likert-type scales were completed by participants at the conclusion of training, each providing a mean motivation to transfer and satisfaction (see Appendix N) score for each participant. In order to address Hypothesis 4, a hierarchical linear regression was used to establish the impact of delivery type on motivation to transfer, satisfaction, and learning after controlling for learner characteristic covariates found with Objective 1. The regression was followed by an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to determine the direction of delivery type advantage for each outcome, again controlling for learner characteristic covariates.

5. The fifth objective of the study was to determine the degree to which motivation impacts the effectiveness of online versus lecture training, as expressed by participant learning. A set of self-report measures was distributed to trainees prior to learning in order to evaluate the role of learner characteristics and motivation. Individual motivation to learn from training was assessed using items from Noe & Schmitt’s (1986) 8-item scale (see Appendix J). As discussed previously, scales were distributed to assess motivation to continue and motivation to transfer. Correlational analysis between learning scores and each aspect of motivation used to determine the relationship between the variables. Motivation was also examined qualitatively using questionnaires discussed below.
Finally, in order to reconcile the somewhat inconsistent description of motivation as both an overarching construct and distinct constructs at varying intervals of training progression, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted including items from each of the motivation measurement scales: motivation to learn, motivation to continue, and motivation to transfer. The factor analysis was specifically intended to determine whether the underlying structure most closely resembled that of a single- or multi-factor construct.

3.7.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

The approach taken to analyze the qualitative data gathered can best be described as eclectic, incorporating elements of both grounded theory and phenomenology. Thematic coding was used to identify recurring themes within trainee reactions to motivation inquiries in survey responses and group discussions. Within each qualitative collection approach, categorical strategies was implemented, but across the whole of the qualitative dataset, a contextualizing strategy was implemented to understand the influence of motivation on learning across the employee groups as it spans the training process and aid in meta-inference (Teddle & Tashakkori, 2009).

3.7.2.1 Email Survey. Four open-ended questions were emailed to volunteers recruited from newly hired DAs. Qualitative document analysis was used to identify themes relevant to the significance of employee reactions to job perceptions and training expectations as it related to motivation. The mechanics discussed by Altheide, Coyle, DeVriese, and Scheider (2008) served as an outline for approaching the analysis.

3.7.2.2 Motivation Survey. A paper-based survey with four open-ended questions, preceded by one yes-no question, was distributed on the day of training, prior to beginning instruction. Respondents were instructed to complete the survey as part of their pre-training
materials. Respondents included both new and returning employees, and employees in both the RA and DA positions. Qualitative document analysis was used to identify themes relevant to the significance of employee reactions to value for training and training expectations as it related to motivation. Again, the mechanics discussed by Altheide et al. (2008) served as an outline for approaching the analysis.

3.7.2.3 Focus Group. Fifteen participants, each of which was an RA, some of whom were returning employees and some of whom were new employees, attended a department-sponsored focus group. Three discussion prompts with follow-up questions were introduced in order to identify themes relevant to the significance of employee reactions to elements of training and impressions of training as it related to motivation. The mechanics discussed by Saldaña (2012) served as an outline for approaching the analysis. An additional coder was recruited to ensure inter-rater reliability.

3.7.2.4 Group Interview. Two participants, each of which was a newly hired DA, attended a research-focused group interview. Ten questions were discussed in order to identify themes relevant to the significance of employee reactions to training, job perceptions and impressions of organizational culture as it related to motivation. The mechanics discussed by Saldaña (2012) served as an outline for approaching the analysis. An additional coder was recruited to ensure inter-rater reliability.

3.7.2.5 Behavior Observations. Thirteen new employees were approached by the researcher at their worksite during a regularly scheduled shift for a behavior observation that included elements examining both procedures and knowledge discussed in training. The employees included both RAs and Das, 8 of whom received video training and 5 of whom received lecture training. A scoring protocol was developed (see Appendix R), but narrative
descriptions of differing trends in the response patterns was the main source of data collected from the observations.
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

As discussed previously, the mixed method approach used in evaluating the DA program allows for greater understanding of the factors playing a role in the effectiveness of training. Specifically, the quantitative data provides insight into the impact of the training delivery methods – video and lecture – on various training outcomes such as learning, affective reactions, and job performance. Additionally, the quantitative approach allows for understanding of how learner characteristics play a role in the effectiveness of training. The qualitative data collection was primarily designed to capture themes of participant motivation, as well as extend descriptions of learning and address potential future research. Combining quantitative data and qualitative information was intended to complete the picture of participant motivation as it interacts with training delivery.

The objectives of the study were examined both quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitative data was collected to address each objective, whereas qualitative findings were gathered to explain and reinforce findings pertaining to Objectives 3, 5, and 6. The hypotheses of the study were tested using the quantitative data analyses discussed in the previous section, whereas the qualitative information gathered from the participants served to further explain the quantitative findings. Trainee characteristics included their demographic information, job status, motivation levels, and digital native scores. Trainees were randomly assigned to either video or lecture training. All returners trained together, whether they were RAs or DAs. The majority of the new employees trained together, with the exception of individuals who attended a second training day due to university hiring policies. Training outcomes included learning, motivation to transfer, satisfaction, and job performance. The relationships between trainee characteristics, delivery type, and resulting outcomes of learning and motivation are conceptually illustrated in
Figure 4.1. The hypotheses examining these relationships represented in this model are listed below. Additionally addressed in this chapter are the findings of the analysis procedures and results as they relate to the hypotheses. Finally, qualitative findings will be discussed.

**Figure 4.1. Conceptual framework representing hypothesized relationships between variables of interest**

H1: Pre-training motivation to learn will not be different between delivery type groups, regardless of assignment to lecture or online training delivery.

H2: To the extent that a participant identifies him or herself as a digital native, this attribute will play a role in the relationship between delivery method and motivation to continue.

H3: Delivery mode will impact participant motivation to continue, with participants taking part in lectures having lower motivation than those in the video group.

H4: Delivery mode will impact training outcomes -
H4a: Learning, such that participants taking part in lectures will have lower learning scores compared to those in the video group.

H4b: Motivation to transfer, such that participants taking part in lectures will have lower motivation to transfer compared to those in the video group.

H4c: Satisfaction, such that participants taking part in lectures will have lower satisfaction ratings compared to those in the video group.

H4d: Performance, such that participants taking part in lectures will have lower job performance scores compared to those in the video group.

H5: The effectiveness of training is associated with participant motivation, such that learning scores will be lower for participants with lower motivation.

H5a: Participants with lower Motivation to Learn will show smaller knowledge gains than participants with higher Motivation to Learn.

H5b: Participants with lower Motivation to Continue will show smaller knowledge gains than participants with higher Motivation to Continue.

H5c: Participants with lower Motivation to Transfer will show smaller knowledge gains than participants with higher Motivation to Transfer.

4.1 Trainee Description

Two hundred and sixty individuals took part in the desk training. All trainees are employed by the Residential Life department of Louisiana State University. Although efforts were made to assign equivalent numbers of trainees to each delivery type, the final usable data from each group was unequal, as will be discussed below. For the purposes of analyses, 69 participants received training material via lecture, while 95 participants received training material via videos. The distribution of participants and resulting percentages are displayed in
Table 4.1 Trainees included both new and returning employees, with new employees trained at 8am and returning employees trained at 10am on August 14, 2013. Employees included both DAs and RAs, as both groups are expected to understand and work the residential lobby desks as part of their employment. A second training day was created due to LSU human resource policies that state that individuals who have not attended LSU for at least one semester prior to employment could not work before August 19, 2013. All trainees attending the Day 2 training were DAs and were primarily new employees.

Table 4.1
Participant Distribution across Delivery Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Data Considerations

Ninety-six individuals were excluded from data analysis, for a final total of 164 usable data points. Table 4.2 includes information on the rationales for data removal, as well as the number of participants removed for each reason within each group. Participant data was removed for a number of reasons, including trainees who were minors and individuals who declined to give consent for their data to be used for evaluation purposes. One graduate student attended training, but his data was not analyzed as this training was intended for an undergraduate population. Additionally, some trainees were missing motivation scales, either because they were not present for the entire training session or because they failed to complete both sides of the scales. Finally, data from returners who came to the training session held on the second day was also not used, as it was designated a training for employees brand new to the university and their presence was anomalous.
A small percentage of trainees went to the correct training room, but arrived at the incorrect time. These individuals received their assigned delivery type, but sat in a room with new employees despite being returners, or attended the returner session even though they were new employees. Because the presented material was identical, their data has been analyzed with the group to which they were initially assigned. The number of trainees in this situation are designated as *Moved Time* in Table 4.2 below.

The *Modified Total* of participants listed in Table 4.2 is derived from the *Original Total*, or number of individuals actually in the room taking part in the training, after subtracting individuals falling within each of the categories for data dismissal as well as the trainees who attended the wrong time. The *Final Total* takes into account the *Modified Total* as well as the data from the individuals who attended the wrong time being subsumed into the appropriate group for analysis.

**Table 4.2**  
Participant Data Removed: Categories and Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRB Consent not signed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Pre-Test</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Pre-Mot</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Mid-Mot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Post-Mot</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day2 Returner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Moved Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cronbach’s Alpha was used to determine the statistical reliability of the data obtained using the 5-point Likert-type scale instruments with .7 as an acceptable cutoff. The analysis included the Motivation to Learn, Motivation to Continue, Motivation to Transfer, Satisfaction, and Digital Native scales. Each scale met the reliability cutoff, as can be seen in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3
Cronbach Alpha Scores for Likert-type Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach Score</th>
<th>&gt; 0.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Learn</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Continue</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Transfer</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Native</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Learner Characteristics

In order to address the first objective of the study as well as investigate the potential for demographic variable confounds, efforts were made to obtain participant demographic information and evaluate the role it plays in training effectiveness. The following participant characteristics were collected: a) gender, b) age range, c) ethnicity, d) year in school, e) college enrolled in, f) additional organization involvement, and g) RA or DA experience. Information was also gathered from department files regarding the h) current job status of the participants. Descriptive analyses were run on the demographic survey as well as trainee job status and are elaborated below. Additionally, participant characteristics such as their Motivation to Learn and Digital Native scores were collected via scales distributed prior to training, which allowed for Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 to be addressed, as discussed below.

4.3.1.1 Gender. All 164 participants responded to the demographic survey item identifying their gender. The largest group of participants (61.6%) identified as female (n=101). A minority of participants (38.4%) identified as male (n=63). No participants identified as transgender.
4.3.1.2 **Age Range.** All 164 participants responded to the demographic survey item identifying their age range. All participants (100%) whose data were analyzed selected the age category of \(18-23\) (n=164). The graduate student selected the age category of \(\text{over 23}\) and there were 2 trainees who selected the age category of \(\text{under 18}\). However, as stated previously, these participants were excluded from analyses although they were required to take part in the training program for employment purposes.

4.3.1.3 **Ethnicity.** All 164 participants responded to the demographic survey item identifying their ethnicity. The largest group of participants (64.6%) identified as **White** (n=106). The remaining participants identified as **Black** (n=40), **Latino/a** (n=4), **Asian** (n=5), and **more than one of the above** (n=9). No participants identified themselves as **American Indian** or **Other**.

The resulting percentages are displayed in Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one of the above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.4 **Year in School.** All 164 participants responded to the demographic survey item identifying their year in school. The largest group of participants (35.4%) selected **Junior** (n=58). The remaining participants selected **Freshman** (n=11), **Sophomore** (n=45), and **Senior** (n=50). The resulting percentages are displayed in Table 4.5.
Table 4.5
Distribution of Participants by Year in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year in School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.5 College Enrolled in. All 164 participants responded to the demographic survey item identifying the academic college in which they are enrolled. The largest group of participants (22%) selected Humanities & Social Sciences (n=36). The remaining participants selected Agriculture (n=3), Art & Design (n=7), Business (n=19), Coast & Environment (n=2), Engineering (n=26), Human Sciences & Education (n=21), Mass Communication (n=13), Music & Dramatic Arts (n=5), Science (n=28), I have not yet declared a major (n=2) and More than one of the above (n=2). No participants selected Veterinary Medicine. The resulting percentages are displayed in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6
Distribution of Participants by Academic College in which they are Enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Enrolled In</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast &amp; Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Sciences &amp; Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Communication</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music &amp; Dramatic Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not yet declared a major</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one of the above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1.6 Additional Organization Involvement. All 164 participants responded to the demographic survey item identifying the number of organizations outside their residential life position in which they are involved. Responses were counted to create a measure that might explain low job performance despite receiving training. As can be seen in Figure 4.2, although the greatest single number of additional organizations was 0 (n= 61, 37.2%), the majority of trainees indicated involvement with at least one organization (n= 104, 62.8%). Each response was counted towards an absolute score. Examples responses included religious or community organizations, clubs, athletics, Tiger Band, and Greek organizations.

![Figure 4.2. Participants involved in organizations and activities outside of their Residential Life position](image)

4.3.1.7 RA or DA Experience. All 164 participants responded to the demographic survey item identifying their RA or DA Experience. As can be seen in Table 4.7, although the greatest single number identifies new employees (n= 62, ≈38%), the majority of trainees were returners (n= 102, ≈62%). The returning participants selected DA (n=31), RA (n=60), and experience as Both an RA and DA (n=11). The resulting percentages are displayed in Table 4.7.
Table 4.7
RA or DA Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RA or DA Experience</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to indicating whether or not they had previous work experience, returning trainees were asked to indicate how long they had worked for the department. All 102 returning employees responded to the demographic survey item identifying their amount of experience. The largest group of participants (47.1%) indicated that they had been employed for 1 year (n=48). The remaining participants indicated their employment had been Less than 1 year (n=22), 2 years (n=22), or more than 2 years (n=10). The resulting percentages are displayed in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8
Amount of Previous Experience in an RA or DA position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RA or DA Experience</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.8 Current Job Status. Finally, department records were used to determine the current job status of the trainees participating in training. Specifically, the department scheduling program, When to Work, was accessed to provide information on whether each participant was new or returning, as well as whether each participant was classified as an RA or DA. The largest group of participants (62.2%) were identified as Returners (n=102). The remaining participants were identified as New (n=62). The resulting percentages are displayed in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9  
Experience as measured by number of new and returning employees  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New or Returner</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returner</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, the largest group of participants (61.6%) were identified as RAs (n=101). The remaining participants were identified as DAs (n=63). The resulting percentages are displayed in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10  
Current Residential Life job position  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RA or DA</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Quantitative Results

As stated previously, the purpose of the quantitative analyses was to establish the effectiveness of the newly centralized desk training program using the data analysis approach discussed in Section 3.7.1: Quantitative Data Analysis. Training effectiveness was conceptualized as each level of motivation, satisfaction with the training program, and knowledge gains from pre- to post-test. Therefore, motivation to learn, motivation to continue, motivation to transfer, satisfaction, and learning served as dependent variables in tests of examining the relationship of learner characteristics, learning, the impact of using a digital native population, the impact of delivery type, and the role of motivation. Again, Figure 4.1 illustrates the hypothesized relationships between the elements involved in training.
4.4.1 Objective 1

The first objective of the study was to evaluate the role of learner characteristics in training effectiveness. Using the information obtained and described in Section 4.3: Learner Characteristics, several analyses were utilized to determine both practical and statistical significance. Specifically, linear regression was used to provide an overview of variable covariance that was likely to be of interest to the Residential Life department in guiding training intervention efforts. Additionally, ANOVAs and t-tests were run to examine categorical and dichotomous variables, respectively, in order to investigate the potential for demographic variable confounds when examining the subsequent hypothesized relationships.

4.4.1.1 Regression: Learner Characteristics and Motivation to Learn. In order to address Objective 1 and determine whether the demographic information collected on the participants indicated a relationship with the effectiveness of training – beginning with motivation to learn – the following were analyzed using linear regression: gender, ethnicity, academic college, additional organization involvement, job tenure, and job type. Length of employment was excluded from the regression as trainees who were classified as new contained no data for that particular variable. Because Age Group was largely without variation (only 1 participant was outside of the 18-23 category), it was not entered into the analysis. Additionally, because returners are largely upper-classmen and new employees are typically sophomores or juniors, Returner or New status and Year in School were seen as redundant. As Returner or New status was more helpful to the department than Year in School, this item was not included in the analysis to provide a clearer picture of participant characteristics which might influence training effectiveness. The results of the analysis are included in Table 4.11. The relationships between
motivation to learn and the learner characteristics of job type and job tenure suggested by the regression analysis are explored further using independent samples t-tests, as discussed below.

Table 4.11
Regression results for learner characteristics on motivation to learn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.837</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>10.261 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-0.026 .980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-0.015 .988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic College</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.037 .540 .988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Org Involvement</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.130 -1.796 .074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA or DA</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.288 4.061 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returner or New</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.323 4.504 .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1.2 Regression: Learner Characteristics and Motivation to Continue. In order to address Objective 1 and determine whether the demographic information collected on the participants indicated a relationship with the effectiveness of training – continuing with motivation to learn – the following were analyzed using linear regression: gender, ethnicity, academic college, additional organization involvement, job tenure, and job type. Length of employment was excluded from the regression as trainees who were classified as new contained no data for that particular variable. Because Age Group was largely without variation (only 1 participant was outside of the 18-23 category), it was not entered into the analysis. Additionally, because returners are largely upper-classmen and new employees are typically sophomores or juniors, Returner or New status and Year in School were seen as redundant. As Returner or New status was more helpful to the department than Year in School, this item was not included in the analysis to provide a clearer picture of participant characteristics which might influence training effectiveness. The results of the analysis are included in Table 4.12. The relationships between motivation to continue and the learner characteristics of additional organization involvement, job
type, and job tenure suggested by the regression analysis are explored further using independent
samples t-tests, as discussed below.

Table 4.12
Regression results for learner characteristics on motivation to continue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.311</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>8.463 .000 1.771 2.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>9 -.102 .126 -.347 .043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>5 -.051 .446 -.092 .041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic College</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.048 -.727 .468 -.023 .050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Org Involvement</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>1 -.139 2.000 .047 -.141 -.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA or DA</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>4 .321 4.715 .000 .277 .678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returner or New</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>4 .342 4.972 .000 .307 .713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.4.1.3 Regression: Learner Characteristics and Motivation to Transfer.** In order to

address Objective 1 and determine whether the demographic information collected on the

participants indicated a relationship with the effectiveness of training – continuing with

motivation to transfer – the following were analyzed using linear regression: gender, ethnicity,

academic college, additional organization involvement, job tenure, and job type. Length of

employment was excluded from the regression as trainees who were classified as new contained

no data for that particular variable. Because Age Group was largely without variation (only 1

participant was outside of the 18-23 category), it was not entered into the analysis. Additionally,

because returners are largely upper-classmen and new employees are typically sophomores or

juniors, Returner or New status and Year in School were seen as redundant. As Returner or New

status was more helpful to the department than Year in School, this item was not included in the

analysis to provide a clearer picture of participant characteristics which might influence training
effectiveness. The results of the analysis are included in Table 4.13. The relationships between
motivation to transfer and the learner characteristics of job type and job tenure suggested by the regression analysis are explored further using independent samples t-tests, as discussed below.

Table 4.13
Regression results for learner characteristics on motivation to transfer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.166</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.130</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic College</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Org Involvement</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA or DA</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returner or New</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1.4 Regression: Learner Characteristics and Satisfaction. In order to address Objective 1 and determine whether the demographic information collected on the participants indicated a relationship with the effectiveness of training – continuing with satisfaction – the following were analyzed using linear regression: gender, ethnicity, academic college, additional organization involvement, job tenure, and job type. Length of employment was excluded from the regression as trainees who were classified as new contained no data for that particular variable. Because Age Group was largely without variation (only 1 participant was outside of the 18-23 category), it was not entered into the analysis. Additionally, because returners are largely upper-classmen and new employees are typically sophomores or juniors, Returner or New status and Year in School were seen as redundant. As Returner or New status was more helpful to the department than Year in School, this item was not included in the analysis to provide a clearer picture of participant characteristics which might influence training effectiveness. The results of the analysis are included in Table 4.14. The relationships between satisfaction and the learner
characteristics of job type and job tenure suggested by the regression analysis are explored further using independent samples t-tests, as discussed below.

Table 4.14
Regression results for learner characteristics on training satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.326</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>-.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic College</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Org Involvement</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA or DA</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returner or New</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1.5 Regression: Learner Characteristics and Learning. In order to address
Objective 1 and determine whether the demographic information collected on the participants indicated a relationship with the effectiveness of training – continuing with learning – the following were analyzed using linear regression: gender, ethnicity, academic college, additional organization involvement, job tenure, and job type. Length of employment was excluded from the regression as trainees who were classified as new contained no data for that particular variable. Because Age Group was largely without variation (only 1 participant was outside of the 18-23 category), it was not entered into the analysis. Additionally, because returners are largely upper-classmen and new employees are typically sophomores or juniors, Returner or New status and Year in School were seen as redundant. As Returner or New status was more helpful to the department than Year in School, this item was not included in the analysis to provide a clearer picture of participant characteristics which might influence training effectiveness. The results of the analysis are included in Table 4.15 below. The relationships between learning and the learner
characteristics of job type and job tenure suggested by the regression analysis are explored further using independent samples t-tests, as discussed below.

Table 4.15
Regression results for learner characteristics on learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic College</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Org Involvement</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA or DA</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returner or New</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1.6 ANOVA & T-Tests: Learner Characteristics and Motivation to Learn. The ANOVA procedure was used to examine categorical group differences on motivation to learn. Learner characteristics of interest were ethnicity, year in school, academic department, and additional organization involvement. Independent samples t-tests were run to examine dichotomous group differences on motivation to learn. Learner characteristics of interest included gender, job type, and job tenure. Data are mean ± standard deviation, unless otherwise stated.

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant’s selected ethnicity and his or her motivation before training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Motivation to learn scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p > .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .001$), necessitating the use of Welch’s $F$. Due to the violation...
of the assumption of normality, both Kruskal-Wallis H and ANOVA tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported retaining the null hypothesis that motivation prior to training was the same across all ethnic groups. Results from the ANOVA indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in motivation to learn scores between the different ethnic categories, Welch’s $F(4,11.553) = 1.940, p = .171$.

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant’s year in school and his or her motivation before training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Motivation to learn scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p < .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .001$), necessitating the use of Welch’s $F$. Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Kruskal-Wallis H and ANOVA tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that motivation prior to training was the same across categories of year in school. Participant motivation prior to training was statistically significantly different between groups representing various school year classifications, Welch’s $F(3,71.533) = 34.814, p < .001, \omega^2 = 0.13$. As can be seen in Figure 4.3, motivation to learn scores decreased from those who identified themselves as Freshmen (4.76 ± 0.2), to Sophomores (4.27 ± .4), to Seniors (3.91 ± .7), to Juniors (3.82 ± .8), in that order. Games-Howell post-hoc analysis revealed that the decrease in motivation to learn scores from Freshman to Sophomore (0.50, 95% CI (0.27 to 0.72)) was statistically significant ($p < .001$), as well as the decrease from Freshman to Junior (0.94, 95% CI (0.64 to 1.24), $p < .001$ ), and the decrease from Freshman to Senior (0.86, 95% CI (0.55 to 1.17), $p < .001$ ). Additionally, the decrease in motivation to learn
scores from Sophomore to Junior (0.44, 95% CI (0.13 to 0.76)) was statistically significant ($p = .002$), as well as the decrease from Sophomore to Senior (0.36, 95% CI (0.04 to 0.68), $p = .022$).

![Figure 4.3. Mean score of motivation to learn across various school year classifications](image)

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participants’ specific academic school enrollment and his or her motivation before training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme. One participant (370) was classified as an extreme outlier, being 3 box-lengths below the rest of the participants in terms of motivation to learn. This outlier was removed from the analysis, but all others were left in the analyses. Motivation to learn scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p < .05$). Homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .370$). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Kruskal-Wallis H and ANOVA tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported retaining the null hypothesis that motivation prior to training was the same across all groups of academic school enrollment. Results from the ANOVA indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in motivation to learn scores between the different academic school enrollment groups, $F(11, 151) = 1.347$, $p = .204$. 
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An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant being involved in organizations outside of Residential Life and his or her motivation before training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Motivation to learn scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p < .05$). There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance ($p = .063$). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Kruskal-Wallis H and ANOVA tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that motivation prior to training was the same between additional organization involvement groups. Participant motivation prior to training was statistically significantly different between groups representing varying degrees of additional organization involvement, $F(6,157) = 2.883$, $p = .011$. Because post-hoc tests were not possible with the inclusion of the one participant who claimed involvement with 7 additional organizations outside his or her residential life position, the ANOVA was run again excluding that participant. Participant motivation before training remained statistically significantly different between groups representing varying degrees of additional organization involvement, $F(5,158) = 3.436$, $p = .006$, $\omega^2 = 0.07$. As can be seen in Figure 4.4, motivation to learn scores decreased from those with no additional organization involvement ($4.26 \pm 0.6$), to 1 additional organization ($3.96 \pm .8$), continued to decrease for participants involved with 2 additional organizations ($3.92 \pm .6$), then increased for 3 additional organizations ($4.1 \pm .5$), decreased again for 4 additional organizations ($3.5 \pm .9$), to 5 additional organizations ($3.4 \pm .8$), in that order. Tukey post-hoc analysis revealed that the decrease in motivation to learn scores from no additional organizations to 4 ($0.71$, 95% CI (0.07 to 1.36) was statistically significant ($p = .020$), but no other group differences were statistically significant.
An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in motivation prior to training between male and female participants. There were 63 males and 101 females who took part in training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot. One participant (419) was classified as an extreme outlier, being 3 box-lengths below the rest of the participants in terms of motivation to learn within the RA group. This outlier was removed from the analysis, but all others were left in the analyses. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that motivation to learn scores were not normally distributed \((p < .05)\). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of \((p = .832)\). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Mann-Whitney U and independent samples t-tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported retaining the null hypothesis that motivation prior to training was the same across categories of gender. Results from the independent samples t-test indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in motivation to learn scores between males and females, \(t(161) = 0.789, p = .431\).
An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in motivation prior to training between RAs and DAs. There were 101 RAs and 63 DAs who took part in training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot. One participant (419) was classified as an extreme outlier, being 3 box-lengths below the rest of the participants in terms of motivation to learn within the RA group. This outlier was removed from the analysis, but all others were left in the analyses. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that motivation to transfer scores were not normally distributed \((p < .05)\). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of \((p = .004)\), necessitating the use of the unequal variance t-test. Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Mann-Whitney U and independent samples t-tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that motivation prior to training was the same for RAs and DAs. As can be seen in Figure 4.5, motivation to learn was higher for DAs \((4.42 \pm 0.45)\) than RAs \((3.82 \pm 0.69)\), a statistically significant difference of 0.59 \((95\% \text{ CI}, 0.40 \text{ to } 0.79)\), \(t(160.646) = 6.652, p < .001, d = .98\).

![Bar chart showing mean motivation score prior to training for RAs and DAs.](image-url)

Figure 4.5. Mean score of motivation to learn across job type groups
An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in motivation prior to training between returning and new trainees. There were 102 returning trainees and 62 new trainees who took part in training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that motivation to learn scores were not normally distributed ($p < .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .003$), necessitating the use of the unequal variance t-test. Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Mann-Whitney U and independent samples t-tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that motivation prior to training was the same across returner and new groups. As can be seen in Figure 4.6, motivation to learn was higher for new employees ($4.40 \pm 0.46$) than returning employees ($3.81 \pm 0.74$), a statistically significant difference of 0.59 (95% CI, 0.41 to 0.78), $t(161.929) = 6.362, p < .001, d = .91$.

![Motivation Score Prior to Training](image)

Figure 4.6. Mean score of motivation to learn across job tenure groups

**4.4.1.7 ANOVA & T-Tests: Learner Characteristics and Motivation to Continue.**

The ANOVA procedure was used to examine categorical group differences on motivation to
continue. Learner characteristics of interest were ethnicity, year in school, academic department, and additional organization involvement. Independent samples t-tests were run to examine dichotomous group differences on motivation to continue. Learner characteristics of interest included gender, job type, and job tenure.

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant’s selected ethnicity and his or her motivation during training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot. One participant (212) was classified as an extreme outlier, being 3 box-lengths above the rest of the participants in terms of motivation to continue. Two additional participants (372 and 476) were classified as extreme outliers, being 3 box-lengths below the rest of the participants in terms of motivation to continue. These outliers were removed from the analysis, but all others were left in the analyses. Motivation to continue scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p < .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p < .001$), necessitating the use of Welch’s $F$. Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Kruskal-Wallis H and ANOVA tests were run to increase sensitivity. Although the Welch’s $F$ indicated group differences, the Kruskal-Wallis analysis supported retaining the null hypothesis that motivation during training was the same across all ethnic categories. Because of the variability in sample size across groups, the Kruskal-Wallis results were utilized. Results from the Kruskal-Wallis indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in motivation to continue scores between the different ethnic categories, $\chi^2(4) = 8.261, p = .082$.

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant’s year in school and his or her motivation during training. There were no outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot. Motivation to continue scores were normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's
test of normality ($p > .05$). There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance ($p = .138$). Results from the ANOVA indicate that participant motivation during training was statistically significantly different between groups representing various school year classifications, $F(3,160) = 12.162, p < .001, \omega^2 = 0.18$. As can be seen in Figure 4.7, motivation to continue scores decreased from those who identified themselves as Freshmen (4.30 ± 0.5), to Sophomores (3.61 ± 0.6), to Juniors (3.25 ± 0.8), to Seniors (3.11 ± 0.6), in that order. Tukey post-hoc analysis revealed that the decrease in motivation to continue scores from Freshman to Sophomore (0.68, 95% CI (0.11 to 1.26)) was statistically significant ($p = .013$), as well as the decrease from Freshman to Junior (1.05, 95% CI (0.49 to 1.61), $p < .001$), and the decrease from Freshman to Senior (1.19, 95% CI (0.62 to 1.76), $p < .001$). Additionally, the decrease in motivation to continue scores from Sophomore to Junior (0.40, 95% CI (0.03 to 0.71)) was statistically significant ($p = .027$), as well as the decrease from Sophomore to Senior (0.50, 95% CI (0.15 to 0.86), $p = .002$).

![Figure 4.7. Mean score of motivation to continue across various school year classifications](image)

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participants’ specific academic school enrollment and his or her motivation during training. There were several
outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Motivation to continue scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p < .05$). Homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .22$). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Kruskal-Wallis H and ANOVA tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported retaining the null hypothesis that motivation during training was the same across all groups of academic school enrollment. Results from the ANOVA indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in motivation to continue scores between the different academic school enrollment groups, $F(11, 152) = 0.880, p = .562$.

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant being involved in organizations outside of Residential Life and his or her motivation during training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Motivation to continue scores were normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p > .05$). There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance ($p = .063$). A one-way analysis of variance test was run to determine if there were differences in motivation to transfer scores between additional organization involvement groups. Participant motivation halfway through training was statistically significantly different between groups representing varying degrees of additional organization involvement, $F(6,157) = 2.879, p = .011$. Because post-hoc tests were not possible with the inclusion of the one participant who claimed involvement with 7 additional organizations outside his or her residential life position, the ANOVA was run again excluding that participant. Participant motivation halfway through training remained statistically significantly different between groups representing varying degrees of additional organization involvement.
involvement, $F(5,157) = 3.424, p = .006, \omega^2 = 0.07$. As can be seen in Figure 4.8, motivation to continue scores decreased from those with no additional organization involvement ($3.61 \pm 0.7$), to 2 additional organizations ($3.4 \pm .6$), to 1 additional organization ($3.3 \pm .8$), to 3 additional organizations ($3.1 \pm .7$), to 4 additional organizations ($3.0 \pm .6$), to 5 additional organizations ($2.5 \pm .2$), in that order. Tukey post-hoc analysis revealed that the decrease in motivation to continue scores from no additional organizations to 5 (1.10, 95% CI (0.05 to 2.14)) was statistically significant ($p = .033$), but no other group differences were statistically significant.

![Figure 4.8](image)

Figure 4.8. Mean score of motivation to continue across varying numbers of involvement with additional organizations

An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in motivation halfway through training between male and female participants. There were 63 males and 101 females who took part in training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Motivation to continue scores were normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p > .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .828$). Results from the independent samples t-test indicate that there were no
statistically significant differences in motivation to continue scores between males and females, 
\[ t(162) = 0.734, \ p = .464. \]

An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in motivation halfway through training between RAs and DAs. There were 101 RAs and 63 DAs who took part in training. There were no outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that motivation to continue scores were not normally distributed \((p < .05)\). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of \((p = .114)\). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Mann-Whitney U and independent samples t-tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that motivation halfway through training was the same for RAs and DAs. As can be seen in Figure 4.9, motivation to continue was higher for DAs \((3.76 \pm 0.59)\) than RAs \((3.14 \pm 0.70)\), a statistically significant difference of 0.62 (95% CI, 0.41 to 0.83), \[ t(162) = 5.887, \ p < .001, \ d = .94. \]

![Figure 4.9. Mean score of motivation to continue across job type groups](image)

Figure 4.9. Mean score of motivation to continue across job type groups

An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in motivation halfway through training between returning and new trainees. There were 102
returning trainees and 62 new trainees who took part in training. There was one outlier, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because it was not extreme, it was left in the analyses. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that motivation to transfer scores were not normally distributed ($p < .05$). Homogeneity of variance was confirmed using Levene's test for equality of variances, ($p > .05$). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Mann-Whitney U and independent samples t-tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that motivation to continue was the same across returner and new groups. As can be seen in Figure 4.10, motivation to continue was higher for new employees (3.78 ± 0.68) than returning employees (3.14 ± 0.64), a statistically significant difference of 0.64 (95% CI, 0.43 to 0.85), $t(162) = 6.041, p < .001, d = .98$.

Figure 4.10. Mean score of motivation to continue across job tenure groups

4.4.1.8 ANOVA & T-Tests: Learner Characteristics and Motivation to Transfer.

The ANOVA procedure was used to examine categorical group differences on motivation to continue. Learner characteristics of interest were ethnicity, year in school, academic department, and additional organization involvement. Independent samples t-tests were run to examine dichotomous group differences on motivation to continue. Learner characteristics of interest
included gender, job type, and job tenure. Data are mean ± standard deviation, unless otherwise stated.

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant’s selected ethnicity and his or her motivation at the conclusion of training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Motivation to transfer scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality (p > .05). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of (p < .001), necessitating the use of Welch’s $F$. Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Kruskal-Wallis H and ANOVA tests were run to increase sensitivity. Although the Welch’s $F$ indicated group differences, the Kruskal-Wallis analysis supported retaining the null hypothesis that motivation after training was the same across all ethnic groups. Because of the variability in sample size across groups, the Kruskal-Wallis results were utilized. Results from the Kruskal-Wallis indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in motivation to transfer scores between the different ethnic groups, $\chi^2(4) = 5.173$, $p = .270$.

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant’s year in school and his or her motivation after training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot. One participant (605) was classified as an extreme outlier, being 3 box-lengths below the rest of the participants in terms of motivation to transfer. This outlier was removed from the analysis, but all others were left in the analyses. Motivation to transfer scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p < .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .008$), necessitating the use of Welch’s $F$. Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both
Kruskal-Wallis H and ANOVA tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that motivation after training was the same across categories of year in school. Results from the ANOVA indicate that participant motivation after training was statistically significantly different between groups representing various school year classifications, Welch’s $F(3,62.649) = 23.163$, $p < .001$, $\omega^2 = 0.13$. As can be seen in Figure 4.11, motivation to transfer scores decreased from those who identified themselves as Freshmen (4.87 ± 0.2), to Sophomores (4.46 ± .5), to Juniors (4.07 ± .8), to Seniors (3.96 ± .7), in that order. Games-Howell post-hoc analysis revealed that the decrease in motivation to transfer scores from Freshman to Sophomore (0.41, 95% CI (0.13 to 0.69)) was statistically significant ($p = .002$), as well as the decrease from Freshman to Junior (0.79, 95% CI (0.47 to 1.12), $p < .001$), and the decrease from Freshman to Senior (0.91, 95% CI (0.58 to 1.25), $p < .001$). Additionally, the decrease in motivation to transfer scores from Sophomore to Junior (0.39, 95% CI (0.06 to 0.71)) was statistically significant ($p = .012$), as well as the decrease from Sophomore to Senior (0.51, 95% CI (0.17 to 0.84), $p = .001$).

Figure 4.11. Mean score of motivation to transfer across various school year classifications
An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participants’ specific academic school enrollment and his or her motivation at the conclusion of training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Motivation to transfer scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p < .05$). Homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .38$). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Kruskal-Wallis H and ANOVA tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported retaining the null hypothesis that motivation after training was the same across all groups of academic school enrollment. Results from the ANOVA indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in motivation to transfer scores between the different academic school enrollment groups, $F(11, 152) = 1.224$, $p = .276$.

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant’s number of organizations involved with outside Residential Life and his or her motivation at the conclusion of training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Motivation to transfer scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p < .05$). Homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .06$). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Kruskal-Wallis H and ANOVA tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported retaining the null hypothesis that motivation after training was the same across all groups of additional organization involvement. Results from the ANOVA indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in motivation to transfer scores between the different numbers of additional organizations, $F(6,157) = 1.295$, $p = .263$. 
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An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in motivation at the end of training between male and female participants. There were 63 males and 101 females who took part in training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that motivation to transfer scores were not normally distributed ($p < .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene’s test for equality of ($p = .407$). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Mann-Whitney U and independent samples t-tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that motivation at the end of training was the same across categories of gender. Results from the independent samples t-test indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in motivation to transfer scores between males and females, $t(162) = 0.515$, $p = .607$.

An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in motivation at the end of training between RAs and DAs. There were 101 RAs and 63 DAs who took part in training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot. One participant (305) was classified as an extreme outlier, being 3 box-lengths below the rest of the participants in terms of motivation to transfer within the RA group. This outlier was removed from the analysis, but all others were left in the analyses. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that motivation to transfer scores were not normally distributed ($p < .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .251$). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Mann-Whitney U and independent samples t-tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that motivation at the end of training was the same across RAs and DAs. As
can be seen in Figure 4.12, motivation to transfer was higher for DAs (4.52 ± 0.55) than RAs (3.99 ± 0.73), a statistically significant difference of 0.53 (95% CI, 0.32 to 0.74), $t(162) = 4.958$, $p < .001$, $d = .79$.

![Figure 4.12. Mean score of motivation to transfer across job type groups](image)

An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in motivation at the end of training between returning and new trainees. There were 102 returning trainees and 62 new trainees who took part in training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that motivation to transfer scores were not normally distributed ($p < .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .030$), necessitating the use of the unequal variance t-test. Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Mann-Whitney U and independent samples t-tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that motivation to transfer was the same across returner and new groups. As can be seen in Figure 4.13, motivation to transfer was higher for new employees (4.55 ± 0.51) than returning
employees (3.98 ± 0.74), a statistically significant difference of 0.57 (95% CI, 0.37 to 0.76),
t(159.636) = 5.830, p < .001, d = .86.

4.4.1.9 ANOVA & T-Tests: Learner Characteristics and Satisfaction. The ANOVA
procedure was used to examine categorical group differences on satisfaction. Learner
characteristics of interest were ethnicity, year in school, academic department, and additional
organization involvement. Independent samples t-tests were run to examine dichotomous group
differences on satisfaction. Learner characteristics of interest included gender, job type, and job
tenure. Data are mean ± standard deviation, unless otherwise stated.

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant’s selected
ethnicity and his or her satisfaction with training. There were several outliers, as assessed by
inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses.
Satisfaction scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality
(p < .05). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test
for equality of (p = .015), necessitating the use of Welch’s F. Due to the violation of the
assumption of normality, both Kruskal-Wallis H and ANOVA tests were run to increase
sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that satisfaction with training was the same across ethnic groups. Results from the ANOVA indicate that participant satisfaction with training was statistically significantly different between groups representing various ethnic categories, Welch’s $F(4,7.812) = 4.147, p = .043, \omega^2 = 0.15$. As can be seen in Figure 4.14, satisfaction scores decreased from those who identified themselves as Black (4.37 ± 0.6), to Latino/a (3.90 ± 1.0), to White (3.70 ± .8), to More than one of the Above (3.30 ± 1.3), to Asian (2.51 ± 1.7), in that order. Games-Howell post-hoc analysis revealed that the decrease in satisfaction scores from Black participants to White participants (0.67, 95% CI (0.10 to 1.25)) was statistically significant ($p = .002$), but no other group differences were statistically significant.

![Mean Satisfaction Score across various ethnic categories](image)

**Figure 4.14. Mean satisfaction score across various ethnic categories**

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant’s year in school and his or her satisfaction with training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Satisfaction scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p < .05$). Homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .138$).
Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Kruskal-Wallis H and ANOVA tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that satisfaction with training was the same across categories of year in school. Results from the ANOVA indicate that participant satisfaction with training was statistically significantly different between groups representing various school year classifications, $F(3,101) = 5.608, p = .001, \omega^2 = 0.12$. As can be seen in Figure 4.15, satisfaction scores decreased from those who identified themselves as Freshmen (4.64 ± 0.4), to Sophomores (3.99 ± .8), to Juniors (3.67 ± .9), to Seniors (3.47 ± 1.0), in that order. Tukey post-hoc analysis revealed that the decrease in satisfaction scores from Freshman to Junior (0.97, 95% CI (0.19 to 1.76)) was statistically significant ($p = .009$), as well as the decrease from Freshman to Senior (1.17, 95% CI (0.38 to 1.97), $p = .001$).

![Figure 4.15](image)

Figure 4.15. Mean satisfaction score across various school year classifications

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participants’ specific academic school enrollment and his or her satisfaction with training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot. One participant (305) was classified as an extreme outlier, being 3 box-lengths below the rest of the participants in terms of satisfaction. This outlier was
removed from the analysis, but all others were left in the analyses. Satisfaction scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p < .05$). Homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .11$). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Kruskal-Wallis H and ANOVA tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported retaining the null hypothesis that satisfaction with training was the same across all groups of academic school enrollment. Results from the ANOVA indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in satisfaction scores between the different academic school enrollment groups, $F(11, 92) = 0.677, p = .757$.

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant’s number of organizations involved with outside Residential Life and his or her satisfaction with training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Satisfaction scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p < .05$). Homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .11$). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Kruskal-Wallis H and ANOVA tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported retaining the null hypothesis that satisfaction with training was the same across all groups of additional organization involvement. Results from the ANOVA indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in satisfaction scores between the different numbers of additional organizations, $F(6,98) = 1.463, p = .199$.

An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in satisfaction with training between male and female participants. There were 42 males and 63 females who completed the satisfaction scale. There were no outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that satisfaction scores were not normally
distributed \( (p < .05) \). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of \( (p = .505) \). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Mann-Whitney U and independent samples t-tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that satisfaction with training was the same across categories of gender. Results from the independent samples t-test indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in satisfaction scores between males and females, \( t(103) = 0.178, p = .859 \).

An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in satisfaction between RAs and DAs. There were 35 RAs and 70 DAs who completed the satisfaction scale. There were no outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that satisfaction scores were not normally distributed for either job type \( (p < .05) \). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of \( (p = .015) \), necessitating the use of the unequal variance t-test. Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Mann-Whitney U and independent samples t-tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that satisfaction was the same across RAs and DAs. As can be seen in Figure 4.16, satisfaction was higher for DAs (4.49 ± 0.54) than RAs (3.43 ± 0.89), a statistically significant difference of 1.06 (95% CI, 0.74 to 1.38), \( t(99.229) = 7.605, p < .001, d = 1.34 \).

An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in satisfaction between returning and new trainees. There were 64 returning trainees and 41 new trainees who completed the satisfaction scale. There were no outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that satisfaction scores were not normally distributed \( (p < .05) \). Homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for
equality of \( p = .08 \). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Mann-Whitney U and independent samples t-tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that satisfaction was the same across returner and new groups. As can be seen in Figure 4.17, satisfaction was higher for new employees \((4.32 \pm 0.64)\) than returning employees \((3.44 \pm 0.93)\), a statistically significant difference of \(0.88 \) \((95\% CI, 0.55 to 1.21)\), \( t(103) = 5.403, p < .001, d = 1.06 \).
4.4.1.10 ANOVA & T-Tests: Learner Characteristics and Learning. The ANOVA
procedure was used to examine categorical group differences on motivation to continue. Learner
characteristics of interest were ethnicity, year in school, academic department, and additional
organization involvement. Independent samples t-tests were run to examine dichotomous group
differences on motivation to continue. Learner characteristics of interest included gender, job
type, and job tenure. Data are mean ± standard deviation, unless otherwise stated.

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant’s selected
ethnicity and his or her learning. There was one outlier, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot.
One participant (243) was classified as an extreme outlier, being 3 box-lengths below the rest of
the participants in terms of satisfaction. This outlier was removed from the analysis, but all
others were left in the analyses. Learning scores were normally distributed, as assessed by
Shapiro-Wilk’s test of normality (p > .05). Homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed
by Levene’s test for equality of (p = .55). Results from the ANOVA indicate that there were no
statistically significant differences in learning scores between the different ethnic groups,
\[ F(4,158) = 1.441, \ p = .223. \]

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant’s year in school
and his or her learning. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but
because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Learning scores were normally
distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality (p > .05). There was homogeneity of
variances, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance (p = .889). Results from the
ANOVA indicate that participant learning was statistically significantly different between groups
representing various school year classifications, \[ F(3,160) = 6.376, \ p < .001, \ \omega^2 = 0.09. \] As can be
seen in Figure 4.18, learning scores decreased from those who identified themselves as Freshmen
(0.36 ± 0.1), to Sophomores (.029 ± .2), to Juniors (0.20 ± .2), to Seniors (0.19 ± .2), in that order. Tukey post-hoc analysis revealed that the decrease in learning scores from Freshman to Junior (0.16, 95% CI (0.02 to 0.30)) was statistically significant ($p = .015$), as well as the decrease from Freshman to Senior (0.17, 95% CI (0.03 to 0.31), $p = .009$ ). Additionally, the decrease in learning scores from Sophomore to Junior (0.09, 95% CI (0.01 to 0.17)) was statistically significant ($p = .024$), as well as the decrease from Sophomore to Senior (0.10, 95% CI (0.02 to 0.19), $p = .011$).

Figure 4.18. Mean learning score across various school year classifications

An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participants’ specific academic school enrollment and his or her learning. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Learning scores were normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p > .05$). Homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .98$). Results from the ANOVA indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in learning scores between the different academic school enrollment groups, $F(11, 152) = 1.018, p = .433$.  
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An ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between a participant’s number of organizations involved with outside Residential Life and his or her learning. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. The number of additional organizations was normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p > .05$). Homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .36$). Results from the ANOVA indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in learning scores between the different numbers of additional organizations, $F(6,157) = 1.663, p = .133$.

An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in learning between male and female participants. There were 63 males and 101 females who took part in training. There was one outlier, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because it was not extreme, it was left in the analyses. The knowledge gain scores were normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality ($p > .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .385$). Results from the independent samples t-test indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in learning scores between males and females, $t(162) = 0.529, p = .598$.

An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in learning between RAs and DAs. There were 101 RAs and 63 DAs who took part in training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that knowledge gain scores were not normally distributed for DAs ($p < .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .14$). Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Mann-Whitney U and independent samples t-tests were run to
increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that learning was the same across RAs and DAs. As can be seen in Figure 4.19, knowledge gained as measured by difference scores from pre- to post-test was greater for DAs (.30 ± 0.18) than RAs (.19 ± 0.15), a statistically significant difference of .11 (95% CI, 0.06 to 0.16), \( t(162) = 4.219, p < .001, d = .68. \)

![Figure 4.19. Difference score of learning across job type groups](image)

An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in learning between returning and new trainees. There were 102 returning trainees and 62 new trainees who took part in training. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that knowledge gain scores were not normally distributed \( (p > .05). \) The assumption of homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of \( (p = .401). \) Due to the violation of the assumption of normality, both Mann-Whitney U and independent samples t-tests were run to increase sensitivity and both analyses supported rejecting the null hypothesis that learning was the same across returner and new groups. As can be seen in Figure 4.20, knowledge gained as measured by difference scores from pre- to post-test was greater for
new employees (.29 ± 0.18) than returning employees (.20 ± 0.15), a statistically significant
difference of .08 (95% CI, 0.03 to 0.13), *t*(162) = 3.076, *p* = .002, *d* = .56.

![Figure 4.20. Difference score of learning across job tenure groups](image)

4.4.1.17 Hypothesis 1. Motivation prior to training should not be different between
lecture and video groups, as analyzed using a hierarchical linear regression. There were 69
participants in the lecture group and 95 participants in the video group. As seen in Figure 4.1,
there should be no relationship between delivery type and pre-motivation. However, because
learner characteristics also impact motivation to learn, these demographic variables were entered
into the first step of the regression to remove the variance. Specifically, year in school, additional
organization involvement, job type, and job tenure were all entered as covariates to create Model
1. A hierarchical linear regression was run to determine if the addition of delivery type improved
the prediction of motivation to learn over and above the variance explained by learner
characteristics. See Table 4.16 for full details on each regression model. Year in school,
additional organization involvement, job type, and job tenure statistically significantly predict
motivation to learn, *F*(4, 159) = 15.413, *p* < .001. Addition of delivery type led to no statistically
significant increase in the model’s ability to predict motivation to learn, supporting Hypothesis 1 that motivation prior to training was the same across lecture and video groups.

Table 4.16
Hierarchical linear regression predicting Motivation to Learn from Year in School, Additional Organization Involvement, Job Type, Job Tenure, and Delivery Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.09**</td>
<td>2.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Organization Involvement</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Type</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tenure</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Type</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R^2                                    | 0.279   | 0.287   |
| F                                      | 15.413**| 12.727**|
| ΔR^2                                   | 0.279   | 0.008   |
| ΔF                                     | 15.413**| 1.709   |

Note. N = 164. *p < .05, **p < .001.

4.4.2 Objective 2

In addition to the demographics and motivation information collected prior to training, a Digital Native scale was distributed in order to address Objective 2: To identify and describe the role of digital nativism in the effectiveness of online versus lecture training, specifically by differential influence on motivation to continue as a result of alignment or dissonance between digital preferences and delivery method.

4.4.2.1 Hypothesis 2. To the extent that a participant identifies as a digital native, this characteristic should influence the relationship between delivery type and motivation during training, as analyzed using correlations and independent samples t-tests. As seen in Figure 4.1, a mediating relationship is hypothesized to exist between delivery type, digital nativism, and mid-motivation.
Statistical analysis failed to support the hypothesis that digital native scores impact the relationship between delivery type and motivation to continue. There was no correlation between digital native and motivation to continue scores, \( r(163)=.006, p>.05 \), as assessed by a Pearson’s product-moment correlation. This is likely due to the fact that there were no differences between delivery type groups on digital native scores, as determined by an independent samples t-test, \( t(163)=.785, p>.05, d=.42 \). In an attempt to comprehensively explore potential relationships between digital native characteristics and motivation to continue, a quartile split of digital native means was produced. The highest (>4.14) and lowest scores (<3.62) on the digital native scale were categorized into “top quartile” and “bottom quartile”, then entered into an independent samples t-test to assess influence on motivation during training. No statistical differences between high and low scoring groups were found, \( t(76)=.532, p>.05, d=.63 \). Finally, because the digital native scale is comprised of 4 subscales – multi-tasking, technology, immediate gratification, and graphics – further correlations were conducted to assess the possibility that although the scale as a whole was not related to motivation to continue, perhaps one of more of the subscales was related to motivation during training. Motivation to continue was not related to any of the 4 digital native scales: multi-tasking, \( r(165)=.12, p>.05 \), technology, \( r(165)= -.01, p>.05 \), immediate gratification, \( r(165)= -.12, p>.05 \), or graphics, \( r(165)= -.02, p>.05 \), as assessed by a Pearson’s product-moment correlation.

4.4.3 Objective 3

The third objective of the study was to obtain and describe measures of learning and performance resulting from taking part in the DA training program. Learning was assessed as a difference score between pre- and post-knowledge tests. All participants received an identical test before training began and then the same test at the conclusion of training. As mentioned in
Section 3.4.4, there were 20 fill-in-the-blank questions, with several multi-part questions. Participants could receive a maximum score of 20 if he or she answered all parts of all questions correctly. Of the participants completing the pre- and post-tests, 69 took part in lecture training and 96 took part in video training. Table 4.17 provides descriptive information – mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum – for the lecture and training groups as they attempted both knowledge tests. Measures include correct responses, incorrect responses, omitted responses, and responses the participant did not reach (DNR).

Table 4.17
Distribution of response patterns for pre- and post-knowledge test for lecture and video groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th></th>
<th>Video</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>St Dev</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test Correct</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test Incorrect</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test Omit</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test DNR</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test Correct</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test Incorrect</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test Omit</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test DNR</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, question 12 on the knowledge test read List 3 examples of clothing considered unprofessional for DAs while working. To get full credit, a respondent would need to respond with 3 different examples provided during training, such as pajamas, clothing promoting off-campus housing, and revealing clothing. Responses considered incorrect included responses that indicated a lack of knowledge (“I don’t know”), incorrect information (“tuxedo”), or responses that were appropriate for an RA, but not for an employee working in the capacity of a
DA ("Community Moodle" as a resource). If a question called for more than one response, multiple points could be awarded for each correct response. However, variations of a correct response only resulted in one point. For example, "Woodlands Apartments" and "off-campus housing" would count as only one correct response. If a question did not call for more than one response, even if multiple correct responses were given, only one point would be awarded. As discussed in Section 3.7.1, omitted responses were skipped by the participant, identified as such by the presence of answered questions following that particular question. DNR responses were judged to be those questions that they participant did not have time to respond to, identified as such by the lack of responses following that particular question.

The knowledge score of each participant was calculated using a composite score of:

\[
\frac{\text{# correct responses}}{\text{(correct responses + incorrect responses + omitted responses)}}
\]

for both the pre- and post-test. This allowed for a calculation of difference scores indicating knowledge gain from pre- to post-test without penalizing participants for not answering questions they did not have time to complete, and provided the outcome variable of participant learning. Participant learning as an outcome variable is discussed as part of Objectives 1, 4, and 5.

4.4.4 Objective 4

The fourth objective of the study was to evaluate the effectiveness of video training as compared to a lecture delivery of the same information. Again, training effectiveness was assessed using motivation to learn, motivation to continue, motivation to transfer, satisfaction, and learning. Two hypotheses were developed to investigate the effectiveness of the delivery type treatment. Specifically, Hypothesis 3 addressed motivation during training as it may be
influenced by training delivery type. Also Hypothesis 4 addressed each of the other 4 outcome variables: motivation to transfer, satisfaction, and learning.

4.4.4.1 Hypothesis 3. It was hypothesized that delivery mode would impact participant motivation to continue, as analyzed using hierarchical linear regression. However, because learner characteristics also impact motivation to continue, these demographic variables were entered into the first step of the regression to remove the variance. Specifically, year in school, additional organization involvement, job type, and job tenure were all entered as covariates to create Model 1. A hierarchical linear regression was run to determine if the addition of delivery type improved the prediction of motivation to continue over and above the variance explained by learner characteristics. See Table 4.18 for full details on each regression model. The full model of year in school, additional organization involvement, job type, job tenure, and delivery type to predict motivation to continue (Model 2) was statistically significant, $R^2 = .399$, $F(5,158) = 20.956, p < .001$; adjusted $R^2 = .380$. Year in school, additional organization involvement, job type, and job tenure were all entered as covariates to create Model 1. A hierarchical linear regression was run to determine if the addition of delivery type improved the prediction of motivation to continue over and above the variance explained by learner characteristics. See Table 4.18 for full details on each regression model. The full model of year in school, additional organization involvement, job type, job tenure, and delivery type to predict motivation to continue (Model 2) was statistically significant, $R^2 = .399$, $F(5,158) = 20.956, p < .001$; adjusted $R^2 = .380$. Year in school, additional organization involvement, job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Motivation to Continue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Organization Involvement</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Type</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tenure</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $R^2$                                  | 0.343    | 0.399 |
| $F$                                    | 20.750** | 20.956** |
| $\Delta R^2$                           | 0.343    | 0.056 |
| $\Delta F$                             | 20.750** | 14.654** |

*Note. N = 164. *p < .05, **p < .001.*
type, and job tenure statistically significantly predict motivation to continue, $F(4, 159) = 20.750, p < .001$. The addition of delivery type to the prediction of motivation to continue (Model 2), led to a statistically significant increase in $R^2$ of .056, $F(1, 158) = 14.654, p < .001$, supporting Hypothesis 3 that motivation during training was impacted by delivery type.

Hypothesis 3 also indicated a predicted direction for relationship between delivery mode and participant motivation to continue, with participants taking part in lectures having lower motivation than those in the video group. Because the hierarchical linear regression indicated a significant amount of variance explained by delivery type, an ANCOVA was run to determine if there were differences in motivation halfway through training between lecture and video delivery formats after controlling for the learner characteristics of year in school, additional organization involvement, job type, and job tenure. There were no outliers in the data, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot. Motivation to continue scores were normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk’s test ($p > .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene’s test for equality of ($p = .809$). After adjustment for learner characteristics, there was a statistically significant difference in motivation to continue between delivery types, $F(1,158) = 105.512, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .085$. As can be seen in Figure 4.21, motivation to continue was higher for those receiving training via video (3.53) than those receiving training via lecture (3.18), thereby confirming the directional prediction of Hypothesis 3.

4.4.4.2 Hypothesis 4. It was hypothesized that delivery type would impact training outcome variables, as analyzed using hierarchical linear regression and ANCOVAs. The sub-hypotheses discussed below address the predicted relationship between delivery type and motivation to transfer, satisfaction, and learning, respectively.
H4a: Impact of Delivery Method on Motivation to Transfer. It was hypothesized that delivery mode would impact participant motivation to transfer, as analyzed using hierarchical linear regression. However, because learner characteristics also impact motivation to continue, these demographic variables were entered into the first step of the regression to remove the variance. Specifically, year in school, job type, and job tenure were all entered as covariates to create Model 1. After removal of one outlier (participant 605), a hierarchical linear regression was run to determine if the addition of delivery type improved the prediction of motivation to transfer over and above the variance explained by learner characteristics. See Table 4.19 for full details on each regression model. The full model of year in school, additional organization involvement, job type, job tenure, and delivery type to predict motivation to continue (Model 2) was statistically significant, $R^2 = .280$, $F(4,158) = 15.377$, $p < .001$; adjusted $R^2 = .262$. Year in school, job type, and job tenure statistically significantly predict motivation to continue, $F(3, 159) = 18.837$, $p < .001$. The addition of delivery type to the prediction of motivation to transfer (Model 2), led to a statistically significant increase in $R^2$ of .018, $F(1, 158) = 3.949$, $p = .049$, 

Figure 4.21. Mean score of motivation to continue across delivery type groups
supporting Hypothesis 4a that motivation at the conclusion of training was impacted by delivery type.

Table 4.19
Hierarchical linear regression predicting Motivation to Transfer from Year in School, Additional Organization Involvement, Job Type, Job Tenure, and Delivery Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.55**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Type</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tenure</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Type</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>18.837**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>18.837**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 163$. *$p < .05$, **$p < .001$.

Hypothesis 4a also indicated a predicted direction for relationship between delivery mode and participant motivation to transfer, with participants taking part in lectures will have lower motivation to transfer compared to those in the video group. Because the hierarchical linear regression indicated a significant amount of variance explained by delivery type, an ANCOVA was run to determine if there were differences in motivation after training between lecture and video delivery formats after controlling for the learner characteristics of year in school, job type, and job tenure. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that motivation to transfer scores were not normally distributed ($p < .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .587$). After adjustment for learner characteristics, the relationship between motivation to transfer between delivery types approached significance, $F(1,159) = 3.570$, $p = .061$, partial $\eta^2 = .022$. As
can be seen in Figure 4.22, motivation to transfer was higher for those receiving training via video (4.28) than those receiving training via lecture (4.09), suggesting that additional data would likely have confirmed the directional prediction of Hypothesis 4a.

![Figure 4.22. Mean score of motivation to continue across delivery type groups](image)

H4b: Impact of Delivery Method on Satisfaction. It was hypothesized that delivery mode would impact participant satisfaction, as analyzed using hierarchical linear regression. However, because learner characteristics also impact satisfaction, these demographic variables were entered into the first step of the regression to remove the variance. Specifically, ethnicity, year in school, job type, and job tenure were all entered as covariates to create Model 1. A hierarchical linear regression was run to determine if the addition of delivery type improved the prediction of satisfaction scores over and above the variance explained by learner characteristics. See Table 4.20 for full details on each regression model. The full model of ethnicity, year in school, job type, job tenure, and delivery type to predict motivation to continue (Model 2) was statistically significant, $R^2 = .418$, $F(5,99) = 14.226$, $p < .001$; adjusted $R^2 = .389$. Ethnicity, year in school, job type, and job tenure statistically significantly predict motivation to continue, $F(4, 100) = 15.815$, $p < .001$. The addition of delivery type to the prediction of satisfaction (Model 2), led to
a statistically significant increase in $R^2$ of .031, $F(1, 99) = 5.209, p = .025$, supporting Hypothesis 4b that satisfaction with training was impacted by delivery type.

Hypothesis 4b also indicated a predicted direction for relationship between delivery mode and participant satisfaction, with participants taking part in lectures will have lower satisfaction ratings compared to those in the video group. Because the hierarchical linear regression indicated a significant amount of variance explained by delivery type, an ANCOVA was run to determine if there were differences in satisfaction with training between lecture and video delivery formats after controlling for the learner characteristics of ethnicity, year in school, job type, and job tenure. There were no outliers in the data, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot. Shapiro-Wilk’s test for normality showed that satisfaction scores were not normally distributed ($p < .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .319$). After adjustment for learner characteristics, there was a statistically significant difference in satisfaction between delivery types, $F(1,99) = 5.209, p = .025$, partial $\eta^2 = .050$. As

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 B</th>
<th>Model 1 $\beta$</th>
<th>Model 2 B</th>
<th>Model 2 $\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.12**</td>
<td>1.63*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Type</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>0.88**</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tenure</td>
<td>0.55*</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 $R^2$</th>
<th>Model 2 $R^2$</th>
<th>Model 1 $F$</th>
<th>Model 2 $F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>15.815**</td>
<td>14.226**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>15.815**</td>
<td>5.209**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 105$. *$p < .05$, **$p < .001$. 

Table 4.20 Hierarchical linear regression predicting Satisfaction from Year in School, Additional Organization Involvement, Job Type, Job Tenure, and Delivery Type
can be seen in Figure 4.23, satisfaction scores were higher for those receiving training via video (3.93) than those receiving training via lecture (3.60), thereby confirming the directional prediction of Hypothesis 4b.

![Figure 4.23. Mean satisfaction scores across delivery type groups](image)

**H4c: Impact of Delivery Method on Learning.** It was hypothesized that delivery mode would impact participant learning, as analyzed using hierarchical linear regression. However, because learner characteristics also impact learning, these demographic variables were entered into the first step of the regression to remove the variance. Specifically, year in school, job type, and job tenure were all entered as covariates to create Model 1. A hierarchical linear regression was run to determine if the addition of delivery type improved the prediction of learning over and above the variance explained by learner characteristics. See Table 4.21 for full details on each regression model. The full model of year in school, job type, job tenure, and delivery type to predict motivation to continue (Model 2) was statistically significant, $R^2 = .222, F(4,159) = 11.327, p < .001$; adjusted $R^2 = .202$. Year in school, job type, and job tenure statistically significantly predict motivation to continue, $F(3,160) = 10.291, p < .001$. The addition of delivery type to the prediction of motivation to continue (Model 2), led to a statistically
significant increase in $R^2$ of .060, $F(1, 159) = 12.262, p = .001$, supporting Hypothesis 4c that knowledge gains were impacted by delivery type.

Table 4.21
Hierarchical linear regression predicting Learning from Year in School, Additional Organization Involvement, Job Type, Job Tenure, and Delivery Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>-0.04*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Type</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tenure</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>10.291**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>10.291**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 164$. *$p < .05$, **$p < .001$.

Hypothesis 4c also indicated a predicted direction for relationship between delivery mode and participant learning, such that participants taking part in lectures will have lower learning scores compared to those in the video group. Because the hierarchical linear regression indicated a significant amount of variance explained by delivery type, an ANCOVA was run to determine if there were differences in participant knowledge gains between lecture and video delivery formats after controlling for the learner characteristics of year in school, job type, and job tenure. There were several outliers, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot, but because they were not extreme, they were left in the analyses. Learning scores were normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p > .05$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was confirmed, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of ($p = .168$). After adjustment for learner characteristics, there was a statistically significant difference in participant learning between delivery types, $F(1,159) = 12.262, p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .072$. As can be seen in Figure 4.24, learning scores were
higher for those receiving training via video (0.27) than those receiving training via lecture (0.19), thereby confirming the directional prediction of Hypothesis 4c.

Figure 4.24. Difference score of learning across delivery type groups

Hypothesis 4d: Impact of Delivery Method on Performance. See Section 4.4.5.

4.4.5 Objective 5

The fifth objective of the study was to describe the relationship between motivation and the effectiveness of online versus lecture training, as expressed by participant learning. Hypothesis 5 was developed to investigate the relationship between motivation and learning quantitatively. Hypothesis 5 addresses learning as it is related to each aspect of motivation: motivation to learn, motivation to continue, and motivation to transfer.

4.4.5.1 Hypothesis 5. It was hypothesized that the effectiveness of training is moderated by motivation, such that learning scores will be lower for participants with lower motivation, as analyzed using Pearson’s Product-moment correlations. As can be seen in Table 4.22, learning, as measured by pre- to post-test difference scores, was significantly correlated with each aspect of motivation.
Table 4.22
Correlations between motivation and learning for both new and returning employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre to Post Score</th>
<th>Motivation to Learn</th>
<th>Motivation to Continue</th>
<th>Motivation to Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre to Post Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.335**</td>
<td>.305**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Learn</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.335**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.618**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Continue</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.618**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Transfer</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>.713**</td>
<td>.719**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

However, after further examination of data, a concern arose about learning confounds because returners should not theoretically be able to learn as much as new employees. The Pearson’s Product-moment correlational analysis was run again including only new employees. The results of the second correlation revealed no relationship between learning and motivation to learn (r=.09), learning and motivation to continue (r=.09), or learning and motivation to transfer (r=.10) for new employees (n=63).

After analyzing correlations between learning and motivation for new employees, a Pearson’s Product-moment correlation was run to determine the relationship between learning and motivation for returning employees. As can be seen in Table 4.23, learning, as measured by pre- to post-test difference scores, was significantly correlated with each aspect of motivation within the returning employees group.
Table 4.23
Correlations between motivation and learning for returning employees only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre to Post Learning Score</th>
<th>Motivation to Learn</th>
<th>Motivation to Continue</th>
<th>Motivation to Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre to Post Learning Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.359**</td>
<td>.329**</td>
<td>.373**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation to Learn</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.359**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.535**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation to Continue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.329**</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation to Transfer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.373**</td>
<td>.648**</td>
<td>.686**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

H5a: Motivation to Learn and Learning. A Pearson's product-moment correlation was run to assess the relationship between motivation to learn and learning as measured by knowledge gains from pre-test to post-test for returning employees. Preliminary analyses showed the relationship to be linear. Although a boxplot indicated the presence of several outliers, they were left in the analysis because they were not classified as extreme. Not all variables were normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test (p < .05). However, Pearson's correlation was still utilized as it is somewhat robust to deviations from normality. There was a moderate positive correlation between motivation to continue and learning, such that higher motivation scores prior to training were associated with higher learning scores, r(102) = .359, p < .001, with motivation prior to training explaining 13% of the variation in learning for returning employees.

H5b: Motivation to Continue and Learning. A Pearson's product-moment correlation was run to assess the relationship between motivation to continue and learning as measured by
knowledge gains from pre-test to post-test for returning employees. Preliminary analyses showed the relationship to be linear. Although a boxplot indicated the presence of two outliers, they were left in the analysis because they were not classified as extreme. There was a moderate positive correlation between motivation to continue and learning, such that higher motivation scores halfway through training were associated with higher learning scores, \( r(102) = .329, p = .001 \), with motivation to continue explaining 11% of the variation in learning for returning employees.

**H5c: Motivation to Transfer and Learning.** A Pearson's product-moment correlation was run to assess the relationship between motivation to transfer and learning as measured by knowledge gains from pre-test to post-test for returning employees. Preliminary analyses showed the relationship to be linear. Although a boxplot indicated the presence of two outliers, they were left in the analysis because they were not classified as extreme. Not all variables were normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test (\( p < .05 \)). However, Pearson's correlation was still utilized as it is somewhat robust to deviations from normality. There was a moderate positive correlation between motivation to transfer and learning, such that higher motivation scores after training were associated with higher learning scores, \( r(102) = .373, p < .001 \), with motivation after training explaining 14% of the variation in learning for returning employees.

### 4.4.5.2 Factor Analysis.

In order to investigate the underlying structure of motivation as a construct, an exploratory factor analysis of the motivation measures was conducted in order to determine whether motivation should be conceptualized as a single or multiple construct structure. All items from the Motivation to Learn, Motivation to Continue, and Motivation to Transfer scales were entered into a principle components analysis using varimax rotation. The extraction revealed 5 underlying constructs, implying that motivation, as it is conceptualized for
this project, most closely conforms to a theory of measurement that treats motivation as a distinct construct at 3 parts in time: before, during, and after training.

The 5 items from the Motivation to Learn scale loaded most strongly on Factor 3. Eight of the 10 items from the Motivation to Continue scale loaded most strongly on Factor 1. Items from the Motivation to Transfer scale loaded predominantly on Factor 2, although several items loaded on Factor 1 or were split between Factors 2 and 1. One item from the Motivation to Transfer scale—“successful application of the training content is an exciting challenge for me”—loaded on both Factors 2 and 3. The Motivation to Continue item “I am overwhelmed by the amount of information” was the only item to load on Factor 4. Similarly, the Motivation to Continue item “I was prepared for this training” was the only item to load on Factor 5. Overall, the resulting rotated component matrix supports the structure of motivation as it was theorized for measurement purposes. The anomalous items and loadings may represent a mismatch between the populations utilized in the development and validation processes and the population used in this study.

4.5 Qualitative Results

As stated previously, the primary purpose of collecting qualitative data was to address motivational concerns within the trainee population, especially as it relates to impacting the effectiveness of training. The quantitative data collected for this study are limited to the day of training. However, the qualitative information gathered from the training participants spans the time period beginning before trainees arrived on campus, the day of training, and several months after the conclusion of the training session. Although not all participants were included in each aspect of qualitative data collection, the samples included DAs, RAs, new employees, returning employees, trainees who took part in the video session, and trainees who took part in the lecture
delivery of training materials. The qualitative data collected here primarily addresses Objective 5: To determine the degree to which motivation impacts the effectiveness of online versus lecture training. The breadth of qualitative information speaks to job perception, training material, and organizational support, allowing for a greater understanding of elements impacting training above and beyond the training program itself. However, to a lesser degree, the qualitative data also informs Objectives 3 and 6, describing learning and providing direction for further research. A narrative approach was used to describe each data collection endeavor discussed below and adds explanation to participant motivation and learning, as well as allowing for departmental evaluation of the training and providing insight into improvements for future training.

4.5.1 Email Survey

Approximately 10 days before training, new DAs were contacted to see if they were to respond to a brief email survey to ascertain their purpose for applying for the job and their expectations for training (see Appendix G; see also Section 3.6.2). The email urged thorough, honest responses, but stressed that the information was not to evaluate the respondent and participation was voluntary. Five of those emailed replied with responses to the questions. One of the respondents had been a DA, taken off a year from LSU, and then returned to the DA position, but was still considered new by the department as his employment had been interrupted.

When asked Why did you apply to be a DA?, there were a variety of responses given, mostly focused on the convenience of on-campus jobs, the seemingly easy nature of the job, and camaraderie found in campus housing communities. Examples include “I don’t have to go to [sic] far after my classes for work”, “The work is not difficult at all so that really gives you a chance to get homework and other critical things done with the free time”, and “I think it is
important for everyone to have a positive on camous [sic] housing experience, and staff is an integral part of creating that environment.”

Responses to the question What do you think you will get out of your experience as a DA? indicated a recognition that the skills learned as part of the DA position could transfer to future employment opportunities. Statements such as “Out of this experience I will learn how to treat people in a DA position. Learning how to handle people in this positions can be very useful in other jobs in the future” and “I think I will learn how to communicate better and learn how to work in a college environment which is what I want to do after college/grad school” illustrated a perceived utility associated with the position. However, others saw more social engagement opportunities, stating “I think as a DA you really get to interact with the res hall community that that you are working with. You can meet really great friends” and “My DA experience will offer me many experiences, but in the end I hope to help create a safe, secure, and positive on campus environment.” At least one reiterated the convenience factors associated with the job, saying “Money. Also a part time job that I know will work around my class schedule so that I don't have to worry about clashes.”

There was little information available on training to incoming employees. One went so far as to say “I don't know anything, really” when asked What do you know about the training for LSU DAs? Others made assumptions on content or knew the timeframe, stating “I am not aware of how the truing [sic] goes but I would think it is for making sure that DAs know what to do at any given time on the job” and “That the date for training changed and didn't work with my schedule, and it should take about 4 hours. That is all!” However, other trainees had some idea of what training might entail. The one respondent with previous experience noted “When I was a DA as a freshman, training was not as complicated as it seems to be this time around. We went
over the basics of the job like key rentals, maintenance requests, checking guests in or out and scheduling” and one respondent knew another employee, so replied:

Just what my roommate told me. It's going to be half a day and we will learn about the things such as how to rent out keys, procedures for things such as calling an RA or RLC, and there might be some demonstrations. Basically we will have a crash course on everything we need to know to work the desks.

Finally, when asked How do you think the DA training will prepare you to do your job?, one respondent felt like training would be sufficient, stating “I would know exactly how to deal situations that I could have not be prepared for if it wasn't for training.” However, other respondents indicated concerns that a training class was not adequate preparation. One saw training as “necessary so that as a DA you can get an overview of the things that you will be in charge of doing” but also felt that “nothing beats the real-time experience of running the desk yourself.” Similarly, another respondent replied saying “DA training will familiarize me with LSU policies and procedures, but nothing prepares you more than actually practicing the things you learn.” One seemed especially concerned that the class would not be enough, writing

I'm hoping it will be thorough enough where I don't forget anything or have any trouble while working behind the desk. I'm a bit worried about the fact that we get a half a day of training and then we work the desks by ourselves. It seems to me that it might be better if we had a double shift with someone who was experienced for at least the first couple of shifts. But I might be over thinking how much there is to know or how difficult it will be.

Within these few brief responses, patterns emerge concerning job perceptions, motivating aspects of the job itself, and concerns about the necessity of implementing more experiential learning to supplement training. These ideas recur throughout the qualitative data and offer guidelines to the department for improving the learning and motivation of employees working the residential hall desks.
4.5.2 Pre-training Motivation Survey

Along with scales and a demographics survey used to gather information on learner characteristics, a short, open-answer survey (see Appendix I) was distributed to trainees prior to beginning training on the day of training. The survey was distributed to 6 different training groups: New employees receiving training via lecture (n=18), returning employees receiving training via lecture (n=39), new employees receiving training via lecture on the second training day (n=12), new employees receiving training via video (n=26), returning employees receiving training via video (n=63), and new employees receiving training via video on the second training day (n=7), for a total of 165 respondents. The purpose of the survey was to explain motivational differences that may exist between participants prior to beginning the desk training session. The survey was made up of 4 questions, with one follow-up question. The questions were designed to establish motivation levels and training expectations. All but one participant completed the survey. Responses often fell into positive, negative, and other categories. Response patterns and exemplifying quotes are organized by group and discussed below.

4.5.2.1 Question 1a. To get an initial sense of trainee motivation, the first question asked of the participants was Are you looking forward to training? Displayed in Table 4.24 are the distribution of results, separated by delivery type and the particular groups from which the survey was collected. Yes responses were typically expressed as “yes”, “yep!”, and “somewhat”, while No responses included “no”, “not really”, and “not particularly”. If a participant answered “yes & no” or “mixed”, it was determined to be Both, and responses such as “no opinion” or “indifferent” were counted as No Opinion. Answers that were deemed Unclear included responses such as “it has to be done”, “I haven't decided yet”, and “seems like it's a lot of work, but much needed information”. Again, 1 participant left the survey unanswered.
Table 4.24  
Distribution of responses to Question 1a on the Pre-Training Motivation Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1 New RAs and DAs</th>
<th>Lecture Group 3 Returning RAs and DAs</th>
<th>Group 5 New DAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanswered:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 2 New RAs and DAs</th>
<th>Video Group 4 Returning RAs and DAs</th>
<th>Group 6 New DAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanswered:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.2.2 Question 1b. The first question of the pre-training motivation survey was comprised of 2 parts – Are you looking forward to training? and Why or why not? – in order to have the participants elaborate on their initial response. As can be ascertained from Table 4.24, each group had positive, negative, and “other” responses, elaborated below. Although there was some overlap of responses across all groups, there were also distinct patterns of responses for new and returning trainees. Groups 1, 2, 5, and 6, each of which was comprised of new employees, tended to have similar themes which were positive for the most part. Conversely, Groups 3 and 4, which were made up of returners, while containing similar themes to each other, were different from the new employees and predominately negative.

Group 1 was made up of new employees trained using lecture delivery on the first day of training. Positive responses included enjoying peer interaction, excitement about the job, seeing training as relevant to job performance, wanting to feel competent, and an intrinsic enjoyment of
learning. Negative responses included concerns about training being boring. Other responses seemed to indicate a recognition of training as means to an end, but no excitement for the process itself.

Group 2 was made up of new employees trained using video delivery on the first day of training. Positive responses included enjoyment of learning, seeing training as relevant to job performance, excitement about the job, wanting to feel competent, seeing training as an opportunity to pick up skills, and curiosity about the training process. Negative responses included exhaustion, concerns about length of training, hunger, concerns about timeframe for training [early], and concerns about training being boring. Other responses seemed to indicate gratitude that training was basically over or no elaboration beyond “indifferent”.

Group 3 was made up of returning employees trained using lecture delivery on the first day of training. Positive responses included seeing training as relevant to job performance, enjoying training, enjoying peer interaction, wanting to feel competent, getting to move in early, desire to be kept updated on changes, excitement about the job, appreciation for training programs, and a desire for review. Negative responses included dissatisfaction with the delivery, concerns about length of training, concerns about training being boring, assertions that if he/she has attended previous trainings then that should be sufficient, concerns that he/she already knows everything relevant, concerns about training redundancy, concerns about timeframe for training, and exhaustion. Other responses seemed to indicate a hesitation to say one way or another.

Group 4 was made up of returning employees trained using video delivery on the first day of training. Positive responses included seeing training as relevant to job performance, enjoying peer interaction, wanting to feel competent, desire to be kept updated on changes, excitement about the job, appreciation for training programs, desire for review, enjoyment of
learning, appreciation for approach to training, appreciation for consistent guidelines, and curiosity about the training process. Negative responses included dissatisfaction with the delivery, concerns about length of training, concerns about training being boring, assertions that if he/she has attended previous trainings then that should be sufficient, concerns that he/she already knows everything relevant, concerns about training redundancy, exhaustion, and concerns about too much content. Other responses seemed to indicate a resignation to the necessity of training, and dissatisfaction with previous training but a willingness to give training a chance.

Group 5 was made up of new employees trained using lecture delivery on the second day of training. Positive responses included seeing training as relevant to job performance, peer interaction, wanting to feel competent, excitement about the job, and an intrinsic enjoyment of learning. This group had no negative or other responses.

Group 6 was made up of new employees trained using video delivery on the second day of training. Positive responses included seeing training as relevant to job performance, enjoying peer interaction, wanting to feel competent, and excitement about the job. Negative responses included concerns about timeframe for training [early], concerns that he/she already knows everything relevant, concerns about length of training, concerns about training being boring. This group had no other responses.

4.5.2.3 Question 2. The second question of the pre-training motivation survey – What do you think you will learn in training? – was designed to reveal whether the motivation levels of the trainees was contingent on their views of the usefulness of training. Groups 3 and 4, which were comprised of returning employees included both positive and negative responses in regards
to their thoughts on what they would learn in training. Groups 1, 2, 5, and 6, which were made up of new employees were limited to positive and “other” responses.

Groups 1 and 2 were made up of new employees trained on the first day of training. Trainees in Group 1 received information via lecture and responded to Question 2 saying they thought they would learn about tools, community information, responsibilities, other skills [communication], how to react in particular situations, procedures, and job expectations. Trainees in Group 2 received information via video and responded to Question 2 saying they thought they would learn about how to react in particular situations, who to contact for assistance, responsibilities, updates, procedures, tools, expectations, and other skills [student support].

Groups 3 and 4 were made up of returning employees trained on the first day of training. Trainees in Group 1 received information via lecture and responded to Question 2 saying they thought they would learn about tools, expectations, other skills [communication, time management, conflict management], procedures, updates, how to react in particular situations, who to contact for assistance, responsibilities, accountability, and be able to refresh current knowledge. However, they also provided negative responses that indicated a perception that the training was a waste of time. Quotes such as “nothing, already know all this stuff”, “everything I already know”, “not much”, and “nothing new” provide a sample of example responses. Trainees in Group 4 received information via video and responded to Question 2 saying they thought they would learn about job expectations, tools, procedures, updates, how to react in particular situations, refresh knowledge, regulations, tools, other skills [organizational, inter-personal, customer service], and responsibilities. Similarly to Group 3, they also provided negative
responses such as “nothing of real use”, “not much”, and “nothing new”, suggesting little value for the training session. Other responses included “not sure”.

Groups 5 and 6 were made up of new employees trained on the second day of training. Trainees in Group 5 received information via lecture and responded to Question 2 saying they thought they would learn about responsibilities, procedures, how to react in particular situations, organization structure, understanding LSU, job expectations, and tools. Other responses included “not quite sure”. Trainees in Group 6 received information via video and responded to Question 2 saying they thought they would learn about responsibilities, procedures, expectations, organization structure, who to contact for assistance, refresh knowledge, updates, and how to react in particular situations.

4.5.2.4 Question 3. The third question of the pre-training motivation survey – **What do you think the purpose of training is?** – was also designed to reveal whether the motivation levels of the trainees was contingent on whether they saw utility to training. Groups 3 and 4, which were comprised of returning employees included both positive and negative responses in regards to their thoughts on what they would learn in training. Groups 1, 2, 5, and 6, which were made up of new employees were limited to positive responses. Although there was overlap to the responses across groups, there were also themes unique to new employees that placed importance feeling comfortable and prepared and themes unique to returners that placed importance on refreshing knowledge and providing updates. Returners also provided a greater variety of responses within their groups.

Groups 1 and 2 were made up of new employees trained on the first day of training. Trainees in Group 1 received information via lecture and responded to Question 3 saying they thought the purpose of training was to provide understanding of position, explain how to do job
correctly, establish consistent guidelines, explain how to help residents, help employees feel comfortable, expose learners to the variety of tasks, expose learners to the variety of situations, and help prepare trainees to do the job. Trainees in Group 2 received information via video and responded to Question 3 saying they thought the purpose of training was to help employees feel comfortable, provide understanding of position, expose learners to the variety of situations, expose learners to the variety of tasks, help prepare trainees to do the job, establish consistent guidelines, explain how to do job properly, and minimize surprises.

Groups 3 and 4 were made up of returning employees trained on the first day of training. Trainees in Group 3 received information via lecture and responded to Question 3 saying they thought the purpose of training was to expose learners to the variety of situations, explain how to do job properly, provide understanding of position, explain updates, refresh knowledge, establish consistent guidelines, help employees avoid mistakes, establish who to contact for assistance, explain expectations, provide protocol, learn about the desks, learn responsibilities, prepare learners to do the job, and explain the use of desk software programs. However, they also provided negative responses such as “to repeat things over and over”, “dissertation research”, and “survey purposes”, indicating a view of training as something that was not designed to meet their needs. Trainees in Group 4 received information via video and responded to Question 3 saying they thought the purpose of training was to establish consistent guidelines, provide knowledge, provide protocols, allow for team building, explain how to do job correctly, prepare learners to do the job, expose learners to the variety of situations, explain how to help residents, provide an understanding of position, support community, and explain emergency response. However, they also provided negative responses that indicated a perception that the training was meant solely to provide liability protection for the department. Quotes such as “to make sure they
[LSU] don’t get sued”, “protect against liability”, “liability purposes” provide a sample of example responses.

Groups 5 and 6 were made up of new employees trained on the second day of training. Trainees in Group 5 received information via lecture and responded to Question 3 saying they thought the purpose of training was to explain how to do job correctly, prepare learners to do the job, explain responsibilities, explain expectations, help employees feel comfortable, establish consistent guidelines, provide knowledge, and provide protocols. Trainees in Group 6 received information via lecture and responded to Question 3 saying they thought the purpose of training was to explain how to provide understanding of position, explain how to do job correctly, establish consistent guidelines, help employees feel comfortable, explain responsibilities, and prepare learners to do the job.

4.5.2.5 Question 4. The fourth question of the pre-training motivation survey – When you imagine good training, how would you describe it? – was asked to provide guidelines for improving future training and potentially explain lack of motivation as discrepancies between expected and actual training. Groups 3 and 4, which were comprised of returning employees included both positive and negative responses in regards to their thoughts on what they would learn in training. Groups 1, 2, 5, and 6, which were made up of new employees were limited to positive responses. Although there was overlap to the responses across groups with responses such as informative and engaging, there were also themes unique to returners that introduced the ideas of an “opt-out” for employees who have demonstrated mastery and stressed the importance of role-play. Returners also provided a greater variety of responses within their groups.

Groups 1 and 2 were made up of new employees trained on the first day of training.
Trainees in Group 1 received information via lecture and responded to Question 4 saying they thought good training could be described as friendly, hands-on, engaging, not repetitive, to the point, something that instills confidence, interactive, fun, easy to learn, informative, visual, useful, unforgettable, easy to understand, enjoyable, interesting, open to questions, active, allowing the learner to leave prepared, and thorough. Trainees in Group 2 received information via video and responded to Question 4 saying they thought good training could be described as quick, to the point, detailed, efficient, organized, clear, using an experienced presenter, establishes understanding, simple, concise, in-hall, interactive, at the desk, questions answered, instills confidence, hands-on, informative, thorough, challenging, videos + take-home packets, fun, efficient, detailed, the learner understands what is taught, engaging, intentional, effective, easy to understand, and descriptive.

Groups 3 and 4 were made up of returning employees trained on the first day of training. Trainees in Group 3 received information via lecture and responded to Question 4 saying they thought good training could be described as interactive, utilizing an entertaining speaker, clear definition of job duties, great presentations, fun, new information, short but deep, not too early, organized, including an “opt out section” for people who can prove competence, quick review, creative, hands-on, concise, thorough, lots of examples, well-presented, relevant topics, detailed, powerpoints, interesting, short, not overexplained, not confusing, not repetitive, engaging, active, the learner feels comfortable at the end, self-paced, discussion, online course, roleplay to establish knowledge levels, small groups, NOT online training, straight to the point, efficient, food provided, and voluntary. However, they also provided negative responses such as “not this dry” and “no stupid games”, indicating a view of training as something that had already disappointed their expectations. Other responses included “not sure”. Trainees in Group 4
received information via video and responded to Question 4 saying they thought good training could be described as funny, honest, personal interaction, face-to-face, small setting, hands-on, interactive, efficient, clear, understandable, useful, the right amount of detail, concise, entertaining, fun, learning, straight to the point, engaging, meaningful, short, able to ask questions, increased complexity for advanced staff, returners get updates only, educational, active, small and large group activities, presentation + application, detail-oriented, worthwhile, not repetitive, staff bonding, delivered via GRD/RLC, organized, professional delivery, visual, practical, applicable, best practices, challenging, new information + short review, rewarding, detailed, absorbed by the trainee, personal, lively, easy to understand, preparing employee, instilling confidence, allowing for learning, and role-playing. However, they also provided negative responses such as “we are valuable resources and sitting through the same things over & over again is wasteful”, indicating a view of training as something that was not worth their time, as it was not something providing new or helpful information.

Groups 5 and 6 were made up of new employees trained on the second day of training. Trainees in Group 5 received information via lecture and responded to Question 4 saying they thought good training could be described as training after which you understand all responsibilities, where you are able to ask questions, informative, interactive, engaging, organized, professional, thorough, positive, insightful, supportive, interesting, hands-on, stimulating, descriptive, delivered by someone experienced, and step-by-step. Trainees in Group 6 received information via video and responded to Question 4 saying they thought good training could be described as something that prepares you for any situation, well-planned, informative, interaction, mix of learning and practice, makes you feel comfortable when you begin, concise, simple, hands-on, engaging, Q & A time, and friendly.
Within these responses, patterns emerge that help to explain the quantitative differences between new and returning employees in terms of training motivation. Although returning employees had more depth and breadth to their responses regarding their expectations for training, this same understanding of what training should entail appeared to be tied to a feeling of already knowing all that training would provide and thus seeing it as a waste of time. At the same time, new employees had positive expectations for both the content of training as well as the competence that would be achieved by attending training.

4.5.3 Focus Group

The Residential Life department regularly solicits focus group participation from RAs in order to collect opinions and insights regarding policies, initiatives, and programs, among other topics requested by staff and the RAs themselves. For the first focus group of the Fall semester, the department included questions regarding training reactions within the topics of discussion. After hearing the responses of the attendees, a request to include them in the research described here was made and granted. After the LSU IRB board approved a modification to the existing project (E#8366), consent was provided by the participants.

Thirteen RAs took part in the focus group. Participants included both 7 returning employees and 6 new employees. Within the group there were individuals who had taken part in both the video and the lecture desk training, although the focus group conversations went on to discuss departmental training in general and was not limited to just impressions of the desk training. However, the insights provided about training included concerns and suggestions that both further elucidated motivational concerns within the RA and returner populations, as well as providing guidelines for the department in terms of improving training.
The interview was conducted on September 24, 2013, in a conference room located in one of the Residential Life communities. The interview lasted approximately 2 hours and took place 6 weeks after training. There were 3 topics discussed following a brief introduction and ground rules. The recently introduced Faculty-in-Residence program was discussed for approximately 40 minutes, the RA selection process was discussed for approximately 14 minutes, and training was discussed for approximately 50 minutes. The training questions used during the interview can be found in Appendix O. The interview was transcribed, then the researcher and a second coder went through transcript and identified emergent themes and patterns of responses corresponding to these themes were coded accordingly, as summarized in Table 4.25. There were no disagreements between the raters during the coding process. However, one coder was focused on the idea of the training experience, while the other coder focused on motivational components of training, sometimes leading to themes being identified by one and not the other. However, each of these discrepancies were discussed and agreed upon by both coders to ensure consistency and completeness. The interview participants recorded in the transcript included two Interviewers (T and S), and 13 participants (P).

Table 4.25
Themes identified from transcript of focus group responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Aspects</td>
<td>Stress competence and tie training to competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stress relevance of session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New stuff is good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep things fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remind returners that they are role-models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shorter sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions – Sessions</td>
<td>Round-Table/ Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious topic interspersed with lighter topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-motivating Aspects</strong></td>
<td>Not enough interaction&lt;br&gt;Need to move around&lt;br&gt;Long days&lt;br&gt;Redundancy&lt;br&gt;Negativity from returners&lt;br&gt;Rumors about people “skipping”&lt;br&gt;Missing vacation/ family time&lt;br&gt;Feel like their time isn’t valued&lt;br&gt;Inconsistent messages&lt;br&gt;Sessions too long&lt;br&gt;Sessions lack relevance&lt;br&gt;No spirit&lt;br&gt;Challenges feel unfair&lt;br&gt;Challenges aren’t rewarded&lt;br&gt;Extra stuff feels forced&lt;br&gt;Extra stuff doesn’t seem to relate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspects of training that lessened motivation to learn</strong></td>
<td>Suggestions to improve effectiveness of training sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestions – General</strong></td>
<td>Stress accountability&lt;br&gt;Need hands-on (desk)&lt;br&gt;Need role-play (desk)&lt;br&gt;Need review sheet (desk)&lt;br&gt;Smaller groups are better&lt;br&gt;Balance information and application&lt;br&gt;Teamwork (not just team-building)&lt;br&gt;Shorter&lt;br&gt;Show how skills are useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestions – In-hall</strong></td>
<td>Community Specifics&lt;br&gt;Explore specifics of day’s training topics&lt;br&gt;More consistency&lt;br&gt;More structure&lt;br&gt;Hands-on opportunities&lt;br&gt;“Bring your laptop” night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestions – Returners</strong></td>
<td>Returners should show some hands-on&lt;br&gt;Returners should do some presentations&lt;br&gt;Different training [for returners]&lt;br&gt;Less redundancy&lt;br&gt;Shouldn’t have to train on something they’ve mastered&lt;br&gt;Mini-training: review &amp; updates&lt;br&gt;Have session choices&lt;br&gt;Talk about personal successes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This pattern of responses suggests there are many non-motivating aspects of the current department training programs, both for the RAs and the desk position. However, the RAs were willing to provide a number of statements and suggestions for potentially promoting the motivation of trainees, such as incorporating engaging elements into training, allowing for hands-on practice of skills, and stressing the relevance of sessions. Finally, returners suggested that training that covers material that they already know comes across as remedial and expressed confusion as to why they would have to relearn information and skills for which they have already demonstrated mastery.

**4.5.4 Group Interview**

In a continuing effort to address Objective 5: Understanding the role of motivation in training and Objective 2: Describing the learning which resulted from training, DAs were invited to participate in a group interview to provide feedback on training.

The DAs had to be new employees because the purpose of the group interview was to ascertain how well the recently developed training program prepared them for the job. Additionally, the DA had to still be employed with the department and an equal number of DAs from both the video and lecture training groups were invited. Finally, the group interview participants had to have signed a Consent Form at training for their information to be collected and used for academic purposes.

The interview was conducted on November 13, 2013, in the Residential Life administrative offices. The interview lasted approximately 47 minutes and took place 3 months after training. Two DAs took part in the group interview (see Section 3.6.2). Both work in the same community and both were part of the video training group, somewhat limiting the generalizability of their responses. However, the attendees were open about concerns, mentioned
various positives, provided suggestions, and asked questions, allowing for a breadth and depth and information to be collected despite the small group of participants.

The questions used during the interview can be found in Appendix P. The interview was transcribed, then the researcher and a second coder went through transcript and identified emergent themes and patterns of responses corresponding to these themes were coded accordingly, as summarized in Table 4.26. There were no disagreements between the raters during the coding process. The coders did use different vocabulary in describing themes. For example, in describing the phrase “I thought we were going to do role-playing,” one coder might note the “need for experiential learning” while the other coder mentioned “disappointment with lack of role-playing.” Also, one coder was focused on the idea of the learning experience, while the other coder focused on training improvement, sometimes leading to themes being identified by one and not the other. However, each of these discrepancies were discussed and agreed upon by both coders to ensure consistency and completeness. The interview participants recorded in the transcript included one Interviewer (I), one Female DA (F), and one Male DA (M).

Table 4.26
Themes identified from transcript of group interview responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Impact</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impression of job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes brought on by training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Suggestions</td>
<td>On-site Tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hands-on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role-play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced co-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Specifics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create “value for job”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stringent Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elements which should be added to training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of the Job</td>
<td>Not hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill development not appreciated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t do anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anyone can do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Realities</td>
<td>Learn on your own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilize resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nervous at first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t practice, then forget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need to be responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learn a lot of skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for Improvement</td>
<td>Supervisor feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarity of policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refresher courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of “team”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lead DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Action” interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positives</td>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When to Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desk grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learn a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensuring off-site learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feel bad about questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly to the pre-training email survey, the DAs taking part in the group interview focused on motivational aspects of job perception, training approaches, and department culture. Specifically, the general view of the job doesn’t attract highly motivated candidates for the position, an idea that could be addressed both by marketing strategies and hiring practices. The participants also claimed training itself included a sense of seriousness and accountability, while demonstrating the value of the job. Finally, the participants felt like the department does a good job of providing recognition and supportive staff after training, but that motivation could be
further improved by instilling greater confidence through practice, providing feedback, and working to build a desk “team”.

4.5.5 Behavior Observations

The final point of contact with employees in addressing Objective 2: to obtain and describe measures of learning and performance resulting from taking part in the DA training program, was a brief behavior observation of trainees. The observations were originally intended to be used to address Hypothesis 4d: Performance, such that participants taking part in lectures will have lower job performance scores compared to those in the video group. However, as discussed in Section 3.6, not enough observations were obtained. The information was not without merit, though, and while lacking the numbers for generalization purposes, the observations were used to further inform the descriptions of learning qualitatively. The observations took place from October 24 to November 14, 2013, approximately 3 months after training. The employees were observed in their communities while working regularly scheduled desk shifts. They were not anticipating an observation to be conducted.

There were originally 20 new employees observed. There were 2 per community, each had given consent for their information to be used, and there were equal numbers of employees chosen from the video and lecture groups. However, due to the fact that several of those observed later had their training information discarded due to incomplete forms, the total number of usable observations was limited to 13 employees. Of the 13 employees observed, 8 had taken part in the video training, whereas the remaining 5 had received training via lecture. Nine of the 10 residential communities were represented in the observations.

The Behavior Observation Protocol is replicated in Appendix Q. As stated in 3.4.6, the elements of the observation were developed in collaboration with the AD supervising Desk
Operations. Items including a set of 7 behavioral and knowledge objectives demonstrating efficient training in terms of employee performance were developed. The Behavior Observation Scoring Key can be found in Appendix R.

The first 2 items on the protocol were behavioral and were on the presence or absence of the behavior. For example, if the Daily Log was signed at the beginning of the shift, the employee received 1 out of 1 points for that item. He or she received 0 out of 1 points if the Daily Log had not been signed. The third item – Is laptop use appropriate? – could also have a not applicable score. In this case, no score was awarded for that particular item, as it was not possible to ascertain the participant’s knowledge, and the participant would receive 0 out of 0 points. The fourth item had both a behavioral component – Was the desk left unattended at any point during the shift? – and knowledge components – What does the employee do when he/she needs to leave the desk? The item was worth a total of 3 points, but because the knowledge component was added after the observations began, 1 employee was only scored on the behavioral component. The fifth, sixth, and seventh items were each based on the employee’s knowledge of proper procedures. For these items, the observer asked the employee to “walk through” the situation in question. When asked “If I were a resident that came to you and told you that I left my key in my room, what would you do to rent me a temporary key?”, the employee would discuss the key rental process from confirming the identity of the resident to replacing the rental materials upon return of the rental key, for a total of 9 possible points. In order to address the item – Does the employee know the proper procedure for addressing the presence of LSU PD? – the employee would be prompted with “If you saw the LSU PD enter the building, tell me what you would do”. Employees who replied with some variation indicating that they would offer assistance, try to get the officer to sign the Police Log, and notify a
supervisor that the police were in the community would be awarded the full 3 points possible. Finally, in order to address the item – *Does the employee know the proper procedure for entering a work order into Maximo?* – the observer would ask permission to come into the desk area and then request that the employee demonstrate the steps required to enter a facilities concern brought to the desk by a resident into the Maximo work order software program. The employee could be awarded a total of 11 points if he or she described the process in its entirety as it was introduced in training.

Although there were not enough observations to generalize to the desk assistant position in its entirety, again, the information gathered can still be utilized to describe learning and performance resulting from the desk training program. Scores on the observation protocol ranged from 9 out of 27 (33%) to 23 out of 29 (79%). Eight of the 13 employees smiled at and greeted anyone who came into the lobby. Ten out of 12 employees signed the Daily Log at the beginning of their shift. One desk binder was out of copies of the Daily Log, prohibiting the employee from completing the task. All employees understood the importance of never leaving the desk unattended, as exemplified by the fact that the desk was never without a staff member when approached by the observer. Employees even went so far as to create text groups in case of temporary coverage needs and create signs to indicate they would return shortly if no replacement could be found. No employees scored more than 7 out of 9 possible responses when answering about Key Rentals, with 4 providing only one-third of the response elements. Only 6 stated that they would ask for an ID as part of the key rental process. Additionally, only 1 employee scored 3 out of 3 points when asked about the proper response to the presence of LSU PD. Finally, answers provided as the employee walked through the procedure for entering a work
order ranged in scores from 2 out of 11 to 9 out of 11 possible points. Only one employee mentioned that an issue reported as an emergency required an immediate call to a supervisor.

Additionally, certain trends were suggested even within the small sample observed. Specifically, the behavior observations contribute evidence to Hypothesis 4c: Understanding the impact of delivery method on learning, by looking at the performance of employees who received information via lecture as compared with those who received information via video. Simple means suggest better performance by those who took part in video training (mean observation score = 63.75) compared with those who took part in training (mean observation score = 49.00), but again, further data should be collected before generalizing to the larger group of employees working the desk. For the most part the difference in scores appears to be determined by the greater depth of responses given to the procedural questions. For example, an employee from the lecture group responded to the key rental item saying:

While the resident fills out the Rental Agreement form, get their name/room so you can find the Key Card, and then issue them a rental key for 24 hours. When they return it, fill out the time information, see if they were called or require a lock change, and file everything back in its proper place.

earning a score of 3 out of 9 and contradicting training which explicitly stated that the desk employee is to fill out forms to ensure accuracy and legibility. Whereas an employee from the video group responded to the work order item saying:

Ask for their ID and where they live. Grab a Key Card and Rental form, fill out as much information as you have, then the resident will complete and sign the forms. Get the rental key, record the code on the Key Card. When they return the key, double-check the code. Date, initial, and fill out the bottom of the Rental form. Put the key back right away.

Similar patterns were evident in responses to the work order item. An employee from the lecture group responded saying:
Call the GRD if it’s an emergency. Be sure to record the RL# in the Maintenance Log. Resident may say “clogged toilet” but you need to get more info, like “is it leaking?” to know if it’s an emergency. Put in resident contact information and enter location.

earning a score of 4 out of 11. Whereas an employee from the video group responded to the work order item saying:

Click on New Work Order. Enter very specific details about issues. If it goes over 250 characters, use the Long Description (but that shouldn’t happen often). Use the drilldown to select location. Work Type is usually EM for emergency in the overnight shifts. Priority is 10 for emergency, 6 for non-emergency. Enter the contact information of the resident, and save. In the Maintenance Binder, write down the name, time, date, issue, contact info, emergency?, and Work Order #.

earning a score of 9 out of 11. Both the Key Rental and Work Order lectures were accompanied by handouts with visual depictions of the appropriate forms and software screen captures, respectively, suggesting something other than the video combination of visual and auditory information as an explanation for the differing levels of knowledge mastery.
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to understand the role of learner motivation in impacting the effectiveness of online versus lecture training in a digital native sample of trainees. In order to accomplish this understanding, a new training program for the desk assistant (DA) position in the department of Residential Life at Louisiana State University (LSU) was developed and evaluated. An explanatory parallel mixed methods design was used in an attempt to more fully understand motivation as it impacts training outcomes by providing qualitative rationale suggesting clarification for quantitative results.

The following chapter is divided into three sections. The first presents a summary of the findings and conclusions drawn using a meta-inference made possible by the mixed methods approach. Study limitations are also discussed. The chapter concludes with implications for future research as well as suggested application of findings.

5.1 Summary and Conclusions

As discussed previously, the research questions guiding this study of the newly created DA training program were as follows:

1. How do learner characteristics impact training outcomes?
2. What are the differences in training outcomes for traditional lecture teaching methods compared to online video learning?
3. What role does motivation play in the effectiveness of training?
4. How do learner characteristics, delivery method, and motivation interact to influence learning outcomes?

Research objectives were also created to address these questions. These objectives were designed to direct the data collection efforts in such a way as to gather information that could
provide suggested conclusions to the research questions, thereby allowing for training program evaluation and improvement. The findings, both quantitative and qualitative, will be summarized and their suggested conclusions discussed below.

5.1.1 Meta-Inference

The parallel design utilized in the mixed methods approach for this study allowed the quantitative and qualitative strands to provide complimentary information across the length of the training process. Specifically, motivation, as it impacted learning, was captured qualitatively before, during, and after training, while learning outcomes resulting from the training program itself were gathered to quantitatively assess the effectiveness of the training. As this data was gathered, ties between quantitative findings, qualitative themes, and current research became apparent as explanation for the phenomenon under study. According to Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009, p. 286) “the most important step in any MM study is when the results (i.e., findings, conclusions) from the study’s QUAL and QUAN strands are incorporated into a coherent conceptual framework that provides an effective answer to the research question.” For this process, as stated in Section 3.4.1: Key Decisions in Choosing a Mixed Methods Design, the data will be mixed at the level of interpretation. A mixed methods approach allows for the combination of methodological approaches to build off the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative strategies while minimizing the weaknesses of each. The meta-inference process integrates the two, creating an explanation beyond that which would have been feasible using a single methodological approach (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2008). Quantitative data gathered using scales and tests will be analyzed keeping in mind the themes and patterns identified using qualitative surveys, discussions, and observations to address the research questions.
5.1.2 Learner Characteristics

Objectives 1 and 2 were used to guide the efforts to address the first research question and develop an understanding of the role of learner characteristics. Learner characteristics gathered on the trainee population included demographic information, academic information, job information, digital native scores, and their initial motivation to learn. This information was initially assessed quantitatively, using descriptives to create a snapshot of the variety within the Residential Life student staff population. Quantitative assessment continued in order to reveal potential relationships between learner characteristics and training outcomes. Any relationships that emerged were then further analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

Analysis of demographic information showed that the trainees were fairly split along gender lines, with a slight majority identifying themselves as female. The trainees almost exclusively fell within the 18-23 range, with 1 person older than 23 and 2 individuals removed from the analysis due to being under 18. Although the majority of the participants identified their ethnicity as White, others identified themselves as Black, Latino/a, Asian, and more than one of the options provided.

Analysis of academic information showed that the participants were predominantly upperclassmen, with junior, senior, and sophomore status, respectively, selected most frequently. Only 11 of the 165 participants identified themselves as freshmen. With the exception of Veterinary Medicine, all academic colleges were represented within the trainee population. The greatest single number of trainees were enrolled in the college of Humanities & Social Sciences. When asked how many organizations outside Residential Life they were involved with, participants identified from 0 to 7 organizations, with the majority being involved with at least one, but the greatest single number being zero.
Analysis of job information showed that the participants were mostly returning employees, distributed across previous experience as an RA, DA, or both. However, the greatest single number of participants were new. Of the returning employees, the majority had been with the department for 1 year, but employees also identified with each of the other categories: less than 1 year, 2 years, and more than 2 years, representing a range of experience within the returner population. Two-thirds of the employees attending training were RAs, whereas only one-third of the employees were DAs.

After further analysis revealed relationships between learner characteristics and training outcomes, ethnicity, year in school, involvement with additional organizations job type, and job tenure were examined quantitatively to assess their impact on training outcomes. Because Hypotheses 1 and 2 also addressed the potential impact of participant motivation to learn and digital native scores on training outcomes, these variables were also analyzed further. In brief, satisfaction with training varied across ethnic categories, with participants who identified themselves as Black being most satisfied with the program. Underclassmen tended to be more motivated, more satisfied with training, and learn more than upperclassmen. Motivation levels during training showed a decrease across groups as their number of outside organizations increased. DAs were more motivated to learn than RAs, had higher motivation levels during training than RAs, had higher motivation levels at the end of training than RAs, were more satisfied with training than RAs, and learned more than RAs. New employees were more motivated to learn than were returning employees had higher motivation levels during training than returning employees, had higher motivation levels at the end of training than returning employees, were more satisfied with training than returning employees, and learned more than returning employees. Digital native scores showed no relationship with delivery method or
motivation levels during training, likely due to the consistently high scores of the training population.

Information gathered using qualitative methods offered additional explanation into the impact of learner characteristics on training outcomes. Specifically, the focus group conducted with the RAs and the group interview conducted with the DAs highlighted different perspectives on the value of training. Returning RAs described training as remedial and redundant, expressing patterns of responses that suggest training often seems like a waste of their time. Themes from the DA group interview included more positive takeaways, including a pattern of responses that suggests a predominately positive view of training and the department as a whole.

In conclusion, the trainees employed by the Residential Life department represent a spectrum of personal and academic identities. However, only the learner characteristics of year in school, job type, and job tenure predominately influenced the potential training gains. Not surprisingly, new employees learned more than returning employees. Also, DAs learned more than RAs, possibly due to content overlap between RA and desk training. These groups also differed in terms of motivation throughout training and satisfaction with training. As new employees and DAs are more likely to be in their first couple of years of school, and returners and RAs are more likely to be approaching the end of their academic tenure, the year in school variable follows similar patterns of motivation, satisfaction, and learning. The discussions with each after training suggest that this may be due to their general perspective of training. The population included in the training program all scored exceptionally high on the digital native scale, making it impossible to tease out potential impacts of this characteristic on training outcomes.
5.1.3 Impact of Training

Objectives 3 and 4 were used to guide the efforts to address the second research question and develop an understanding of the impact of training. Training impacts were operationalized as motivation to continue, motivation to transfer, satisfaction, and learning. Participant learning was of particular interest in evaluating the effectiveness of the training. Additionally, the differences between lecture and video groups as measured by the aforementioned outcomes were important for determining future training direction.

Learning was assessed quantitatively using knowledge gains. A fill-in-the-blank test was used to examine gains in declarative knowledge that resulted from training. Correct scores, incorrect scores, and omitted scores were used to create a pre- to post-test difference score. Learning difference scores indicated that the training program was an overall success. This difference score was utilized in analyses between groups when looking at learning as a training outcome.

However, learning was also assessed qualitatively using discussion and behavior observation, so as to understand knowledge and skills gained through training that were not assessed using a declarative knowledge test. Themes from the focus group included suggestions for improving the impact of training and reinforcing the learning that takes place in training. Specifically, more interactive components such as hands-on and role-playing elements should have been incorporated to ensure mastery, as well as a greater sense of accountability. The group interview participants suggested a number of less tangible gains that resulted from training, such as a greater understanding of the scope, responsibility, and value of the job. Unlike the focus group, the group interview participants felt that the training conveyed a sense of seriousness and accountability, although these impressions might be tied to the new-found understanding of the
job received in training. Behavioral observations also provide evidence of performance and knowledge conveyed by the training in use by employees.

Quantitative findings, as explored by Hypotheses 3 and 4, support the conclusion that employees who took part in video training scored higher on measures of motivation to continue, satisfaction with training, and learning than those who received job training via lecture. Also, the difference between delivery types on motivation to transfer scores approached significance, indicating a trend of higher motivation to transfer scores for participants in the video group. Additionally, as hypothesized, video and lecture groups did not vary in their initial motivation to learn.

In conclusion, both quantitative and qualitative evidence suggests that employees learned as a result of taking part in the training program. Again, as mentioned previously, returners did not gain as much information as new employees, but this is to be expected given their previous training and experience with the job. Also, DAs showed greater learning gains than RAs, possibly due to content overlap between RA and desk training. However, qualitative perceptions of the learning that took place as a result of training imply that some employees saw multiple areas in need of improvement within the training program. At the same time, other employees, while acknowledging that training was weak in a couple of areas such as knowledge application, saw the training program as providing both knowledge and perspective about the position. Again, these differences were especially apparent across RA and DA groups as well as new and returning employee groups. Finally, video training resulted in greater knowledge gains than lecture training. This suggests that the should the department decide to pursue video training in the future, concerns about learning should be minimal.
5.1.4 Influence of Motivation

Objective 5 was used to guide the efforts to address the third research question and develop an understanding of the influence of motivation. Measures of motivation gathered from the trainee population included instruments that assessed means for motivation to learn, motivation to continue, and motivation to transfer. These scales were distributed and completed before, during, and at the conclusion of training, respectively. This information was initially assessed quantitatively, using correlations to analyze the relationship of each with learning. Qualitative investigations into learner motivation included surveys and discussion in an effort to address the third research question and more fully understand the influence of motivation.

Correlations between measures of motivation to learn, motivation to continue, and motivation to transfer were all significant. However, when correlations between the three motivation scores and learning were analyzed, the correlations were significant for returning employees only.

Information gathered using qualitative methods offered additional explanation into the influence of motivation. Qualitative information, gathered using inquiry into trainee perceptions, expectations, and reactions, suggests that motivation influences training before, during, and after the training process. Themes within qualitative findings suggested different motivations going into training and upon completion of training for these groups as well.

New DAs polled via email survey were overall positive about the position and the training, but did not express clear ideas about expectations for the job, both in terms of their responsibilities or its value to them beyond just a paycheck. Motivational influences such as perceived value for the position and concerns about the comprehensiveness of training were evident even in the few responses received.
The pre-training motivation survey provided even more evidence of differences between new and returning employees in terms of their motivation. Even a cursory glance at the response patterns for the first question – Are you looking forward to training? – indicates further evidence of greater motivation on the part of new employees as compared with returning employees. Participant responses of No outnumbered responses of Yes in the returner group, whereas the opposite pattern was apparent with groups including new employees. Returning employees also provided more Both and Unclear responses, suggesting a hesitance to be overly excited about learning via training sessions. This pattern of greater positive responses from new employees was continued across questions of general training anticipation, perceived value of training, and descriptions of quality training. At the same time, returning employees provided more responses deemed negative, expressing skepticism about the worth of training and describing it as a waste of time.

The focus group responses also provide insight into the negative responses predominant in the pre-training motivation survey data for returning employees. Of particular value in explaining the lackluster motivation levels of the returning employees were recurring statements regarding the implication that training feels like a waste of time to returners, as they perceive a lot of redundancy and repetition in training. Returners also expressed concerns that feel as though their time is not valued when they sit through sessions that they believe are poorly planned and executed.

The pattern of responses provided by DAs who took part in the group interview suggests a predominately positive view of training and the department as a whole. At the same time, the participants echoed the sentiments of the RA focus group in expressing a desire to see training include more hands-on and role-play aspects to apply the knowledge gained and boost
confidence levels at the conclusion of training. Their suggestions for impacting motivation included approaches before, during, and after training.

In conclusion, motivation impacts employee attitudes before they even begin their job. The ideas of job perception, training quality, and department culture recur throughout the qualitative data. They suggest explanations for quantitative findings regarding the relationships between motivation and learning, as well as offering guidelines to the department for improving the learning and motivation of employees working the residential hall desks.

5.1.5 Process of Learning

Meta-inference was used to guide the efforts to address the final research question and develop an understanding of the learning process as it occurred for student staff taking part in the training program. Learner characteristics, training outcomes, and motivation were each assessed using quantitative and qualitative methodologies in order to explain their complex impact on the effectiveness of training approaches in the LSU Residential Life department.

Quantitative results revealed that although motivation was similar across delivery types, overall learning was better for video. However, motivation was influenced by both job type and job tenure, such that training outcomes differed for RAs as opposed to DAs, as well as new and returning employees. Motivation, in turn, was correlated to learning, but only for returning employees, such that returners who entered training motivated and open to learning, seeing value in the training process, did experience knowledge gains.

Information gathered using qualitative methods offered additional explanation into the process of learning. In addition to data provided by the quantitative strand of research, the impact of motivation of training effectiveness was further explained by the qualitative information gathered from participants. Motivation – before, during, and after training – seems to be tied to
experience status more than delivery. Motivation influences training effectiveness, but elements outside of training influence motivation, especially learner characteristics, with new employees having a more positive outlook towards the position and the training process.

These findings suggest that a variety of motivational interventions may be required to ensure optimal training effectiveness across all groups of trainees.

5.2 Limitations and Concerns

The primary concern for generalizing the results of this study is the artificiality of the training settings. The approach to training as described in this study will be different from future training, because of the focus on evaluating effectiveness which required as comparable of a manipulation as was feasible. However, in the future, as long as the department is satisfied that the online training is not significantly worse than the traditional approach, the videos will be distributed to employees prior to their official training to be watched on their own time.

Although the hands-on, role-playing, and group discussion elements that were meant to be introduced during the second half of the training day will be in place in the future, the online aspect will be different. There may be generalizability concerns moving online training from a more social, classroom-based setting to an individual environment. Also, the department may want to consider taking additional steps to ensure motivation and engagement in this alternate setting as well as collecting performance measures to ensure similar learning outcomes. Finally, as stated by both the focus group and group interview participants, accountability could be a greater concern when the responsibility for viewing the videos lies solely on the employee.

The training setting itself had a number of additional concerns, although these are likely to be mitigated in the future with training videos being used exclusively. First of all, although visuals were included with lecture, it was still primarily an auditory presentation whereas video
utilized both visual and auditory delivery. Additionally, the lecture component of training utilized a male voice whereas all of the videos were recorded using a female voice, creating a possibly threat to internal validity. However, due to the fact that both presenters were practiced speakers, familiar with the material, and made efforts to keep delivery tone, cadence, and timing similar, differences due to speakers should have been minimal. Also, as mentioned previously in section 3.4.2: Training Day, the training schedule presented a concern for internal validity in that knowledge gains may have been attributable to training received as part of preparation for employment in the RA position for approximately half of the trainees. Communication with the RA training team was used in an attempt to minimize content overlap. In combination with the steps mentioned in Section 2.5.3, validity threats were addressed to the extent possible in this setting.

Another limitation of the study is a result of the nature of the participants who volunteered to take part in the focus group and group interview sessions. The employees who took part in the discussions used to provide qualitative data regarding motivation may have exclusively represented the most motivated trainees. It would have been preferable to include individuals who were not particularly motivated to attend training, learn from training, or apply training in addition to those who had a positive outlook and experience with training. However, it is hoped that the rapport developed between the interviewer and participants, as well as the depth and honesty of responses provided by the participants allowed for insights into non-motivating aspects of the training experience, as well as areas in need of improvement, even given the sample used.

Finally, a scale that measured motivation longitudinally and could be implemented to allow for repeated measures analysis would have been ideal for this study. Unfortunately such a
scale was not available, requiring instead the use of 3 different scales, inspired by research in the areas of psychology, education, and training, as discussed in Chapter 2. Figure 5.1 illustrates

Figure 5.1. Theoretical relationships between learning and motivation as discussed in the fields of psychology, education and training
these differing conceptualizations of the relationship between motivation and learning. Although information gathered from the focus group and group interview provided more insight into reasons for motivation differences, conclusions drawn about motivational trends across training are limited due to the fact that the differences observed could be attributable to the use of scales assessing aspects of motivation unique to their temporal relationship with training. It could be argued that this approach has some face validity and was not inappropriate given that motivation itself can be described as being impacted by different elements depending on the stage of the training or learning process. However, this conceptualization of motivation is not unique to this project. Beier and Kanfer (2010) also propose a metamodel of training motivation, separated into elements of motivation impacting training effectiveness before, during, and after the learning experience. Additionally, the factor analysis results (see Section 4.4.5) indicate that motivation, as measured here, is a distinct construct at 3 points in time. Future researchers may want to consider constructing a valid instrument that is designed to track motivation or an instrument with subscales particular to motivation as it changes across a learning experience. Or, given that motivation appears to be different as suggested by the findings of this study, future researchers may take a similar approach but are cautioned to examine the scale items to ensure compatibility with the population of interest.

5.3 Implications

The research and findings discussed here have potential implications within and beyond the department. Potential future research directions suggested below could lead to improved training, greater understanding of the variables of interest in this study, or both. Additionally, a number of applications inspired by the psychological, educational, and training theories
discussed in Chapter 2, as well as the contributions of LSU student staff participants are suggested for future use in this and other residential life departments.

5.3.1 Future Research

The sixth and final objective of this study was to identify opportunities for future research. Several of the limitations and unforeseen circumstances lend themselves to opportunities to explore the results of this study, either by extending the current evaluation tools, improving the rigor, or manipulating variables of interest.

In terms of extending the current evaluation tools, future research should incorporate more behavior observations, with the protocol scores used as measurable outcomes. The researcher would likely need to control for opportunity to practice implementing training, keeping in mind that some employees work night shifts that may not allow for regular performance of some trained skills or application of knowledge. In theory, the employees should still possess and be able to articulate said skills and knowledge, but the researcher may still need to consider day and night shifts as different groups.

Also, the performance evaluation that was originally intended as a quantitative measure should be incorporated regularly as a tool for assessing training effectiveness in the future. Not only do performance evaluations provide information to the employee regarding strengths and weaknesses of his or her job abilities, but performance evaluations guide improvements to the training program by highlighting trends in employee strengths and weaknesses. The performance evaluations could also provide valuable information to the department about patterns of behavior resulting from different training approaches, different supervisory styles, and different community needs.
Another level of assessing training effectiveness suggested by Kirkpatrick (1959, 1996) is that of the organization level. Although not utilized in this particular study, several organization-level outcomes might be of interest in future studies of training for the department of Residential Life. Specifically, turnover trends, elements of the progressive discipline process, and employee satisfaction could all be tracked to provide additional information regarding the effectiveness of the training program.

Considerations that might improve the rigor of the study might include better design of instruments, better communication between stakeholders regarding the training logistics, and heavier recruiting strategies for DA focus groups. If these steps are taken in future research endeavors, more data should be retained for analysis purposes, elements of training that were intended to be reinforced within the communities should take place appropriately, and the motivation of DAs can be understood as it represents a greater degree of the population.

Finally, manipulating variables of interest might provide insights into creating an optimal training program given what was learned in this study regarding the impact of learner characteristics on training effectiveness. Specifically, research conducted on motivation interventions as their introduction impacts motivation to learn might reveal strategies for increasing learning by increasing initial motivation levels. Additionally, because the population of interest in this study scored so high on the digital native scale, the training team might consider conducting research on whether implementing more elements favorable to a digital native population increases training learning and satisfaction.

5.3.2 Applications

Finally, this study, coupled with previous research and findings regarding motivation, allow for a rich set of suggestions that would allow the department of Residential Life to enact a
variety of motivation interventions that would allow for improvements to training in the future. Table 5.1 was created to guide the efforts of Residential Life in introducing motivational elements to their training programs. Although much of this list may be easier to introduce to their face-to-face training initially, there is no reason why these elements cannot also be incorporated into a training program that relies heavily on video training.

Within Table 5.1, motivational concepts that were discussed in Chapters 1 and 2 as guiding the theoretical framework of this study are split into 3 sections: psychology, education, and training. Each section is divided into 4 subsections, representing research findings that have established ties between particular concepts and motivation. Under each subsection, in addition to a research-supported motivational concept, there is a suggested tactic or tip to be used for motivation intervention, a quote from student staff gathered during the qualitative data collection phases of this study showing the relevance of the concept to Residential Life training, and a list of previous research findings that provide support for the intervention. For example, under the section comprised of motivational elements discussed in education literature, the subsections are tied to Keller’s (1984) ARCS model of instructional design. The ARCS model as it relates to learner motivation was discussed in Chapter 2 and utilized in the development of the scale measuring motivation to continue administered during training. The components of the ARCS model – attention-grabbing, relevant, confidence-boosting, and satisfying (Keller, 1984) – were each used to create a suggested change to or reinforce the importance of an element of training. Quotes from the focus group and group interview that highlighted the need as seen by the student staff were provided. For example, to support the education concept of relevance, a quote taken from the RA focus group states “Felt some lectures went over things dealing with things that did not have anything to do with being an RA”, reinforcing the provided suggestion of Speakers.
Table 5.1
Relevant concepts of motivation and suggested interventions as supported by qualitative findings and existing research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational Concept</th>
<th>Suggested Motivation Intervention</th>
<th>Qualitative Support</th>
<th>Research Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>• Incorporate regular anecdotal reminders of intrinsic motivation • Extrinsic rewards should be minimized</td>
<td>“I have an 80 hour work week that I am not allowed to get paid for”</td>
<td>Malone &amp; Lepper (1987); Myers (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Reiterate that training prepares the learner to perform the job</td>
<td>“This is my first job and I want to make sure that I do everything perfectly”</td>
<td>Chen et al. (2000); Ford et al. (1997); Mathieu et al. (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Orientation</td>
<td>Treat mistakes as learning experiences</td>
<td>“I like learning new things”</td>
<td>Dweck (1986, 1989); Klein et al. (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dread</td>
<td>Share “worst-case” scenarios when appropriate</td>
<td>“Old videos seemed really serious”</td>
<td>Burke, Salvador, Smith-Crowe, Chan-Serafin, Smith, &amp; Sonesh (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education – ARCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention-grabbing</td>
<td>• Share facts or statistics justifying content • Incorporate peer teaching</td>
<td>“If I knew we would be learning only new material, I would be more excited”</td>
<td>Burke &amp; Moore (2003); Malone &amp; Lepper (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Speakers should include explanation of how content can be incorporated into learner’s job</td>
<td>“Felt some lectures went over things dealing with things that did not have anything to do with being an RA”</td>
<td>Artino (2008); Burke &amp; Moore (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence-boosting</td>
<td>Learning should include hands-on and role-playing activity to allow for demonstration of mastery</td>
<td>“At the end, you should feel comfortable w/ the material”</td>
<td>Burke &amp; Moore (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying</td>
<td>Speakers should include explanation of personal expertise or competence regarding content</td>
<td>“Some sessions were like we were just talking so you can tell us about your job. We want to know what to do with our job”</td>
<td>Artino (2008); Burke &amp; Moore (2003); Mathieu et al. (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Create different training “tracks” for basic, returner, and advanced learning options</td>
<td>“Where it’s voluntary to come if you feel like you don’t know/remember”</td>
<td>Baldwin, Magjuka, &amp; Loher (1991); Malone &amp; Lepper (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Concept</td>
<td>Suggested Motivation Intervention</td>
<td>Qualitative Support</td>
<td>Research Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Stress the transferability of student staff skills outside Res Life jobs</td>
<td>“Show returners how to market RA skills at the beginning”</td>
<td>Dubois &amp; Long (2012); Mathieu et al. (1992); Vroom (1964)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of Support</td>
<td>Knowledge, skills, and abilities acquired in training should be reinforced on the job</td>
<td>“Do training in the morning then going over it in in-halls”</td>
<td>Holton et al. (2000); Tharenou (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Create a consistent set of performance expectations with accompanying accountability process</td>
<td>“[Training] was saying ‘you got responsibilities’… it’s your job, and if you do wrong, they’re going to point you out”</td>
<td>Herzberg (1987)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
should include explanation of how content can be incorporated into learner’s job. This suggestion and quote are then followed by references to work by Artino (2008), who found task value to be a significant predictor of satisfaction with a training course, and Burke and Moore (2003), who found discussed the challenges of creating relevance in organizational behavior courses so as to retain student engagement. Each concept introduced follows a similar pattern of suggestion, quote, and relevant research.

Because the hypothesized interaction between motivation and training delivery favors online videos over traditional lecture, this has implications for the training delivered in the future. In addition to being utilized as training tools, as mentioned in Table 5.1, videos can also be used as a motivation intervention. Although emotional appeals may not necessarily be the most effective approach, videos creating a sense of loyalty, pride, and excitement are economically feasible and technologically viable. Such videos could be distributed before other topics are sent out in an attempt to make training seem less tedious. Clips of other employees speaking about the benefits of training in terms of confidence-building could be included. Benefits of the job should be stressed at selection in such a way that job perceptions are positively impacted. For example, if the acquired skills are portrayed as preparing employees for future jobs leading to economic or promotion benefits, trainees may be more motivated to learn.

The department should find data collected from the qualitative measures helpful in deciding the most viable and effective motivation interventions for elements of training. Additionally, the department needs to consider issues of accountability and in-person application of the knowledge gained through videos in order to ensure mastery.

It is clear that the LSU Residential Life department values training and strives to improve it. It is also clear that there is still much work to be done. Although this study could be perceived
as a green light by the department to incorporate video training due to results showing that not
only were final motivation and satisfaction equivalent across groups regardless of delivery
method, learning and motivation during training were higher for video training. However, the
study also highlights the need for trainee motivation to be more intentionally addressed by
department. Both quantitative and qualitative data collected in this study, as well as previous
research, reveal a clear link between motivation and training effectiveness. Of particular concern
is the motivation of returning employees, as their ability to benefit from training is suggested by
this research to be even more closely related to their motivation. Input from the students, as well
as previous research, were used to create a list of potential interventions that could be utilized in
order to apply the findings to improving training.
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## APPENDIX A: TRAINING TOPICS AND DELIVERY METHODS

### Desk Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Online/Video</strong> (department-wide)</th>
<th><strong>Face-to-Face</strong> (community specific)</th>
<th><strong>Hands-On</strong> (department-wide)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Position Description</td>
<td>• Unique responsibilities for each hall</td>
<td>• Key Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General Expectations</td>
<td>• Desk Layout</td>
<td>• Key Rentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overview of Desk Policies</td>
<td>• Where to find things</td>
<td>• Key Rental Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Customer Service, esp. TONE</td>
<td>• Where to put things</td>
<td>• Persona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <em>Parents</em></td>
<td>• On-call information</td>
<td>• Check-in procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FERPA/Buckley Hold</td>
<td>• Important numbers and resources</td>
<td>• RICR’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overview of Desk Forms</td>
<td>• Quiet Hours</td>
<td>• Key Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources</td>
<td>• Alcohol Policies</td>
<td>• Check-out procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introduction to <em>Living on Campus</em> Handbook</td>
<td>• 24-hour desks vs WCA/ECA</td>
<td>• MAXIMO (work orders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who To Call &amp; When</td>
<td>• Using the Community website</td>
<td>• Incident Reports - Kara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Office Supplies</td>
<td>• Emergencies IN YOUR COMMUNITY</td>
<td>• <em>When to Work</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o If next shift no-show’s</td>
<td>o Location of supplies</td>
<td>• Accepting Deliveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accountability Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key Policy</td>
<td>• Scenarios/Grey Areas (Situation+Discussion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Swipe Access Systems</td>
<td>o Concerned parent</td>
<td>• Desk role-playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LSU PD Protocol</td>
<td>o Angry resident</td>
<td>o Greeting residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emergency Response OVERVIEW</td>
<td>o Drunk resident</td>
<td>o Phone etiquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Call Up</td>
<td>o Smell marijuana</td>
<td>o Facilities complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Don’t Get Involved</td>
<td></td>
<td>o Fire alarm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MAXIMO Tutorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timesheets &amp; Shift Exchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ View Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Shift Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Request Off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training Authorizations/Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benefits of Position:** Administrative Skills, Critical Thinking, Customer Service, Safety, Leadership
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APPENDIX B: FIRST OBSERVATION OF TRAINING: FIELD NOTES

Training Context: Lobby for Laville Honors Hall, residential community at Louisiana State University
Job Title: Desk Assistant
Date: Saturday, January 19, 2013
Time: I arrived at approximately 9:45pm. The trainee arrived at approximately 9:50pm. The trainer arrived at approximately 10:10pm.

I arrived in the Laville lobby about 15 minutes prior to the time when training was scheduled to begin. I introduced myself to the employee who was working the desk at the time, informed her that I was there to observe training for the employee who would be coming to relieve her, and then went and sat nearby to wait.

The newly hired employee arrived approximately five minutes later, also introduced himself to the employee currently working, and the two of them proceeded to chat until the trainer arrived. The conversation became an almost informal introduction to the position, so I tried to take notes on what she told him, even though it was not part of the official training. She described the job as “pretty easy”, let him know that he is likely to spend a lot of time “watching Hulu and doing homework”, told him that he will get to “help people”, and said that it was “usually not too busy.” She also mentioned that the main things he’d need to know about were temporary keys, MAXIMO [the system for placing repair requests with the Facilities Department], contacting the Resident Assistant (RA) on-call for help, learning the computer, Persona [the system which allows for the use of electronic key access for that building], and the Daily Log, where each DA indicates his or her worked shifts and any out-of-the-ordinary occurrences. They initially discussed their respective involvement in Student Council organizations. They also realized the fact that they had both applied to work the RA position for the Fall semester and were motivated to apply for the DA position in hopes that it would give them experience which would increase their chances for being hired as RAs.
At this point the current employee’s shift was finished, but because the trainer had not yet arrived, she was not comfortable leaving the new employee at the desk by himself with no training. She invited him to come behind the desk so she could tell him a few more things. Again, even though this was informal instruction from a co-worker, I tried to note what she told him about the job. She began by telling him that you “learn a lot on your own” and said that “there’s a lot of paperwork, but it’s easy”. She pointed out there is a Log of Rounds completed by the RA on-call and showed him where the forms were for Key Cards. She mentioned that you “feel important behind the desk” and warned him that “it’s a little busier on nights when people go out”. She brought up the Daily Log again, this time showing him some examples of what other people filled out, mentioning that sometimes people put in “silly stuff” (i.e., survived zombie attack) but that the supervisors were ok with that because if it was entertaining, people were more likely to look through it and catch the important things as well. She told him that there was a community website with “everything you need to know” and let him know that, as an LSU employee, he’d have to take an online Ethics Training course. She wrapped up by saying it’s a “fun job… random people will talk to you” and mentioning that there are times when it can be stressful, such as when a lot of people need your assistance at one time or when there are computer issues.

The trainer arrived as they were finishing their conversation, so the current employee left, and the official training began. The trainer began by signing on to the community website, letting the employee know that he would get him access shortly, and suggesting that the employee add the website to his Favorites. As the computer was loading, the trainer pointed out that a nearby dry-erase board was always updated to reflect the current RA on-call, as well as contact information, and encouraged the employee to contact them with any questions or situations.
The trainer proceeded to walk the employee through the use of the website, pausing on occasion to point out paper versions of the online forms. He mentioned that not all communities had moved to the electronic versions of the forms, that the online forms were identical to the paper versions, and that in the case of any technical difficulties, it was acceptable to use the paper version if needed. He showed the trainee what he referred to as “The Everything Binder”, where the Daily Log, Delivery Log, Equipment Log, Maintenance Log, and employee Timesheets are located. Similarly to the previous employee, he explained that the Daily Log has columns for entering an employee’s name, date, time of shift, and anything unusual. He pointed out that for the Delivery Log, a student signature is required, and he mentioned that deliveries are not accepted from UPS or FedEx. When going over the Timesheet, he reminded the trainee that employees are not allowed to work over 20 hours per week university-wide. He also informed him that the Laville policy on Timesheets is that employees will leave them in the binder, fill them out as appropriate, leave them in the binder, and that the supervisor will collect them on Wednesdays bi-weekly. After replacing the binder, he pointed out the mailboxes for the RAs, himself, and the Residence Life Coordinator (RLC), in case any messages needed to be delivered to other members of the staff. He mentioned that the Persona Card Swipe System information is located both on the website and in the binder. He also briefly went over the LSU PD Log, mentioning that the policy is such that police should sign when leaving, but that they are not required to reveal the reason that they are in the community.

At this time, the trainer returned his focus to the information available on the community website. He demonstrated locating the schedule for DAs and RAs as well as contact lists for those employees. He showed the trainee where to find campus maps in case anyone called looking for directions. He spent considerable time explaining MAXIMO entries, the maintenance
work order system. He was able to walk the trainee through two Request Log entries, instructing him on entering pertinent information and accessing previous work orders. Next, he explained that Google Voice had been set up to avoid employees having to use their personal cell phones for work purposes. Finally, he went over the online and physical processes for Key Rentals, the forms and procedures used when residents lose or lock out their keys.

To wrap up the training, he pointed out the Lost & Found area of the desk, as well as the equipment available for check-out to residents, which included cables, tools for adapting their beds, games, etc. He showed him how such check-outs would be recorded in the Equipment Log. Finally, he reminded the new employee that he should be getting a username and password shortly that would allow access to the website and reiterated that the on-call RA was available for any questions or concerns that might arise during his shift.

**My observations**

- Recruitment for the position seems to be mostly word of mouth. These particular students seem very involved and ambitious, so the first employee’s descriptions of the job were mostly positive and encouraging, but if employees have less of a work ethic, I’m concerned that this position could be painted in an unflattering light.

- Although the trainer’s “tour” of the website was thorough and clearly a lot of work has gone into making it a convenient tool, I was surprised at the complete lack of discussion about customer service aspects of the job, expectations and accountability, and crisis response. It seemed like there were a lot of topics not covered.

I liked that the supervisors were ok with “silly stuff” being on the Daily Log. It seemed to encourage DAs to show some creativity and personality and maybe connect a little with other employees that they likely rarely see since it’s a one-person job.
APPENDIX C: SECOND OBSERVATION OF TRAINING: FIELD NOTES

Training Context: Evangeline classroom, located in the basement of Evangeline Hall, a residential community at Louisiana State University

Job Title: Desk Assistant

Date: Saturday, February 2, 2013

Time: I arrived at approximately 2:15pm. The trainees were already present for a different meeting when I arrived. The trainer was also already present, and she began training at about 2:30.

I arrived early for the 2:30pm training, and therefore sat in on about 15 minutes of discussion regarding the schedule adaptations for the upcoming Mardi Gras holiday week. Although all of the Desk Assistants (DAs) were present for the schedule meeting, most were returning from the previous semester, and so, already having been trained, left when the schedule meeting concluded. The trainer was left with a group of two to train. She informed them that training would last approximately 1 hour, that they would be paid for training, and that training would consist of both lecture and a short “field trip” to the desk.

The training was primarily delivered via a PowerPoint presentation. The topics included in the presentation were mostly focused on policies regarding customer service, keys, emergency response, confidentiality, and confrontation. Customer service was further elaborated to include expectations about punctuality, greeting residents, policies on headphones/cell phones/laptops, appropriate music and movie expectations, restroom privileges, the fact that only department employees are allowed behind the desk, and the importance of a professional attitude. Customer service was stressed as smiling, being competent, and being professional – “put on your DA face”. The presentation included a YouTube video [Bon Qui Qui at King Burger by MadTV], followed by a discussion by the trainees of what was professional, what wasn’t professional, and why they thought the trainer used this particular video. The trainer also discussed that there are more subtle aspects of customer service, such as knowing how to react when, as a DA, you are
blamed for things that are not your fault. She stressed that when dealing with student problems or complaints, tone is very important.

Her explanation of confidentiality was brief but included a lot of examples of its importance. She discussed FERPA laws, the difference between public information and private information, and described Buckley Holds. Her next slides introduced the accountability process for the DA position. She explained that problem behaviors consisted of things like consistent tardiness, carelessness, FERPA violations, general lack of integrity/respect, and things of that nature. She noted that the typical disciplinary actions proceeded from verbal warning to written warning to disciplinary probation to dismissal. She described each step and its purpose, also noting that particularly egregious actions could lead to immediate dismissal. After that, she briefly described many of the forms used by DAs: Daily Log, Visitation Log, Delivery Log, Maintenance Request Log, Maintenance Personnel Sign-in Sheet, and the Desk Schedule. The PowerPoint also included links to the website, which the trainer briefly explored, encouraging the trainees to visit it on their own, and made special note of the fact that many of the paper forms used regularly could be printed from the website if needed.

At this point, the trainer escorted the new employees upstairs to the lobby desk. She described the desk layout. She pointed out the forms for Key Rentals and the Key Cards. She also showed the trainees a roster containing the names and information of all of the residents, reminding them of privacy policies, informing them that no residents were currently considered Buckley Holds, and explaining that the presence of such information made it vitally important that the desk never be left unattended. She showed the trainees the Desk Ops Folder, letting them know that they could find Timesheets, the Delivery Log (for perishable items only, no UPS or FedEx deliveries), and the Maintenance Logs inside. She described the LSU PD Log and
mentioned that recent changes in the relationship between the department of Residential Life and LSU PD meant that officers were likely to be seen more often in residence communities, but as an added measure of safety. She told the new employees that many times, working at the desk, they would play a role as a first responder in possible emergency situations. She instructed them to always contact a Resident Assistant (RA). She also told them to call 911 if a person appeared to be under the influence of alcohol. She told them they might need to reassure the resident that they would not be in trouble; contacting the authorities is seen as a safety measure. Next, she showed the trainees where the on-call RA information was located, relevant phone numbers, printed instructions on phone use, and reminded them that they are “never alone at the desk”. Some residents were in the lobby interacting a little loudly at the time of the training, which prompted questions from the trainees about whether such behavior was acceptable. The trainer explained that there were no policies prohibiting residents being loud in the lobby, and that the DAs were not responsible for correcting such behaviors. The trainer then briefly mentioned MAXIMO as the system for reporting maintenance issues. She also showed the trainees the location of the keys and the information to be filled out in case of a Key Rental. As a final note, she showed the trainees the Alarm Panel and instructed them to call up to an RA if they noticed any alarm codes.

When we returned to the training classroom, the trainer told the new employees that she had one final exercise for them before training was concluded. She proceeded to hand out “scenarios” printed on slips of paper, each containing a situation that a DA might encounter. Examples included a resident coming in drunk, a DA smelling marijuana, and a resident demanding an immediate move out due to longstanding maintenance issue that has not been resolved. The trainees were instructed to discuss potential ways to address the situations. They
then shared their suggested actions with the trainer. She agreed with and elaborated on their solutions. She discussed a few additional grey areas such as letting people in the front door, differences between legal processes and LSU processes regarding infractions, and balancing confidentiality with compassion when dealing with the concerns of resident’s parents. She wrapped up by reminding the trainees to sign in for an hour at the desk to ensure that they were paid for training.

**My observations**

- I thought the presentation of the content was done very well. The trainer was an excellent speaker, the PowerPoint was simple and well-organized, and the videos, field trip, and discussions broke up the lecture so it didn’t become overly tedious.

- The website for this community doesn’t seem as though it’s kept up or utilized frequently. It could be a great tool, but it’s definitely not being used as such currently.

- There was a lot of content for just one hour of training. I mentioned this to the trainer after the session. She told me that this is considered the “formal” training and she requires all DAs to have gone through it before they can work shifts at the desk. However, after they are hired, she does do an “informal” training that consists more of practice and role-playing at the desk. During the informal training, she’ll have them practice smiling at everyone as they come in, role-play some common resident scenarios with the assistance of the DA currently working, and practice filling out Work Order Requests using MAXIMO and Key Rental forms. She also goes into more depth about each of the logs and what information is required when filling them out.
APPENDIX D: COMMENTS FROM PILOT TEST

DA Remarks Emailed to Researcher Regarding Training Videos

LS:
In the handbook vid- there's a lot of noise in the background
customer service vid- our main priority is residents, but I think it's also important to remember to speak
that way with everyone we encounter
ferpa vid- what if a new resident asks the name of their roommate? can we just say first name since they'll
be meeting anyway?
maximo- maybe show what the save button looks like. I know I had trouble finding it when I first started.
and calling up- who to call up 7am- 10am? RA's aren't on call anymore and GRD + RLC haven't arrived
they all look good to me!

AM:
The other ones were great.

MC:
- Accountability
  o I found this video on the consequences and general disciplinary steps to be quite thorough.
  o This video is very accurate and it delivers the information in a clear, concise manner. I liked this because it means that employees can't get confused about the disciplinary process.
  o I don't feel that anything has been left out.
  o It is the perfect amount of information.
  o I absolutely think that a mid-semester DA would be able to operate as a knowledgeable member of our team on day one with the information in this video.
- Card Swipe Systems
  o I feel like this video got the information needed across, but it is a complicated subject for those unfamiliar with the system. So having said that, I definitely recommend talking about it in a much deeper manner at training sessions.
  o It is quite accurate.
  o The only thing that I would add is mentioning the responsibility and expectations that go with being able to give out keys.
  o It is not too much.
  o I think that a mid-semester DA would get the gist of it from this video, but further explanation will be needed in person from their supervisor.
- Customer Service
  o It gives the perfect amount of information for the given topic.
  o Yes, it is very accurate and as someone who prides myself on my ability to give great customer service, I think that this video gives the perfect description of how it should be done.
  o I don't think that anything is left out.
o I think it is the right length.
o A mid-semester DA would absolutely understand the expected level of customer service after seeing this video.

• FERPA
  o Yes the information contained in this video is quite thorough. I appreciated the explanations given about the different privacy policies.
o It is absolutely accurate.
o I don’t think that anything was left out.
o I don’t think that anything needs to be cut.
o Yes, I think that a mid-semester DA would definitely understand the privacy policies that we use in ResLife.

• Guests
  o I think that this video is very thorough and plainly lays out what is acceptable behavior with regards to having guests.
o I feel that the information is perfectly clear and accurate.
o I don’t think that anything is left out.
o I think that everything in this video is important and should be kept.
o I think that a mid-semester DA would definitely understand the guest policies after watching this video.

• Living on Campus Handbook
  o I think that it gave all the information needed about the handbook.
o Yes it is very accurate.
o I think that they could mention that there is usually a handbook at every front desk.
o It is the perfect amount of information needed to discuss this topic.
o Yes, a mid-semester DA would be able to operate as expected on Day 1 with this information.

• Resources
  o Yes it is very thorough and gives good information about the resources.
o It is very accurate.
o This is not so much a recommendation for anything to be added to the video because it is great, but I think that a uniform way of keeping the resources should be adopted throughout the Res Halls. I have had too many instances of not being able to get the information that I needed for residents because the resources are not kept in a clearly marked location or just aren’t there at all. The biggest thing is having up to date and accurate on call information for the night shift DAs. I work primarily at night during the regular semester and it would be a tremendous help, to know that I will always be able to find the information that I need.
o No, it is the perfect amount of information.
o Yes, a mid-semester DA would be able to function as expected with the information in this video.

• Maximo
This video was excellent at handling how to use Maximo. I am very familiar with the system so I had no trouble with it, but if I were a new employee this video would greatly improve my understanding of the process. Excellent video.

This video is exceedingly accurate and contains great examples.

Nothing has been left out as far as I can tell.

I think that it is the perfect length.

Yes! I absolutely think that this video will allow mid-semester DAs to perform their job exceptionally on Day 1.

WP:
Accountability: Good video, provided full explanation of what happens when you violate along with what are immediate termination violations.

CardSwipe: perfect!! I would like to see the walkthrough video if i can though.

Customer Service: Good video, might want to add in an example of what they should say when answering the phone just in case.

FERPA: Great, Very clearly explains the residents privacy rights.

Guests: Great video

LoCHandbook: Good video,

Resources: Very helpful, maybe the handbook video could be shortened and added to this one?

Maximo: All usernames and passwords for maximo should be located at the desk, somewhere around the computer monitor.
Great video though, good detail and examples.

Human Resources: Much needed video! Great!

Desk Forms: Good video

WhentoWork: Great vid, Might want to give a really quick look at the mobile version though. The mobile version has a couple features such as "My upcoming shifts" and "Whos on Now/Later" just might payoff to show its an option.

Comments: all these are great and informative videos, i think there should be some introduction to key rental procedures and lock change procedures. Also, you could just have each desk make a video of how things operate at the desk, because key rentals at the apartments are much different from key rentals in the persona halls. That would cover all bases, or even if thats not possible have some resources at the desk to help the DAs know the procedures.
APPENDIX E: CONSENT FORM

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY- BATON ROUGE CAMPUS

Study Title: Desk Assistant Training Evaluation

Consent Form

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the newly created centralized desk training program for Louisiana State University Residential Life employees. In order to do this, we will be collecting information from participants going through the training program. All information collected will be provided to the department of Residential Life in order to assess the degree to which employees are benefitting from the program. However, we also need volunteers to take part in an academic research study designed to gain an in-depth understanding of the role of trainee characteristics and instructional design in the effectiveness of the program. We would like you to consider participating. Participation does not involve providing data additional to what is collected for the training assessment; it merely allows researchers to use your data for both the workplace evaluation and academic research endeavors. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you will not be penalized in any way for not permitting the use of your data.

Any discomforts or risks that may result from participation are minimal. Your participation will allow you to learn more about the ways that researchers attempt to reveal and understand important and distinctive approaches to training. The data gathered on you will be kept confidential and any identifying information you provide will be removed. All data will be examined only by duly authorized representatives of the research team and you are assured that the information will not be used for any purpose other than the scientific goals of the experiment. Even if you initially choose to participate, you are free to change your mind about the use of your data at any time without penalty of any sort.

Any questions you may have regarding procedures or any other aspect of the study can be answered by contacting Serena Fisher (813-361-2247) in the Department of Residential Life at LSU.

I have been briefed by the project director (or designate) in detail about this project and understand what my participation involves. I agree to participate with the understanding that I may withdraw at any time. I agree with the terms above and have read and understand this consent form.

________________________ __________________________
Participant Signature Today's Date

________________________
Print Your Name
APPENDIX F: CONSENT FORM FOR FOCUS GROUP

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY- BATON ROUGE CAMPUS

Study Title: Desk Assistant Training Evaluation
Consent Form

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the Fall 2013 training program for Louisiana State University Residential Life employees. In order to do this, information collected via a departmental focus group with employees who went through the training program will be utilized in an evaluative report. All information has already been collected by the department of Residential Life in order to gain a broad understanding of patterns of employee reactions. However, an academic research study designed to gain an in-depth understanding of the role of trainee characteristics and instructional design in the effectiveness of the program is also underway. We would like you to consider granting permission to use information from the focus group in which you took part. Participation does not involve providing data additional to what was previously collected for the focus group; it merely allows researchers to use your data for both the workplace evaluation and academic research endeavors. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you will not be penalized in any way for not permitting the use of your data.

Any discomforts or risks that may result from participation are minimal. Your participation will allow you to learn more about the ways that researchers attempt to reveal and understand important and distinctive approaches to training. The data gathered on you will be kept confidential and any identifying information you provide will be removed. All data will be examined only by duly authorized representatives of the research team and you are assured that the information will not be used for any purpose other than the scientific goals of the experiment. Even if you initially choose to participate, you are free to change your mind about the use of your data at any time without penalty of any sort.

Any questions you may have regarding procedures or any other aspect of the study can be answered by contacting Serena Fisher (813-361-2247) in the Department of Residential Life at LSU.

I have been briefed by the project director (or designate) in detail about this project and understand what my participation involves. I agree to participate with the understanding that I may withdraw at any time. I agree with the terms above and have read and understand this consent form.

________________________  ____________________
Participant Signature          Today’s Date

________________________
Print Your Name
APPENDIX G: PRE-TRAINING SURVEY

Pre-Training Survey

Why did you apply to be a DA?

What do you think you will get out of your experience as a DA?

What do you know about the training for LSU DAs?

How do you think the DA training will prepare you to do your job?
APPENDIX H: DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

Personal Characteristics

Please choose the description with which you most comfortably identify yourself:

Gender

- Male
- Female
- Transgender

Age

- Under 18
- 18-23
- Over 23

Ethnicity

- White
- Black
- Latino/a
- Asian
- American Indian
- Other
- More than one of the above

Year in School

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior

College in which you are Enrolled

- Agriculture
- Art & Design
- Business
- Coast and Environment
- Engineering
- Human Sciences & Education
- Humanities & Social Sciences
- Mass Communication
- Music & Dramatic Arts
- Science
- Veterinary Medicine
- I have not yet declared a major
- More than one of the above

Please list any additional Academic, Greek, Sports, or Other Organizations with which you are involved:

Have you been an RA or DA previously?

- No
- RA
- DA

If yes, how long were you in your position?

- Less than 1 year
- 1 Year
- 2 Years
- More than 2 Years
APPENDIX I: MOTIVATION SURVEY

Training Evaluation Survey

Are you looking forward to training? Why or why not?

What do you think you will learn in training?

What do you think the purpose of training is?

When you imagine good training, how would you describe it?
# APPENDIX J: PRE-TRAINING SCALES

## Training Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am willing to exert considerable effort to learn the content of the training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>When using the internet for my work, I am able to listen to music as well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am able to surf the internet and perform another activity comfortably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I use the internet every day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I expect quick access to information when I need it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>When I study, I prefer to learn those that I can use quickly first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I use computers for many things in my daily life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I use pictures more than words when I wish to explain something</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I expect the websites that I visit regularly to be constantly updated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I wish to be rewarded for everything I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>When I send out an email, I expect a quick reply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I keep in contact with my friends through the computer every day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I use a lot of graphics and icons when I send messages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I am able to use more than one applications on the computer at the same time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I use smiley faces a lot in my messages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I will get more from this training program than most people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I will try to learn as much as I can from training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I am able to communicate with my friends and do my work at the same time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I can chat on the phone with a friend and message another at the same time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>When I need to know something, I search the internet first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I use pictures to express my feelings better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I prefer to receive messages with graphics and icons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I can check email and chat online at the same time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I am motivated to learn the skills emphasized in this training program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I will try even harder if I can't understand some part of this course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I use the computer for leisure every day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K: EXAMPLE HANDOUT FOR KEY RENTAL LECTURE

Key Rental Forms

Renting a Key: Key Rental Agreement

**RESIDENT KEY RENTAL AGREEMENT**

- Rental of a room/entry key is $5.00 per rental charged to your fee bill beginning with the third rental (first two rentals per year are free). Rented key(s) must be returned within **24 hours** after the key(s) being issued (even on weekends). Key(s) may only be rented to the resident assigned to the room.
- Failure to return the rented key(s) within 24 hours will result in a lock change and a charge of $45.00 for residence halls and up to $125.00 for apartments.

**KEY CHECK-OUT**
- _____ Entry Door Key
- _____ Bedroom Door Key
- _____ BOTH Entry & Bedroom Door Keys

- Resident's name:__________
- Building/Apartment:__________
- Room:__________
- LSU ID #:__________
- Cell Phone Number:__________
- Date Issued:__________
- Time Issued:__________ am pm
- Resident's Signature:__________

**KEY RETURN**
- Courtesy call: YES NO N/A
- Lock Change requested: YES NO
- Date Returned:__________
- Time Returned:__________
- Staff Signature:__________
- GRD/RLC Use only: Lock Change RL #:__________ Date:__________
- RD/KEY Fee Assessed: _____ $45 (RES HALL BDRM) _____ $60 (APT BDRM) _____ $65 (APT ENTRY) _____ $125 (APT Both)

GRD/RLC's: Please submit completed forms to the Business Office weekly.

Renting a Key: Key Card

**NAME:**
**BUILDING & ROOM:**
**LSU ID #:**
**CELL PHONE #:**

**KEY CODE/CARD #:**
**RESIDENT SIGNATURE**
**DATE OUT**
**STAFF INITIALS**
**DATE IN**
**STAFF INITIALS**

**Rental # (Please circle):**
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
Returning a Rental: Key Card

NAME: 
BUILDING & ROOM: 
LSU ID #: 
CELL PHONE #: 

KEY CODE/CARD # | RESIDENT SIGNATURE | DATE OUT | STAFF INITIALS
--- | --- | --- | ---

Returning a Rental: Key Rental Agreement

**RESIDENT KEY RENTAL AGREEMENT**

Rental of a room/entry key is $5.00 per rental charged to your fee bill beginning with the third rental (first two rentals per year are free). Rented key(s) must be returned within 24 hours after the key(s) being issued (even on weekends). Key(s) may only be rented to the resident assigned to the room.

**Failure to return the rented key(s) within 24 hours will result in a lock change and a charge of $45.00 for residence halls and up to $125.00 for apartments.**

**KEY CHECK-OUT**
-  Entry Door Key
-  Bedroom Door Key
-  BOTH Entry & Bedroom Door Keys

Resident’s name: 
LSU ID #: 
Cell Phone Number: 
Date issued: 
Time issued: _______ am / pm

Signature indicates agreement to terms of key rental above.

**KEY RETURN**
-  Courtesy call: YES NO N/A

Date Returned: _______ Time Returned: _______ Staff Signature: 

Use only: 
Lock Change RL #: 
Date: 

RDKEY Fee Assessed: 
-  $45 (RES HALL BDM) 
-  $60 (APT BDM) 
-  $65 (APT ENTRY) 
-  $125 (APT Both)

GRDxRLCs Please submit completed forms to the Business Office weekly.
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### RESIDENT KEY RENTAL AGREEMENT

**Rental of a room/entry key is $5.00 per rental charged to your fee bill beginning with the third rental (first two rentals per year are free).** Rented key(s) must be returned within 24 hours after the key(s) being issued (even on weekends). Key(s) may only be rented to the resident assigned to the room.

*Failure to return the rented key(s) within 24 hours will result in a lock change and a charge of $45.00 for residence halls and up to $125.00 for apartments.***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY CHECK-OUT</th>
<th>Entry Door Key</th>
<th>Bedroom Door Key</th>
<th>BOTH Entry &amp; Bedroom Door Keys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident’s name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSU ID #:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Phone Number:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Issued:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Issued:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident’s Signature:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Signature:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY RETURN**

- **Courtesy call:** YES NO N/A  **Lock Change requested:** YES NO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Returned:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Time Returned:</th>
<th>Staff Signature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRD/RLC Use only:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RDKEY Fee Assessed:**

- **$45 (RES HALL BDRM)**
- **$60 (APT BDRM)**
- **$65 (APT ENTRY)**
- **$125 (APT Both)**

GRD/RLCs: Please submit completed forms to the Business Office weekly.
APPENDIX L: DECLARATIVE KNOWLEDGE TEST

Desk Assistant Quiz

1) When someone comes into my lobby, as a desk assistant I should:
                            
                            
                            

2) The number one priority for a desk assistant is:
                            
                            

3) After the ______ time a resident loses a key, he or she will be assessed a fee.
                            
                            

4) There are ______ card swipe systems used for access to LSU communities.
                            
                            

5) The card swipe systems are _______ and _______
                            
                            
                            

6) List 3 policy violations for which a desk assistant can be immediately terminated:
                            
                            
                            
                            

7) The When to Work scheduling program allows desk assistants to:
                            
                            
                            
                            

8) FERPA legislation is related to:
                            
                            

9) The Maximo software program is used for:
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10) A first-time policy violation for a DA will generally result in:

_____________________________________________

11) List 3 resources that each DA should be aware of and prepared to utilize in helping guests:

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

12) List 3 examples of clothing considered unprofessional for DAs while working:

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

13) List 4 potential reasons for the LSU PD to be in a residence hall:

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

14) Overnight guests must be __________ and at least ______ years old:

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

15) The two forms used for key rentals are:

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

16) If a parent calls and wants you to go check on their student, you should:

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

17) In an emergency, you should:

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________
18) When calling up for a non-emergency, call the ______ during the day, and the ______ after business hours:

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

19) When calling up for an emergency, consult the:

_____________________________________________

20) List 5 different forms that can be found at each desk:

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________
## APPENDIX M: DURING-TRAINING SCALE

**Training Evaluation Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am learning new things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I like the way the information is being delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>These topics could be presented in a better way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I think this information will help me when I start my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I am overwhelmed by the amount of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I find it easy to pay attention to the presenter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>This information seems useless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>If I take this seriously, I will look competent when I’m working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I was prepared for this training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX N: POST-TRAINING SCALES

## Training Evaluation Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Not at all typical of me</th>
<th>Not very typical of me</th>
<th>Somewhat typical of me</th>
<th>Fairly typical of me</th>
<th>Very much typical of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Successful application of my training will probably be appreciated by my supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>While applying training at work, I can learn a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The more training I apply on my job, the better I do my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The harder I work at learning, the better I’ll be able to do my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The way the trainer taught the material made me feel more confident I could apply it in my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It is clear to me that the people conducting this training understand how I will use what I learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My job performance will be better if I use the new things I learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The trainer used lots of examples that showed me how I could use my learning on the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Successful application of the training content is an exciting challenge for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE OTHER SIDE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the instructor’s knowledge of course material and subject matter?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the instructor’s ability to keep the interest of the class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the instructor’s presentation and explanation of course materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the instructor’s overall effectiveness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with communication of course objectives in clear, understandable terms?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the match of course objectives with your idea of what you thought would be taught?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the relevance of the course content to your job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the course’s emphasis on most important information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the extent to which the course prepared you to perform current job tasks more effectively?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the extent to which the course prepared you to perform new job tasks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with quality of this course overall?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX O: FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

Post-Training: RA Focus Group

1) Research has shown that without employees who are motivated to learn, training is virtually useless. What motivates you to get the most out of training?
   a) Can we make it a culture to make it more serious?
   b) Do pre-training videos help out?

2) Think back to the week of training when you arrived on the final day for desk training. In looking at the participant response, especially for desk training, it was noted that some people came in with an excitement to learn and an appreciation for the value of reviewing knowledge. Those participants showed greater satisfaction with the training and saw it as a good use of their time. Others who arrived at training with the opposite attitudes hated training and saw it as ineffective in every way. How do you think the department could help more people see the value in training?
   a) What do think might make people dismiss the effectiveness of training even before it began?
   b) What do you suggest happen within training that might change their perspective?

3) When the training committee looks at the RA assessment of Fall Training, we try to pull out themes that will help us improve future training. Sometimes though, we receive a lot of conflicting information from you guys. For instance, we hear that training is very redundant and yet we try to base training off end-of-year assessments mentioning topics that RAs feel weren’t covered thoroughly. Also, we hear both that training is too long and, at the same time, get a list of topics that should be added. Some people loved morning energizers, social media challenges, and development pieces such as “Marketing Your Skills as an RA”, whereas others saw such elements as a waste of time. Why do you think we hear such different messages and what would you really like to see training look like?
APPENDIX P: GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Post-Training: DA Group Interview

In what ways did you find DA training helpful?

To what extent do you feel confident in your ability to perform your job as a result of training?

How do you think the training could have been better?

How did the training give you a greater appreciation for the importance of the DA role?

Talk about the way training will happen in the future... What should be included?

How do you think we should market/develop desk assistants?

Do you wish you got more frequent feedback on your job? What kind and how often?

Do you think When to Work emails are an effective communication tool?

Is there anything you wish you’d known about the job before you started?

Do you have any Additional Comments or Questions for me?
APPENDIX Q: BEHAVIOR OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

Performance Evaluation

Community: ___________________________  Date: _________________

Employee Name: ___________________________

Supervisor: ___________________________

Does the employee consistently smile and greet people as they come into the lobby?

Was the Daily Log signed at the beginning of the shift?

Is laptop use appropriate?

Was the desk left unattended at any point during the shift? What does the employee do when he/she needs to leave the desk?

Does the employee know the proper procedure for a Key Rental?

Does the employee know the proper procedure for addressing the presence of LSU PD?

Does the employee know the proper procedure for entering a work order into Maximo?
APPENDIX R: BEHAVIOR OBSERVATION SCORING KEY

Does the employee consistently smile and greet people as they come into the lobby? [1 pt]
Yes or No [1 pt]

Was the Daily Log signed at the beginning of the shift? [1 pt]
Yes, No, or N/A [1 pt]

Is laptop use appropriate? [1 pt]
Yes, No, or N/A [1 pt]

Was the desk left unattended at any point during the shift? What does the employee do when he/she needs to leave the desk? [3 pt]
Yes or No [1 pt]
Put up a sign or get someone to cover or inform GRD/RLC [1 pt], don’t be gone more than 5 minutes [1 pt]

Does the employee know the proper procedure for a Key Rental? [9 pt]
Ask for the resident’s ID [1 pt]. Get a Key Rental Agreement form and fill out the top half [1 pt]. Locate the Resident’s Key Card, then enter the Key Code, date, and staff initials [1 pt]. Circle the rental number in the top corner [1 pt]. Inform resident about fees and that the rental has to be returned within 24 hours [1 pt]. Have the resident sign both forms [1 pt]. Each day, you’re supposed to follow-up with anyone who still has a rental out. When the key is returned, check to make sure the codes match on the Key Card [1 pt]. Fill out “returned key” information [1 pt]. Put the Key Rental Agreement form, Key Card, and rental key all back in their appropriate places [1 pt].

Does the employee know the proper procedure for addressing the presence of LSU PD? [3 pt]
Greet the officer. Offer assistance [1 pt]. Try to have the officer sign the Police Log, but be understanding if they cannot [1 pt]. Notify the GRD, RLC, and/or RA on-call that the police are in the building [1 pt].

Does the employee know the proper procedure for entering a work order into Maximo? [11 pt]
Pull up the Maximo website and sign in using your community information [1 pt]. Select New Work Order [1 pt]. Note the RL# in the Maintenance Log [1 pt]. On the Work Order page put the problem in the description box (be short but specific) [1 pt], indicate location (using drill down menu) [1 pt], choose Work Type (usually CM or EM) [1 pt], choose Work Priority (either 6 or 10) [1 pt], and enter resident contact information (name, phone, and email) [1 pt]. Be sure to Save [1 pt]. Enter all of the information into the Maintenance Log as well [1 pt]. If the request is described as an emergency, call up immediately to have someone check it out [1 pt].
APPENDIX S: EMPLOYEE EVALUATION
For the purpose of this evaluation, the job responsibilities of the Desk Assistant position have been divided into several main job functions:

**Communication and Customer Service, Administrative Responsibilities, and Individual Development**

Under each section are individual criteria described with behavior statements. Please respond to these statements. At the end of each section, please use the following guidelines in determining an overall rating for the employee’s job performance in the area that you are addressing. In writing comments, please be as specific and descriptive as possible, reflecting on the DA's performance and offering suggestions for improvement. Remember that the evaluation process is designed to evaluate the performance, not the personality, of the employee. Thank you for your time and effort in this process.

### Guidelines for performance evaluation in each section (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>The employee maintains above average job performance and demonstrates excellent skills and/or abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>The employee fulfills normal job requirements and has demonstrated acceptable skills and abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>The employee has minimal understanding of skill area or needs to raise skill level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>The employee does not meet minimum expectations in this area and has poor skills and/or abilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Communication/Customer Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates good judgment, responsible decision making, timely follow-through, effective problem solving and appropriate communication (including but not limited to verbal, non-verbal, written and online)</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains privacy and/or confidentiality in all facets of the position</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps the RLC and GRD advised of information in the community and resident concerns or issues</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides prompt, friendly service to all customers</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains a working knowledge of the Department and University resources</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers desk telephone and accurately direct calls to the proper location</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Administrative Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses keys for official University purposes that are directly related to the job responsibilities of the DA</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends DA staff meetings, trainings, scheduling meetings, and other meetings directed by the GRD</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports all maintenance problems involving University property, deficiencies, or damages to the GRD/RLC and other appropriate channels (i.e. Maximo) as well as works with custodial staff to promote a clean and well-maintained community</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports all violations of University rules, regulations and policies to the GRD or RLC</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Follows the policies and procedures set by the GRD or RLC of the community | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Needs Improvement | Unsatisfactory
---|---|---|---|---
Overall | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Needs Improvement | Unsatisfactory

**Individu**al Development

| Accepts constructive feedback | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Needs Improvement | Unsatisfactory
---|---|---|---|---
| Demonstrates the ability to understand their DA position | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Needs Improvement | Unsatisfactory
| Serves as a role model for all University and Residence Hall policies | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Needs Improvement | Unsatisfactory
| Balances academic, employment, and personal responsibilities with little to no struggle | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Needs Improvement | Unsatisfactory
| Overall | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Needs Improvement | Unsatisfactory

**Overall Desk Assistant Performance**

| Overall | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Needs Improvement | Unsatisfactory
---|---|---|---|---

**Summary Comments**

| Areas of Success | Areas for Improvement |
---|---|

**Improvement Plan**

---

*Desk Assistant Signature* | *Date*

---

Graduate Resident Director Signature | Date

---

Resident Life Coordinator Signature | Date

---

*I understand that my signature indicates only that I have read and discussed this performance evaluation with my supervisor. It does not necessarily mean that I agree with the contents of this evaluation. I may attach written comments if desired.

If comments are attached, initial here: ____
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