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ABSTRACT

UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF MANDATORY ONLINE TRAINING AS RELATED TO TRAINING SELF-EFFICACY, MOTIVATION, AND UTILITY

Tori Austin, Ph.D.
Department of Educational Technology, Research, and Assessment
Northern Illinois University, 2023
Cynthia Campbell, Director

Organizations spend millions of dollars training employees in ways to improve their skills—recently through mandatory professional development delivered virtually or through online asynchronous platforms. This research investigated how social exchange theory and self-efficacy theory inform faculty participants’ motivation to transfer such knowledge and skills from mandatory online trainings into their workplace practices. Faculty who had attended mandatory online training were asked to complete a 25-item survey about their motivation to transfer information from the training into their workplace practice as well as their perceived utility of training and their training self-efficacy. This study examined the extent to which motivation to transfer mandatory online training information to workplace practice is related to employees’ perceptions about the utility of such trainings and their training self-efficacy.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The empty university campus has an occasional masked person braving the halls. The cleaning crews are in protective gear, sanitizing classrooms, and staying six feet apart from each other. All meetings and classes pivoted to an online format, leaving a shell of what once was a bustling college campus. University employees, like the rest of the world, were impacted by the virus. The coronavirus first appeared in December of 2019 in Wuhan, China (Guan et al., 2020). By January 2020, the virus reached the United States (World Health Organization, 2020). In an attempt to control the spread of the virus, universities adjusted training for employees by limiting the number of people attending in-person trainings and encouraging the use of virtual platforms.

The increased use of e-training methods (Kimiloglu et al., 2017; Newton, & Doonga, 2007) led to numerous studies evaluating the effectiveness (Beinicke & Bipp, 2018) of this workplace learning approach. Existing literature on the best way to evaluate e-training (Choudhury & Pattnaik, 2020) is discussed through defining e-training (Kamall et al., 2016), training effectiveness (Vasile & Teodosescu, 2015), and how learners’ perspectives play a role in training effectiveness (Chircu, 2014; Kimiloglu et al., 2017, Lin et al., 2019).
Problem Statement

Research has examined online training or mandatory workplace training, but there is little research combining the two concepts into mandatory workplace online training. There are even fewer studies on university and college faculty’s motivation to transfer mandatory online training. This section addresses the gap in the research and the contribution this study made to the body of knowledge surrounding the growing trend of mandatory online training. Two researchers were contracted by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs to find out if mandatory training influences employee performance. In putting together the government report, they did a meta-analysis of 3,516 research articles to determine the amount of research dealing with the effectiveness of mandatory computer-based training on “government ethics, workplace harassment, or privacy and information security-related topics” (Peterson & McCleery, 2014, p.1). The researchers’ examined each study based on “four key domains: risk of bias (includes study design and aggregate quality), consistency, directness, and precision of the evidence” (p. 6). From their analysis, only seven studies met the criteria. Of these seven articles, only three studies address mandatory training related to sexual harassment (Perry et al., 2010) and diversity awareness (Rynes et al., 1995; Sanchez et al., 2004). However, the mandatory training in these studies was not delivered exclusively online. Consequently, Peterson and McCleery (2014) could not draw sufficient inferences about the effectiveness of mandatory computer-based training transfer given the few studies meeting their criteria.

During meta-analysis of the 3,516 articles, Peterson and McCleery (2014) found two diversity and three sexual harassment training articles; however, no articles on motivation to transfer mandatory online training were found. Between the few articles on the topic of
mandatory computer-based workplace learning (Preusser et al., 2011; Wan et al., 2012), and Peterson and McCleery (2014) finding no studies including motivation to transfer mandatory online training, the current study sought to fill the gap by studying faculty’s motivation to transfer information presented in mandatory online training to their everyday workplace practice. Wan et al. (2012) analyzed the learning strategies of 212 employees of an international company and found no significant difference in learning outcomes for those who attended online trainings voluntarily. One article (Preusser et al., 2011) supports that having a choice improves employees’ performance in the training. Preusser et al. surveyed 70 university employees who voluntarily attended a sexual harassment training with Human Resources. They found the employees did learn the information from the online sexual harassment training, which makes this article relevant to employee training research surrounding freedom of choice. Gegenfurtner et al. (2016) conducted a meta-review of 29 studies on training transfer of mandatory training and also found training transfer was higher when the training was voluntary if learning was the goal of the training. However, if being able to demonstrate an ability was the goal of the training, training transfer was higher when participation was mandatory. The online method of mandatory training was missing from Gegenfurtner et al.’s meta-review findings; therefore, a gap exists in research on mandatory online training transfer.

A significant contribution to research on the growing trend of mandatory online training is needed. Leadership and coworkers’ positive attitudes tie in with employee engagement, job satisfaction, and a favorable view of workplace e-learning systems (Lin et al., 2019). Job training satisfaction leads to job satisfaction, which leads to better job performance (Huang, 2019). During the pandemic, organizations had a few challenges setting up technology and trying to implement training remotely (Embree, 2020; Opsahl et al., 2021). The challenge of employee
engagement in remote training (Opsahl et al., 2021) was accompanied by the task of companies converting training to digital formats (Lakewood Media Group LLC, 2020; Opsahl et al., 2021). Members of the Training magazine were recruited to participate in a U.S. survey of organizations with over 100 employees. The data collection provided information on the budgets and training practices of 202 organizations, which is compiled into a yearly report. The 2020 Training Industry report showed that organizations spend a significant amount of their budget on employee training, with 42% of the companies putting mandatory and compliance training completely online. Of the organizations included in the report, 7% were educational services or academic institutions. The other organizations were from government, manufacturing, medical, nonprofit, and retail industries. Additionally, 54% of the organizations reported plans to maintain some remote training post pandemic. The highest priorities for workplace training in 2020 were to increase the effectiveness of training programs (Lakewood Media Group LLC, 2020). Given the growing trend of mandatory online training, the current study is important to examine participants’ perspectives about such requirements and understand how their experiences might inform training practices (e.g., so valuable resources are spent wisely).

Although research investigating mandatory online training in the corporate setting is limited, fewer studies have investigated the effectiveness of mandatory online training for faculty and staff in higher education. Hode et al. (2018) surveyed 108 university faculty and staff about their perceptions of the usefulness of the information presented in a four-week online diversity training. In the study, online training was mandated by supervisors for some participants, while others signed up to attend the training voluntarily. A cultural competence pretest and posttest assessment measured participants’ awareness, attitudes, openness, planned behaviors, and self-efficacy related to diversity. Additionally, the researchers asked participants about their feelings
about computer usage. The participants were emailed a pretest to be completed before attending the course. Once the course was over, participants were emailed the posttest. Using the transformative learning theory as the framework, the researchers found that faculty and staff who were more comfortable with computers showed greater learning from the online course. The course was voluntary; however, the few faculty or staff members required to attend the trainings left comments about the course exceeding their expectations and confirmation that they did use the content from training in their everyday practice. Although training transfer was evident by at least one participant whose attendance of the online training was mandatory, the self-efficacy scales used in the Hode et al. (2018) study was not deemed reliable. This leaves a gap in the research on the training self-efficacy of faculty who take online training. Additionally, in Hode et al.’s (2018) study, there was no instrument to measure their motivation to transfer training included in the survey. This is identified as another gap in the research and is addressed further in the instrumentations section. The lack of research on the effects of mandatory online training on university faculty’s perceptions about their training self-efficacy, perceived training utility, and their intent to transfer learning to their everyday workplace practice is the problem this study addressed.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty’s perceptions of mandatory online training with respect to motivation to transfer training, training utility, and training self-efficacy.
Research Questions

The following questions guided this study:

1. To what extent are the demographic variables related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy?

2. To what extent is the frequency and type of mandatory online training related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy?

3. To what extent is mandatory online training self-efficacy (the belief in one’s capability to perform successfully in mandatory online training) related to faculty members’ motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge/skills?

4. To what extent is perception of mandatory online training utility related to faculty motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge and skills?

5. How do faculty describe their mandatory online training experience?

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical frameworks that informed this proposal are social exchange and self-efficacy theory.

Social Exchange Theory

University faculty’s perceptions of rewards and costs of mandatory online training were examined through the lens of social exchange theory to explore their motivation to transfer
training (Figure 1). Social exchange theory (Homans, 1958) suggests that employees weigh the costs and rewards of the workplace environment and that such can vary based on organization and individual characteristics and can change over time (West & Turner, 2007). For example, an employee may initially view workplace training as beneficial when newly hired, but with experience and time in service, they may view workplace training less positively. Consequently, costs and rewards are central tenants of social exchange theory. Cole et al. (2002) defines cost as the resources, time, and effort an employee invests, and reward as the support and income employees receive.

Figure 1: Assumption of how the social exchange theory applies to motivation to transfer training model. (Adapted from Cropanzano et al., 2017, p. 17)
Building on existing research investigating motivation to transfer training to the workplace, this study operationalized reward as factors that positively influence employees’ desire to transfer training and cost as factors that negatively affect employees’ desire to transfer such training to their workplace practice. Social exchange theory acknowledges that rewards are centered around a person’s self-interest. To calculate a person’s self-interest, the reward minus the cost equals the worth of committing to an organization or committing to using the information learned in a training. As Madera et al. (2011) stated, an employee’s perception of training utility can vary based on the individual. James et al. (2011) found the retirement eligible workforce tend to forgo retirement if they perceived the rewards to outweigh the costs. The researchers compared the results based on age: “emerging adults (24 years old and younger), settling in adults (25 years old to 39), prime working years (40 years to 54 years old), approaching retirement (55-65 years old), and retirement eligible (66-year-old and older)” (p.182) and found that age groups reported feeling differently about workplace rewards. The “approaching retirement (55-65 years old) and retirement eligible (66-year-old and older)” (James et al., 2011, p.182) groups were more affected by supervisor support and recognition. The “emerging adults (24 years old and younger) and settling in adults (25 years old to 39)” (James et al., 2011, p.182) were more affected by career development and promotions. Applying social exchange theory, it is possible that if training self-efficacy and perceived utility are high, employees will be more motivated to transfer skills and knowledge from mandatory online training to the workplace. Similarly, if employees’ training self-efficacy and perceived utility were low, they might be less motivated to transfer such knowledge and skills acquired through mandatory online training in the workplace.
Using the framework of social exchange theory, I investigated university employees’ perceptions of mandatory online training and their motivation to incorporate such information into their workplace practice. This research builds on existing research reporting the connections between motivation to transfer and other factors considering

- Organizational support that influences learning transfer (Joo, 2011).
- Self-efficacy and supervisors’ support that influence motivation to transfer (Arefin & Islam, 2018; Na-Nan & Sanamthong, 2020).
- Training self-efficacy and managerial support that influence the perception of training utility (Guthrie & Schwoerer, 1994).
- Utility value (how useful the employee perceives the task) and motivation to transfer such information that influence the interest to transfer such skills to the workplace (Gegenfurtner, 2020).
- Self-efficacy and motivation to transfer that influence the use of information from training (Machin & Fogarty, 1997; Na-Nan & Sanamthong, 2020).
- Employees’ perceptions of training outcomes, work environment, and experience in training influence training transfer (Santos, 2006).

Self-efficacy and perceived utility can contribute to one’s motivation to transfer training information into practice. Research has reported the relationship between self-efficacy and organizational support on motivation to transfer training (e.g., Arefin & Islam, 2018); yet, research on the effects of these factors related to transfer of mandatory online training to workplace practice is limited. Although social exchange theory holds that individuals’ perceptions about the rewards and costs are important when considering a given action, it is unclear the weight these variables contribute to subsequent decision-making (e.g., rewards and
costs of transferring mandatory online training in the workplace. Kontogiorghes’s (2001) study examining the transfer climate (e.g., which includes things that remind the employee of the training and be able to use their training knowledge and skills on the job) found that training transfer was more likely with intrinsic rewards (e.g., praise, recognition) and supervisory support than extrinsic rewards (e.g., pay, promotion).

Leadership and coworkers’ positive attitudes tie in with employee engagement, job satisfaction, and a favorable view of workplace e-learning systems (Lin et al., 2019) that align with rewards or benefits for an employee (Chanana & Sangeeta, 2020). Recent studies found satisfaction with job training leads to overall job satisfaction, which leads to better job performance (e.g., Huang, 2019), and the higher the extrinsic rewards, the more commitment the employee has to the organization (Chanana & Sangeeta, 2020). To survey perceptions of voluntary participation in the training programs, Salamon et al. (2021) used an adapted version of Noe and Schmitt’s (1986) motivation to transfer scale, perceived training transfer scale, supervisor support scale, and a scale indicating if the training was mandatory. Participants in their study included 380 managers and non-managers. Survey findings showed that mandatory training without organization support lowered participants’ motivation to transfer such training. The social exchange theory supports Salamon et al.’s conclusions that employees who perceive supervisor support to be limited are less motivated to transfer their training to the workplace and when employees feel supported, they are more likely to incorporate training into their workplace practice.

In applying the social exchange theory, the better the rewards, the higher the employees’ motivation. Santos and Stuart’s (2006) random sample of the 167 who responded from the 350 mailed questionnaires showed the employees’ attitude toward the training influenced the
effectiveness of the training. If there were extrinsic motivations like a promotion or raise involved, employees would likely transfer their training and use the new skills or knowledge in the workplace. The intrinsic motivation is relevant as well. Curado et al. (2015) found employees who voluntarily attended training are more intrinsically motivated to use their skills learned in training on the job. Additionally, Gegenfurtner et al. (2016) found goals for training were more positive when participation in training was voluntary compared to mandatory.

**Self-Efficacy Theory**

Self-efficacy theory was developed by Albert Bandura (1994) as an explanation for an individual’s perception of their ability to carry out a task. Bandura (1994) identified four sources of efficacy information: learning from adversity, witnessing others carry out a task successfully, persuasion to succeed in a task due to social expectations, and altering self-doubt to reduce stress. The following theory framed the participants’ confidence during training and the influence training self-efficacy can have on motivation to transfer training.

A person’s self-efficacy is determined by their mental state, motivation, and environment. Self-efficacy and supervisors’ support were found to influence motivation to transfer training (Arein & Islam, 2018; Na-Nan & Sanamthong, 2020). Self-efficacy and motivation to transfer training were found to influence participants’ use of information from training (Machin & Fogarty, 1997; Na-Nan & Sanamthong, 2020). Guthrie and Schwoerer (1994) expanded Bandura’s self-efficacy theory to explore training self-efficacy, which was found to affect training motivation. Training self-efficacy refers to the belief in one’s ability to perform successfully in training and has been measured with a six-item scale used by Guthrie and Schwoerer (1994).
University staff have been included in research to find correlations between self-efficacy and motivation surrounding workplace training. Faculty from public and private Pakistani universities, mostly male (69%) with a minimum of 18 years of education, were surveyed to understand how the resistance to change and the faculty members’ self-efficacy are associated with the universities’ learning culture or the motivation of the faculty member to transfer training (Islam, 2019). The researchers found when faculty feel confident, or have self-efficacy, they are motivated to share their learning with others. Another study found self-efficacy was an influence on training transfer. Ford et al. (1992) surveyed 180 Air Force basic training graduates and supervisors four months after an 18-week technical training to study how often the airmen performed certain types of training tasks and the airmen’s perceived supervisor support, while also assessing their self-efficacy. The study found that the confidence of the airmen was positively related to their ability to transfer the information and skills from training. It is possible faculty members are more motivated to transfer training when they have higher self-efficacy in mandatory online training.

Definitions

This section defines the key concepts used throughout this research. The following terminology helps to explain university employees’ perceptions about mandatory online training and their motivation to incorporate such information into their workplace practices.

Effectiveness: Effectiveness is the successful achievement of the desired result.

Faculty members: Higher education employees in the role of university faculty and/or community college instructors with tenure or on a tenure track. Administrators and/or
department chairs (despite holding a faculty position), and graduate/research/tuition assistants are not included.

**Mandatory Training:** A required employee training arranged by the employer.

**Online Training:** The computer-based content intended to teach participants a new idea or reinforce existing knowledge.

**Training Effectiveness:** Santos and Stuart (2006) defined training effectiveness as a combination of the quality of the training and the trainees’ attitude toward the training and management practices. An effective training maximizes the participants’ learning (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2007).

**Training Self-Efficacy:** The confidence one has surrounding their capabilities to perform information and skills from training.

**Training Transfer:** The employee’s use of the training information, or skills post training, in the workplace.

**Training Utility:** The usefulness of skills and knowledge in everyday workplace performance.

**Assumptions**

This study assumed the following:

1. Faculty members have attended mandatory online training recent enough to recall the effect of the training on their everyday workplace behavior.
2. Faculty members respond honestly on the survey tool.
3. Faculty members respond honestly when interviewed about their experiences and perspectives.
Limitations

Limitations are the potential things that can undermine the quality of the research conducted. For this study, potential limitations exist because this survey research utilizes human participants. There are limitations to survey research such as when implementing quantitative research methods and interpreting the numbers (Jencik, 2011), there is room for researcher bias. The way a study is set up can contribute to data bias (Roulston & Shelton, 2015). In this study, participants had only a select number of choices on the survey. Another potential limitation existed when participants were informed about the research topic, they could have tailored their responses to what they thought was desirable. In addition to trying to please the researcher, participants were being asked about their workplace practice, which could have led to concerns about confidentiality and less than honest responses.

I attempted to minimize the limitations by using existing scales, having the survey reviewed, and including a confidentiality statement for participants. There are ways I tried to ensure the survey questions captured the relevant responses for this research and that the questions were not misleading. I carefully selected existing instruments, with proven validity and the survey went through several rounds of review, including feedback from a pilot group and the dissertation committee.

To address the honesty of the participants, I added a confidentiality statement informing participants they would not be individually identified in the invitation to participate in the study. Additionally, the opening statements encouraged the participants to be honest, noting their perception would be helpful to the research. Implementing these strategies helped minimize the identified limitations of this research.
Significance of the Study

Although this study focused on mandatory online training for faculty members, workplace learning and performance are universal concerns for most organizations, the instructional technology community, and the practitioners in talent development fields. There is a gap in the research surrounding the growing trend of mandatory online training and the motivation to transfer training by university faculty members. Islam (2019) researched faculty members’ motivation to transfer training but limited the study to faculty members sharing the information with others. This study included faculty members’ motivation to use the skills and information from training. Hode et al. (2018) studied university faculty members and staff about the usefulness of information presented in an online training but did not include the motivation to transfer training component. Hode et al.’s (2018) research also focused on learning theories instead of the self-efficacy theory or social exchange theory. This study contributes to the field of instructional technology by contributing to the research surrounding mandatory online employee training. It is important to investigate if faculty members are more motivated to transfer training when they have higher self-efficacy regarding mandatory online training. Another significant contribution to the body of knowledge exists in researching whether training self-efficacy and perceived utility are high and how this influences the level of faculty members’ motivation to transfer skills and knowledge from mandatory online training to the workplace.

Summary

Research is considered valid when there is strong support and rationale (Roulston & Shelton, 2015). The literature review includes studies from the education and organizational
learning fields on online training advantages, challenges, and methods. Important research surrounding motivation to transfer mandatory online training is missing from the body of knowledge (Peterson & Mc Cleery, 2014). This study addresses gaps in the literature pertaining to university employees’ perceptions of and the relationship among training utility, training self-efficacy, and motivation to apply such knowledge and skills acquired through mandatory online training to workplace practice. Moreover, this study triangulated quantitative (survey) and qualitative (interview) data to better understand the participants’ motivation, efficacy, and intention to transfer mandated online training into their workplace practice. The method for data collection is described in Chapter 3. Training effectiveness is linked to training transfer, and therefore, researching the motivation to transfer training and to what extent employees apply skills and information from mandatory trainings will help maximize workplace training, organizational resources, and employee output.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter examines online training and mandatory training to identify gaps in the research that combine the two areas. There is a review of the challenges and advantages of online training and perceptions surrounding the effectiveness of online training. Employees’ perceptions of training effectiveness and training usefulness are explored in relation to employees’ motivation to transfer the knowledge and skills learned during mandatory online training. The chapter also reviews literature on the social exchange theory and self-efficacy theory as they relate to the employees’ perceived costs and rewards of mandatory online training and the effect on training transfer.

Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory may inform university faculty participants’ motivation to transfer such knowledge and skills from mandatory online trainings into their workplace practice. This section covers the history, assumptions, and utility of the theory. Social exchange theory’s (SET) roots, for which Muldoon et al. (2018) gives credit to sociologist George Homans’s (1958) work, can be traced back to the rituals of gift exchange and the dynamics in relationships. The social exchange theory (Organ et al., 2006) has evolved to testable costs and rewards (West & Turner, 2010) or a costs and benefits (Muldoon et al., 2018) theory used in this study to further explore workplace learning, interactions, perceptions, and behaviors. Cole et al. (2002) explained cost as
the resources, time, and effort an employee invests and rewards as the support, incoming income, affection, and goods received by an employee. The social exchange theory assumes the value of cost and rewards vary among employees (West & Turner, 2010) and using the instruments in this study, the results investigated to what extent employees feel it is worth it to transfer training.

Social exchange theory has been used to look at the positive supportive interactions and experiences by employees and the outcomes that effect job satisfactions (Harden et al., 2018) and perceived organizational support (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Applying the social exchange theory to the Harden (2018) study, researchers found federal IT employees were committed to staying with the organization based on their perception of workload, perception of fair bonuses and benefits, and their ability to use and advance technology skills. The employees had to perceive the rewards outweigh the cost to continue their commitment to the organization. The theory is appropriate for the current research because the study used the unidimensional social exchange theory model (Cropanzano et al., 2017) to demonstrate the relationship between motivation to transfer learning from mandatory online training and university employees’ perceptions of support, efficacy, and training usefulness (Figure 1). Cropanzano et al. uses a hedonic value framework on a gratification axis to demonstrate how to optimize interactions with employees to get the desired results. The model separates the variables into initiating action and target responses. The higher the initiating action moves in a desirable actions zone, the more the target response will likely fall into a desirable response zone. And so, the reverse is the lower the initiating action moves into an undesirable actions zone, the more the target response will likely fall into an undesirable response zone. Cropanzano et al. pulls from the social exchange theory to further explore how the initiating actions trigger the responses. The current study used the unidimensional model to explore the reciprocity scale of how to get employees to the
desirable response of motivation to transfer training. The perception of utility and perception of support was studied as possible variables to triggering the desirable or undesirable levels of motivation to transfer training.

Cropanzano et al. (2017) expanded the model to include deeper elements of relationship to explore the trust and distrust of employee-supervisor pairs and the actions that occur in that dynamic. This study only used the unidimensional model in investigating the university employee perceptions about mandatory online training and their motivation to incorporate such information into their workplace practice. Applying social exchange theory was paired with the theory of self-efficacy to explain the relationship of faculty members’ perceived rewards (PTU, TSE) with the motivation to transfer training (MTT) to their workplace practice.

Training Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy explained to what extent, if any, mandatory online training motivated faculty members to use the information in their everyday workplace practice and if there is a relationship between their motivation, perception about the utility of such trainings and training self-efficacy. Bandura (1994) explained four sources of efficacy information as learning from adversity, witnessing others carry out a task successfully, persuasion to succeed in a task due to social expectations, and altering self-doubt to reduce stress. Additionally, four psychological processes are associated with self-efficacy research: cognitive, affective, selection, and motivational. The cognitive is the mental process of developing self-efficacy in which an individual has to fight against self-doubt. The affective is how well an individual can deal with the stress of their perceived efficacy. The selection is the process in which self-efficacy confidence relates to the choices made. The higher the perceived self-efficacy in a choice, the
higher the chance the choice is selected. Motivational is explained by an individual’s goals, expected outcomes, and perception of their attributes. To further explore the four sources and process of self-efficacy surrounding faculty members’ mandatory online training transfer the training self-efficacy (TSE) instrument was used.

The training self-efficacy instrument was originally developed by Bandura (1990, 2012), who influenced much of the self-efficacy research. Bandura (2012) gives the most accurate ways to measure self-efficacy when assessing attitudes or opinions. The current study sought the perception of employees and applied the Likert scale to the training self-efficacy instrument. Bandura warned of trying to narrow the self-efficacy measures, which could weaken the survey instrument results. This study avoided trying to narrow the self-efficacy scale to a single task and instead focused on confidence level as a result of mandatory online training by looking to Ford et al.’s (1992) research that used an eight-item (seven-point) self-efficacy scale to study perceptions of training. Later, Guthrie and Schwoerer (1994) developed a training specific seven-point Likert-type response scale (Cronbach’s α = .82; 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = neither agree or disagree, 5 = somewhat agree, 6 = agree, 7 = strongly agree). Arefin and Islam (2018) tested Machin and Fogarty’s (1997) self-efficacy scale and found a Cronbach’s =0.83, composite reliability=0.90, and average variance extracted = .75. Also, the self-efficacy scale used by Ford et al. (1992) found reliability of .81. (see Appendix C). Training self-efficacy research and the proven instrument helped determine whether training self-efficacy moderated faculty members’ motivation to transfer mandatory online training to workplace practice more than faculty members’ perception of mandatory online training utility. Bandura (1994) addressed the development of self-efficacy over time, and with a mandatory
online workplace training taking place before this study, participants were given time to grow in self-efficacy regarding the knowledge or skills from the training.

**Online Training**

As universities responded to the pandemic’s social distancing protocols, mandatory online training became necessary. Online training is commonly termed e-learning, which is “defined as the transfer of knowledge and skills, in a well-designed course content that has established accreditations, through an electronic medial like the internet, Web 4.0, intranets and extranets” (Choudhury & Pattnaik, 2020, p. 2). Researchers recommend that organizations develop a long-term strategic plan to ensure online training is a part of the company culture and has a positive effect on the future success of the organization (Kamall et al., 2016).

A qualitative study by Newton and Doonga (2007) analyzed interview responses concerning the reasons for using e-training, the perceived benefits of e-training, and the measures used to evaluate the e-training effectiveness of 63 training managers and 38 training suppliers. Newton and Doonga found the training managers viewed flexibility in addition to cost savings as a benefit to e-training. They found the modalities most used for e-training delivery were web-based (84%), followed by CDs and videos (42%).

There are numerous benefits to organizations implementing online training. Managers perceived the most common advantages are the flexibility, accessibility, and customization (Kimiloglu et al., 2017). The accessibility theme was expanded when Kimiloglu et al. found there were no barriers regarding who could take advantage of technology-mediated learning. In addition to the benefits, there are challenges to online training that include keeping all stakeholders in the loop and having the tools to roll out such a training (Macpherson et al., 2004).
Kimiloglu et al. (2017) surveyed managers to explore the organizational perspective of online training and found the managers preferred training that combined classroom and online learning. Four areas were perceived as advantages of online learning: employee motivation and involvement, convenience, flexibility of customizing content, and low cost. The disadvantages included employee concentration, communication challenges, a lack of company support, the infrastructure, or the lack of competent individuals to take training.

Companies blending online training increased employees’ perceptions of competency when online training accompanied in-person training (Wahl-Alexander et al., 2018). Choudhury and Pattnaik (2020) identified that individual learners and stakeholders share responsibility for ensuring effective e-learning. However, a disadvantage to e-learning can be the learner not developing true connectedness. The lack of feedback and nonverbal cues leaves the implementer and learner with an ambiguous perception of the success of the e-learning environment. Choudhury and Pattnaik explained the initial challenges stakeholders face when starting an e-learning course, such as not having the proper technology, bandwidth, or buy in from the learning community.

Kimiloglu et al. (2017) found no barriers to accessing online training; however, research of worldwide post pandemic online training by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2020) found barriers to taking online training. The adult training barriers included participants’ motivation to take the training, time commitment, the inconvenience of where to take the training, lack of financial resources to take the training, lack of employer support, unexpected events, and lack of prerequisites. Training participants’ family and other work-related commitments were included as variables that hindered their full participation in online learning.
Mandatory Training

Mandatory training, a required employee training arranged by the employer, has been investigated qualitatively and quantitatively. This section reviews the research surrounding mandatory training’s effectiveness. Organizations added mandatory safety training to empower employees to take precautions to reduce the spread of the coronavirus (Guan et al., 2020), but safety training has been required in many industries. Abdelhakim et al. (2018) evaluated the effectiveness of mandatory airline food safety training using the Kirkpatrick Model. The researchers’ qualitative data collection included semi-structured interviews and observations. Food safety behaviors were observed both during and following training to assess the effectiveness on workplace behavior. A limitation of this study was the lack of quantitative data to support the qualitative findings. Research has found employees have an unfavorable view of mandatory training and do not invest the same effort they would into training they attend by choice or provide the same quality feedback when surveyed about the experience (Mythen & Gidman, 2011). The decision makers and designers for employee training are tasked with creating effective mandatory training without including choice by employees. The increased social distancing efforts prioritize online training over in-person training. Trainers and developers are tasked with helping learners receive the best experience in an online training they feel forced to attend. The current research helped determine the motivation of faculty members to use the knowledge from mandatory training and its ability to lead to adjustments for future training.

Mandatory training has been increasingly moved to an online method (Lakewood Media Group LLC, 2020). The challenges of online training – such as employee concentration,
communication, lack of company support, lack of infrastructure, or lack of competent individuals
to take training (Kimiloglu et al., 2017) – are compounded by the extra layer of learners feeling
forced to attend a mandatory training. The same advantages occur in mandatory online training
(Greene & Marcham, 2019) as with all other online training, such as consistency, time
efficiency, cost savings, and self-paced learning. Mandatory online training overcomes the
stigma associated with required training by giving employees flexibility as to when and where
they can take the training, which may indicate an advantage of implementing mandatory training
in an online format (Gegenfurtner et al., 2016). Offering these simple choices can increase the
benefits of the training on employee knowledge transfer. A study of employees at a Portuguese
insurance company tested autonomous motivation and controlled motivation to transfer learning
from training. The study found employees who attend training voluntarily are more intrinsically
motivated to use their skills learned in training on the job (Curado et al., 2015).

Employees who have organizational support surrounding mandatory training has been
researched as well. Salamon et al. (2021) surveyed 380 managers (54%) and non-managers and
found mandatory training without organization support lowers the motivation to transfer training.
The results showed supervisor support was a significant predictor of the motivation to transfer
from a mandatory training. Supervisory support was also a significant determinant of motivation
to transfer training in Arefin and Islam’s (2018) study of banking officers’ desire to use what
they learned in training. Another variable that significantly affected the motivation to transfer
was for the banking officers to have the opportunity to use the information from training.

The current study used a survey design similar to the research design chosen by
Kimiloglu, Ozturan, and Kutlu (2017). Findings from the results of their 19-question survey
allowed the researchers to conclude that the companies wanted to include instructional
technology with their customary trainings. Although Guthrie and Schwoerer (1994) found only a moderate correlation between job tenure and training utility, a non-significant relationship was found regarding employees’ perceptions of the need for training, but the managers and supervisors in that study had been with the organization an average of 6.9 years. The current survey included demographic questions asking about time with the organization. Due to the multiple types of mandatory training – from safety training (Abdelhakim et al., 2018) to ethics, harassment, or security training (Peterson & McCleery, 2014), there was a question for participants to identify the different types of mandatory training they have attended online and when the trainings were attended as variables relevant to the current study.

The effectiveness of mandatory online training can be examined through the lens of social exchange theory by assessing the influence of perceived rewards (PTU, TSE) on the motivation to transfer training (MTT). A study (Beckett, 2020) on continued professional development investigated nurses engaging in required training in an e-learning platform mandated for their profession. The survey included 39 pediatric nurses (20 to 65 years old) with some new to the profession, less than five years, and some seasoned with over 20 years of service. Data collection included interviews and surveys for a mixed methods approach. The survey questions were about e-learning’s value and the contributions to continued professional development. Also included were questions about the flexibility and accessibility of e-learning. The nurses were given access to modules not in the mandated curriculum and they only did the required courses in the e-learning modules. The mixed methods study found 74% of the nurses agreed or strongly agreed that e-learning specific to their practice was valuable. Almost all (97%) nurses disagreed with all mandatory training being online, but they did acknowledge e-learning gave them flexibility and helped with their professional development. However, 62%
did not prefer to have mandatory training online. The study showed, in the case of the pediatric nurses, their e-learning system was not easy to navigate and they did not feel they were given enough time to complete the e-learning. The challenges of time and accessibility issues with their specific mandatory online training may have an influence on their responses. The nurses were motivated to do the mandatory training because of extrinsic rewards of meeting the professional board requirements to revalidate their license. The nurses who were intrinsically motivated felt learning other topics was reward enough for them to do the extra modules outside of the mandatory e-learning. The nurses from the interviews made the connection that their completing extra modules in addition to the mandatory training would pay off in the rewards of being the best nurse.

Based on the review of quantitative and qualitative research surrounding mandatory training, the current study used a mixed method sequential triangulation approach through survey results to collect quantitative data and qualitative interviews (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007) to verify the quantitative responses. The approach helped identify how faculty members described their mandatory online training experiences and perceptions of mandatory training themes that may emerge during data analysis (Attride-Stirling, 2001).

**Perception of Training Effectiveness**

Training effectiveness research connects to faculty members’ motivation to use the information from mandatory training in their everyday workplace practice. This section further defines effectiveness, reviews the research history and addresses the models used for training effectiveness assessment. A meta-analysis of 761 papers on the effectiveness of e-learning revealed that many studies operationalized the term effectiveness, measuring it by the way
employees meet training objectives and applying the learning outcomes in the workplace (Noesgaard & Ørngreen, 2015). Education effectiveness researchers Creemers and Kyriakides (2015) defined effectiveness with two dimensions: quality and equity. Quality was based on how much was achieved or the outcomes. Equity covered the breadth or variety of effects. In the 1980s, research attempted to identify the characteristics of organizational effectiveness as a construct. One such study by Hall (1980) found goal attainment was one basis for organizational effectiveness. Yet, because goals varied among organizations, such diversity made goal attainment a complex variable to define and measure. Similarly, work by Faerman and Quinn (2017) found organizational effectiveness to be a difficult construct to define due to variations of situations, contexts, and/or stakeholder cultures.

Perceptions of effectiveness were researched to create criteria to define effectiveness (Cameron & Whetten, 1981). Research reports that effective training can maximize participants’ learning (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2007). For example, Kontoghiorghes (2002) reported the relationship between training effectiveness and three factors: training transfer, work environment, and learning during training. As mentioned earlier, Santos and Stuart (2006) defined training effectiveness as a combination of the quality of the training, the trainees’ attitudes toward the training, and management practices. Their case study researched influences on training effectiveness in an English financial company in 1999. The value of training and encouragement to pursue professional development influenced the perception of effectiveness. Santos and Stuart (2006) recommended that management should offer encouragement of professional development and extrinsic rewards following training to motivate employees to transfer training. The current study used social exchange theory as a framework to further explore the relationship of rewards and faculty members’ motivation to transfer training.
Training Effectiveness

Several models and theories have been used to address the effectiveness of training, including the Technology Acceptance Model ([TAM]; Choudhury & Pattnaik, 2020; Kimiloglu et al., 2017; Ramayah et al., 2012). Kimiloglu et al. investigated the perceptions in a business community of Turkey when integrating e-learning into their corporate training. Survey results were analyzed using quantitative methods. The research found companies wanted to include the instructional technology with their customary trainings as long as the advantages of incorporating the technology outweighed the disadvantages. The companies already using e-learning in their corporate training had a more positive outlook and perceived more advantages to having the technology. Kimiloglu et al.’s findings related to perceptions of advantages and disadvantages of e-learning usage. Similarly, Choudhury and Pattnaik (2020) used content analysis of 138 e-learning studies and found that TAM was commonly used. The researchers’ synthesis method identified articles by narrowing to select criteria: business journals, in English language, and including topics of e-learning. They noted the model’s importance to studying e-learning success, challenges, and advantages. Additionally, they found that many studies included user satisfaction as a variable and recommended considering use of learned content to determine effectiveness.

The current study researched faculty perceptions on motivation to transfer training. Although several models can be used to explore faculty perceptions of training effectiveness, the Kotter’s change theory model was used as the framework to research University of Michigan faculty leaders’ perceptions of the success of an interprofessional education program (Najjar & Ascione, 2020). Kotter’s eight-step change process included the following: create a sense of
urgency, build a guiding coalition, form a strategic vision, enlist a volunteer army, enable action by removing barriers, generate (and celebrate) short term wins, sustain acceleration, and institute change. The research was guided by questions like “What possible strategies did they endorse to support successful IPE implementation?” The case study included faculty interviews and an in-depth review of University of Michigan’s five-year IPE initiative. Eight themes emerged: leadership role, negative influences, positive influences, and endorsed implementation strategies, each had their own sub-themes. The researchers then correlated the themes to the steps in Kotter’s change process model to ensure the successful implementation of the IPE in five years. The current study implemented a similar approach by using a sample of university employees and several instruments (Ford & Noe, 1987; Ford et al. 1992; Madera et al., 2011; Noe & Schmitt, 1986) to gather their individual perceptions. Effectiveness is a vital component of online mandatory training. Evaluation theorists (e.g., Chen, 1994) state that the worth of a program is overlooked when judging entirely on outcomes, which is why the perceptions of the stakeholders is significant when looking at the influence on transfer of training.

Training is important to university employees (Gallaudet University, 2017). When employees receive quality training, they feel they are valued by the organization and their commitment to the organization’s success increases (University of Texas at Austin, 2017). A study of 297 Taiwanese engineers found learner satisfaction with workplace e-learning systems was not affected by the environment, but it was increased by the positive attitude of supervisors and colleagues. Acceptance also led to the employees’ higher level of engagement (Lin et al., 2019).

Employee engagement is closely connected to training effectiveness and employee motivation. Employee engagement is defined as “employees [who] work with passion and feel a
profound connection to their company” (SHRM, 2011, p. 4). Research (e.g., Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2016) shows engagement to explain employees’ motivation to learn in online training platforms. For the current study, engagement referred to the employees’ experience with the online training. Engagement theory can be used to research how learners interact with the training technology. However, it does not address the effectiveness of individual self-directed computer-based training. Engagement theory is best applied to a collaborative computer-based learning study (Kearsley & Shneiderman, 1998), which was outside the scope of the current study.

Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2016) found employees’ perceptions were influenced by training satisfaction, engagement, and feelings about the relevancy of the training. A quantitative study by Joo, Lim, and Park (2011) looked at the effect supervisors, peers, and the organization have on the corporate learning environment. Correlations were found between the participants’ ability to use the knowledge from their e-learning program and the organizational support. Joo et al. also found that organizational support was statistically significant regarding learning transfer. When the employees were engaged and invested in learning they were more likely to absorb the training material.

An employee’s ability to use skills learned in training on the job (i.e., learning transfer, transfer of training, or transfer of learning) is described in Egan (2020). Beinicke and Bipp (2018) compared training methods, looking at the training transfer research or training effectiveness of corporate e-learning versus the corporate classroom training. However, the current study filled the gap in the research related to mandatory online trainings by surveying faculty.
To better understand the employees’ perceptions of training effectiveness, Noe and Schmitt (1986) structured a training program model using surveys results taken during a two-day training program for educators; 20 of the 60 were assistant principals. The training participants’ immediate supervisor and four co-workers, two teachers and two administrative staff, were surveyed on learning behavior performance. There were questions about the participants’ activity level – for example how often they used the skills from training. The participants also took the survey on learning, behavior and performance as well as assessments on career planning and reactions to training assessment, which included items on motivation to learn, transfer, and the environment. Immediately after training, the participants were given the motivation to transfer (see Appendix C) and work environmental scales, which surveyed their perception of the favorability of the work environment and how much control the participant held. The researchers found learning had a significant effect on performance improvement, the participants’ perception of whether they agreed with their strengths and weakness in the skills assessment, directly influenced how satisfied they were with the training. If the participant disagreed that they were weak in an area of the training, they were less satisfied with the training. If the participant agreed they were weak in an area of the training, they were more likely to see the training as useful and were more satisfied with the training.

The adapted Cropanzano et al. (2017) social exchange theory unidimensional model gratification axis moving from undesirable actions to desirable action is in alignment with Noe and Schmitt’s (1986) assessment of training attitudes on training effectiveness. Noe and Schmitt found there was a significant effect on the desired response (reaction) of behavior change from training by participants who were invested in career advancement. This would indicate the participants who saw the training as helpful to their future success (reward) attended the training
(cost) and found it was worthwhile (worth) to apply the information and skills from training. Noe and Schmitt found that “motivation to transfer and perceptions of the favorability of the work environment for the use of new skills may influence the training effectiveness” (p. 519). However, they acknowledged the scope of their research was to construct the influence on the training model and although the motivation to transfer scale was used, it was not explored to the full extent, which is why the current study is significant.

**Perception of Training Utility and Self-Efficacy**

Faculty’s perception of training utility and self-efficacy may influence their motivation to transfer training to their workplace practice. This section further defines training utility and explores the instrument used to assess employees’ perceptions of the usefulness of training. Training utility is the usefulness of skills and knowledge in everyday workplace performance. Guthrie and Schwoerer’s (1994) research found managerial support, education level, and training self-efficacy have an effect on perceptions of training utility. Their survey of 715 managers and supervisors found perceptions of training utility positively associated with training self-efficacy and managerial support, which gives weight to the current exploration of the relationship between the perceived utility of a mandatory online training and motivation to transfer. The researchers adapted Bandura’s (2012) self-efficacy measures to focus on the strengths and tasks specifically related to training self-efficacy. Self-efficacy and managerial support are important variables in the perceived utility of training and, therefore, have an effect on motivation to transfer training. The current study analyzed motivation to transfer training as the outcome variable, and perception of training utility and training self-efficacy were predictor variables.
Research has also shown how self-efficacy influences transfer from training. Organizational leaders from a multinational IT company’s corporate e-learning course were given an online survey asking them to rank their perceptions of the course (Wong & Sixl-Daniell, 2017). The researchers measured the organizational effectiveness by the program outcomes and whether the employees perceived they were competent in the necessary job skills. The majority of the participants perceived their research (67.57%), written communication (66.22%), and time management (81.08%) skills were better as a result of the course. Over 90% of the participants reported they slightly agreed they were eager to work and felt more competent to carry out their job.

Self-efficacy and perception of training utility research is used to analyze training effectiveness to improve training or assess training needs. Ford and Noe’s (1987) research studying the effect of managers on employee’s perceptions of the usefulness of training incorporated the training utility scale. The scale includes five items questioning the relevance of the skills learned in training and whether the time spent in training was worthwhile. The 506 managers received a training needs assessment, which surveyed the training utility scale, their assessment of training needs in 80 skill areas, their job supervisory levels, and their functional specialties. The levels were classified as first-line supervisor, second-line supervisor, and third-line supervisor. They found the managers with a favorable perception of training utility desired more training on quality control. In training needs or training effectiveness research, some studies included the perception of organizational support (Guthrie & Schwoerer, 1994), which is addressed further in the next section.

Post training self-efficacy and the perception of a supportive environment were assessed by Ford et al. (1992) to study connections to training transfer. The study included 180 (mostly
male) Air Force airmen and their supervisors. The supervisors were surveyed about their perceptions of the airman, which included likability, potential, ability to trust the airman, and how much work gets done in their department (what the researchers called workflow). The airmen survey included questions on types of tasks performed and how often (researchers termed it activity level), perceived supervisor support, and self-efficacy. The researchers received the airman’s ability measure through a military provided Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) test score to analyze as an additional determinate to training transfer. The survey used the 10-item perceived organizational support scale that included questions about the supportive environment created by the supervisor and coworkers. The airmen also answered the eight-item self-efficacy instrument to rate their level of confidence in performing the task from training. Ford et al. (1992) found the higher the self-efficacy level, the more the airmen performed the task from training, including harder tasks. Airmen were more likely to perform the harder task when there was a supportive environment.

Organizational support affects other key areas of employee perception about on the job trainings (Guthrie & Schwoerer, 1994). Madera et al. (2011) included 92 management consultants, who were surveyed immediately after and six months after a five-day training program that introduced them to a new method for training other consultants. The researchers assessed the consultants’ perceptions of training utility, organizational support, and use of a new method introduced in the training. The organization at which the training occurred provided the researchers with Ford et al.’s (1992) perceptions of organizational support tool to study the effect of perceived organizational support on the perception of training utility. Madera et al. (2011) found perception of training utility is fluid because the consultants’ responses changed between the pre-test and the post-test which was given six months later. When surveyed immediately
participants’ perception of training utility did not have a significant effect on their training transfer, but there was a significant correlation six months later. Also, when there was high organizational support, adoption of the new training method was high immediately as well as six months after training. Organizational support had a direct effect on whether the consultants used the new method. Dachner et al. (2019) also found the best way organizations can maximize learning transfer is by supporting employees in their development.

Faculty’s perception of training utility can be assessed using the perceptions of training utility (PTU) five-item instrument developed by Ford and Noe (1987) and used by others (e.g., Madera et al., 2011). This is a seven-point Likert-type response scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = neither agree or disagree, 5 = somewhat agree, 6 = agree, 7 = strongly agree). The purpose of this instrument is to describe the usability of training as perceived by employees who complete the training. When studying the effect of managers on employee’s perception of the usefulness of training, Ford and Noe (1987) incorporated the training utility scale and noted an internal consistency of .87. Guthrie and Schwoerer (1994) adapted Ford and Noe’s (1987) five-item training utility scale because an item duplicated the support scale used for data collection. The substitute question still resulted in a five-item scale (Cronbach’s α = .87). Guthrie and Schwoerer studied how self-efficacy and manager support affected employees’ perceptions of training utility. The scale used by Madera, Steele, and Beier (2011) studied the effect of perceived organizational support on perception of training utility and found an internal consistency between .84 and .85. Ford replied to a request for permission to use the instrument in this study and delivered copies of questionnaires and scoring procedures for this study (see Appendix C; K. Ford, personal communication, October 12, 2021).
with organization, supervisor experience, and categories of mandatory online trainings attended, including but not limited to sexual harassment, cybersecurity, workplace ethics, and safety are related to faculty’s perception of mandatory online training utility.

Motivation to Transfer Training

There are few studies on university and college faculty’s motivation to transfer mandatory online training into practice. Therefore, to investigate to what extent, if any, mandatory online training motivates faculty to use the information in their everyday workplace practice, this section begins with employee motivation research. Employee motivation to perform new skills and their investment in carrying out the skills work together to influence adoption (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2016). To further explain, motivation to transfer training is the desire of the employee to use the information or skills from training post training (Noe & Schmitt, 1986). Several studies have been conducted on employee motivation to transfer training. A highly cited study surveyed 40 police officers after a three-day training program (Machin & Fogarty, 1997). The participants received a pre-training survey day one, a second survey after training day two, and a survey one week after the training. Machin and Fogarty used Noe’s (1986) motivation to transfer training instrument to measure the relationships among variables: self-efficacy, motivation to learn, training performance goals, goal achievement, training transfer goal, training reactions, and situational constraints. Using the same tool, Arefin and Islam (2018) found self-efficacy and motivation to transfer related to the success of the participants using the information from training. The training reactions affected motivation to transfer and self-efficacy. Arefin and Islam’s study of randomly selected bank officers suggests three causes were present in the motivation to transfer training. Self-efficacy was found to be a
determinant of motivation to transfer training. Another finding included supervisory support as a determinant of motivation to transfer training. Lastly, the banking officers having the opportunity to use the information from training affected their motivation to transfer. Both studies (Arefin & Islam, 2018; Machin & Fogarty, 1997) found self-efficacy and supervisory support influenced the motivation to transfer training. A recent Hungarian study found mandatory training without organization support reduced the motivation to transfer training through an adapted version of Noe and Schmitt’s (1986) motivation to transfer scale (Salamon et al., 2021). Because no significant relationship was found, the current study did not include career commitment and awareness of how the training connected to their organization’s strategic goals as variables, which is similar to Arefin and Islam’s (2018) study. However, the current study used Noe and Schmitt’s (1986) motivation to transfer training instrument to explore perceived support further by analyzing the variables within a mandatory online training format.

The motivation to transfer survey items are most appropriate for measuring employees’ mandatory online training transfer motivation (Machin & Fogarty, 1997; Noe & Schmitt, 1986). Noe and Schmitt developed the scale when evaluating the effectiveness of a school administrators’ training program. The motivation to transfer scale was combined with motivation to learn and environmental favorability to assess the participants’ reactions to the training. The combined scale of 21 items had a high internal consistency (α=.95). Arefin and Islam (2018) tested Machin and Fogarty’s (1997) motivation to transfer scale and found Cronbach’s α = .923, composite reliability = .945, and average variance extracted= .812. Permission to use the instrument has been provided by Raymond Noe (see Appendix C; R. Noe, personal communication, October 4, 2021). Evidence in previously cited research demonstrates limitations in exploring motivation to transfer mandatory online training. Using the perception of
training utility (PTU), training self-efficacy (TSE), and motivation to transfer training (MTT) instruments, the current study explored whether training self-efficacy moderates faculty’s motivation to transfer mandatory online training to workplace practice more than faculty’s perception of mandatory online training utility.

Summary

This study fills the gap in the research related to mandatory online trainings by surveying faculty within the framework of self-efficacy and the social exchange theory. Self-efficacy and managerial support are important variables in the perceived utility of training and therefore have an effect on motivation to transfer training and were evaluated with a narrow focus on mandatory online training. Managerial support was removed as a variable for this study because the trainings for this study are mandatory and require participant participation regardless of support for the training. Some studies use the social exchange theory to better understand relationships, organizational support, and job satisfaction. This study explored the theory by including employee motivation to transfer training skills and knowledge.

There are studies on online training or mandatory training, but the current study adds to the body of knowledge of combining mandatory online training. The literature included research on online training, mandatory training, motivation to transfer training, perception of training utility, and training self-efficacy. The limitations were explored to explain the significance of the current study. The current research combined the concept of employees who lack control over the training they attend and the mode of the mandatory training takes place outside the traditional classroom setting. Overall, training effectiveness is linked to training transfer and, therefore,
researching the motivation to transfer training and to what extent employees apply skills and information from mandatory training helps maximize workplace training.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodology used to answer the research questions: specifically, the research design, participants, recruitment procedures, instrument, procedures, and analysis. As noted in Chapter 1, the purpose of this study was to examine faculty’s perceptions of mandatory online training with respect to motivation to transfer training, training utility, and training self-efficacy.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extent are the demographic variables related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy?

2. To what extent is the frequency and type of mandatory online training related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy?

3. To what extent is mandatory online training self-efficacy (the belief in one’s capability to perform successfully in mandatory online training) related to faculty members’ motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge/skills?
4. To what extent is perception of mandatory online training utility related to faculty motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge and skills?

5. How do faculty describe their mandatory online training experience?

This chapter uses the research questions to align the descriptions of the study design and methodology.

Research Design

The current study used a sequential triangulation mixed-methods design (Johnson et al., 2007). Quantitative data were collected and analyzed to explain or predict the outcomes. However, qualitative interviews were also conducted to understand if the participants’ perceptions revealed more details surrounding the motivation to transfer mandatory online training in alignment with the quantitative survey results. The use of both quantitative and qualitative techniques in the same study added to the validity of findings (Leech & Onwegbuzie, 2007). This study combined quantitative and qualitative research through the mixed method of sequential triangulation, in which the results of the quantitative method led to the qualitative method (Johnson et al., 2007).

Participants

Faculty from a large public university and a community college in the Midwest were recruited for study participation. Both institutions require faculty to complete mandatory online training. The university had a population of over 17,000 students, around 1,144 faculty, and 42 different schools within seven colleges. The community college had a population of nearly 3,300 students, 180 faculty, and 70 degree or certificate programs. A convenience sample of 1,324
faculty was used for this study. A random sample from the pool of participants who volunteered to be contacted after the survey was selected for subsequent interviews. A priori G* Power analysis was done, assuming $\alpha=0.05$, a medium effect size and power of 80%. For this study, 55 faculty members were determined to be the minimum sample size needed for the linear regression analysis.

There were 873 survey invitation emails sent to faculty, there were 111 survey participants, and 24 volunteers for the qualitative interviews. Eight interviews were conducted.

Data Collection

The data collection process used an online survey instrument created and distributed through Qualtrics. The participants were contacted through an email containing an explanation of the study and a link to the survey instrument (see Appendix D). To gain access to the survey instrument, the participants were given a screening question – “Have you attended mandatory ONLINE training assigned by your employer?” – to determine if they met the criteria for inclusion in the research. Based on the response, participants were advanced to the remaining survey items. If participants respond “no” to the screening item, they were excluded from the study and received a “Thank you for your time” banner on their computer.

A Midwest university and a Midwest community college were contacted to request access to their faculty for participation in the study. I sent an email to the heads of the support offices at the universities who provided mandatory online training for their staff. Once the emails were returned, the responses directed me on what steps to take to get permission to distribute my survey instrument to their staff members. The Midwest two-year community college distributed the online survey instrument to faculty once a copy of the Institutional Review Board
application, survey instrument and IRB approval had been sent to their Office of Institutional Research (see Appendix B). Their office reviewed and approved my request, and the college then shared faculty contact information. The faculty members who volunteered to be a part of the study were contacted for participation.

The public Midwest university used in this study directed me to work with the proper university channels in the teaching support office to gain access to the faculty email addresses and request their participation in the survey. This required a copy of the approved IRB application and contact information for the IRB administrator at the researching institution.

For this study I asked the faculty to complete an online survey instrument via an email with details about the study and a Qualtrics link to the survey instrument. I obtained the sample from university employees who had participated in at least one mandatory training in an online format given by their organization. The convenience sample was asked to share their perceptions of mandatory online training, their motivation to incorporate the knowledge and skills from their mandatory online training, their perceptions about training utility and training self-efficacy surrounding such training.

Prior to collecting data, I submitted an application through the Institutional Review Board for approval to conduct this study. Upon approval, I reached out to the college and universities and requested their permission to distribute the survey instrument to the faculty in their institutions.

The survey instrument was distributed electronically through Qualtrics, a web-based survey instrument for collecting data. A statement that completion of the survey instrument constituted consent to participate in the survey was included in the email invitation. The informed consent statement included a description of the study, the nature of each component of
the survey instrument, and the estimate of how long it would take the participant to complete the survey, which was less than 10 minutes.

Initial contact with university participants was sent to their email addresses and included a link to the survey instrument. Future use of the information was shared with participants in the email invitation, so they could voluntarily choose to participate or opt out without any consequences. In addition to the survey, a qualitative interview volunteer request was added to the survey. The item consisted of the following statement: “If you wish to participate in a follow up interview, please provide your email address for the researcher to contact you. Randomly selected volunteers will be contacted through email and scheduled for an interview.”

Instrumentation

The existing instruments to measure motivation to transfer training knowledge and skills, perceived training utility, and training self-efficacy are described here. The study collected data using eight demographic items, one screening item, one invitation to participate in a follow up interview, and a 16-item survey instrument created and validated by Ford and Noe (1987), Ford et al. (1992), Guthrie and Schwoerer (1994), and Madera et al. (2011). The survey instrument was made available immediately after the participant answered “Yes” to the screening question. The introduction to the survey items explained that “the results of this survey will be used to improve mandatory online training” and participants were told this was a research study.

The item response options in the instrumentation were modified from the original seven-point Likert items to six-point Likert items (Nadler et al., 2015). To analyze the effect of the multiple interpretations on the response options for a quantitative survey instrument, the researchers looked at how the descriptive statistics would change with a “neither” or “no
opinion” anchor as a response. Although the values were still within the 95% confidence and there was no statistical difference in attitudes using the forced options of the four-point scale, there was variety in the interpretations of the midpoint. Adapts were made in this survey instrument to work toward clarity on survey items and less ambiguity in the interpretation of the findings. Due to the adaptations of reducing the seven-point Likert items (1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat disagree, 4 = Neither agree or disagree, 5 = Somewhat agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly agree) used in the previously cited research to six-point Likert items (1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat disagree, 4 = Somewhat agree, 5 = Agree, 6 = Strongly agree), the survey instrument revisions were taken through a series of reviews.

This section explains the use of the perceptions of training utility (PTU) instrument, the training self-efficacy (TSE) instrument, and the motivation to transfer training (MTT) instrument. First, the perceptions of training utility is a five-item instrument developed by Ford and Noe (1987) and used by others (e.g., Madera et al., 2011). In this study the instrument is a composite of five items (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.907$) that asks respondents to respond to six-point Likert items (1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Somewhat agree, 4 = Somewhat disagree, 5 = Disagree, 6 = Strongly disagree) to indicate their agreement or disagreement with statements related to this construct. The item stems consist of the following: “Mandatory online training has been useful for my professional development,” “The information in mandatory online training has been relevant to skills I had hoped to develop,” “The time spent to complete mandatory online training was worthwhile,” “I have been able to apply what I learned in mandatory online training in the workplace,” and “I have opportunities to practice the skills emphasized in the mandatory online training in the workplace.” These statements were changed to include terms specific to mandatory online training, reworded for consistency, and the seven Likert response
options were reduced to six. The author of the original instrument replied to a request for permission to use the instrument in this study and delivered copies of questionnaires and scoring procedures for this study (see Appendix C; K. Ford, personal communication, October 12, 2021).

Next, the training self-efficacy (TSE) instrument originally developed by Bandura (1990, 2012) and expanded in research by Guthrie and Schwoerer (1994) and Putter (2013) was considered. In this study the training self-efficacy instrument is a composite of six items (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.64$) that asks respondents to use a six-point Likert response options to indicate their agreement or disagreement with statements related to this construct (1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Somewhat agree, 4 = Somewhat disagree, 5 = Disagree, 6 = Strongly disagree). The item stems consist of the following: “I do well in mandatory online training,” “I am able to learn information and skills in mandatory online training,” “I am able to apply skills from mandatory online training,” and “I am able to apply what I have learned from mandatory online training.” These items were changed to include terms specific to mandatory online training, reworded for consistency, and modified from seven-point Likert items to six-point Likert items.

Lastly, the motivation to transfer (MTT) instrument (Machin & Fogarty, 1997; Noe & Schmitt, 1986) was used to measure participants’ mandatory online training transfer motivation. The instrument is a composite of seven items (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.814$) that asks respondents to respond to six-point Likert items, indicating their degree of agreement with statements related to this construct: 1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Somewhat agree, 4 = Somewhat disagree, 5 = Disagree, 6 = Strongly disagree. The item stems consist of the following: “The skills I learned during the mandatory online training will be helpful in solving work-related problems,” “I intend to use the knowledge and skills acquired from the mandatory online training when on the job,” “I set specific goals for maintaining the skills that I have learned from the mandatory online
training,” “I feel capable of using the skills developed in the mandatory online training in my everyday work,” “I know of work situations in which I plan to use what I have learned in the mandatory online training,” “I know using the skills covered during mandatory online training will result in better job performance,” and “It is important for me to use the skills covered during mandatory online training.” These items were changed to include terms specific to mandatory online training, reworded for consistency, and the seven-point Likert items were modified to six-point Likert items. One item from the original scale pertaining to trainers, “There are usually more problems than the trainers realize in using training program content in my daily work activities,” was replaced because this study is specific to mandatory online training. The new item states, “Using mandatory ONLINE training content will be helpful in solving work-related problems in my everyday work.” Permission to use the instrument was provided by the author (see Appendix C; R. Noe, personal communication, October 4, 2021).

In addition to the instrument items, a qualitative interview volunteer request was added to the survey. The item consists of the following statement: “In order to participate in a follow up interview, please provide your email address for the researcher to contact you.” Randomly selected volunteers were contacted through email and scheduled for an interview. Once survey data were collected, the tools on the survey were prepared in an open-ended conversational style for the interview.

In conclusion, the previously described instruments were used to measure perceptions of training utility, the training self-efficacy, and the motivation to transfer mandatory online training to workplace practice. All duplicate items were removed, and the statements were reworded for consistency. Reliability evidence for the scales used in the data collection process has been provided in prior research (Ford and Noe, 1987; Ford et al.,1992; Guthrie & Schwoerer,
1994; Madera et al., 2011), and adjustments were made after the pilot study to ensure the internal consistency levels were acceptable.

Techniques for Ensuring Reliable and Valid Data

To ensure the instruments used in this study provided valid data to measure the intended focus of this research, the scales were adapted from previously conducted research and a group of full-time faculty members ($n = 10$) were contacted and asked to participate in a pilot test of the survey instrument. Members were asked to time themselves from the beginning of the survey instrument until the end, to ensure the time indicated in the IRB form and in the explanation of the study to participants was accurate. The pilot testers were also asked to read the survey instrument thoroughly, comment on any statements that were not clear, and give feedback on anything they felt was missing.

The pilot group was emailed the survey instrument link and asked to provide feedback electronically through a reply to the email with the survey instrument link. They were informed about the research questions and the purpose of the study and were given instructions to provide feedback on the clarity, instructions on the survey, questionnaire items, formatting, time to complete survey instrument, and the ease of completing the survey. Overall, they reported the survey link worked, the items were clear, and the survey only took about five minutes to complete. The pilot study results showed a fairly high internal consistency for the perceptions of training utility instrument (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .907$), an internal consistency for the training self-efficacy instrument (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .640$), and a robust internal consistency for the motivation to transfer instrument (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .814$). The internal consistency for the training self-efficacy instrument (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .640$) low value of alpha could be due to a low number of questions
used from the training self-efficacy instrument in the pilot survey. The questions were removed because of similarity to the motivation to transfer instrument. To preserve the reliability of the training self-efficacy instrument, all questions from the scale were included in the survey instrument.

In addition to any revisions made based on the feedback from the full-time faculty members who were a part of the pilot group, the dissertation committee also reviewed the survey instrument and gave suggestions for improvement. After all feedback was considered and discussed with the committee, the survey instrument was formulated for the participants.

Analysis

In this section I show the data analysis method for each research question. Descriptive statistics were used in this data analysis to describe participant demographics (i.e., gender, organizational setting, years of employment, time in current position, and types of mandatory online training(s) attended). The categorical demographic variables were described using frequency distribution tables, and the other demographic variables were described by finding the mean, range, and standard deviation.

Research question 1 stated, “To what extent are the demographic variables related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy?” This question was answered by evaluating the outcomes of a regression analysis.

Research question 2 stated, “To what extent is the frequency and type of mandatory online training related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training,
motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy?” A linear regression analysis was conducted for each TSE, PTU, and MTT as the dependent variable.

Research question 3 asked: “To what extent is mandatory online training self-efficacy (the belief in one’s capability to perform successfully in mandatory online training) related to faculty members’ motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge/skills?” This question was answered by evaluating the outcomes of a regression analysis.

Research question 4 asked: “To what extent is perception of mandatory online training utility related to faculty motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge and skills?” This question was answered by evaluating the outcomes of a regression analysis.

Research question 5 asked: “How do participants describe their mandatory online training experience?” The data were analyzed using QDA Miner software for thematic data analysis (Attride-Stirling, 2001). The participants’ answers were reviewed for meaning of phrases while highlighting frequently occurring words. This is a valid form of qualitative data interpretation. “Clearly, the process of deriving themes from data and illustrating these with some representational tool is well established in qualitative research” (p. 387). The first round of coding revealed basic themes, the next round revealed the subthemes, and finally the themes were identified (Attride-Stirling, 2001) by illustrative quotations. This coding helped to narrow the answers to the research questions. The quantitative data results from the surveys were combined with the qualitative data from the interviews to see if the qualitative results supported the quantitative results.
Ethical Considerations

The opportunity to maximize the learning in mandatory online trainings as a result of the findings of this research is a great benefit to participants and the field of instructional technology. The collection of personally identifiable information was kept low to minimize the risk of participation in this study. The data collected through the Qualtrics system was kept confidential to maintain subject anonymity.

- Credibility. This study was grounded in reality by achieving transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1986).
- Transferability. The study can be duplicated outside of the Human Resource Development or instructional technology field, which is achieved by providing a detailed report of methods and data collection. Based on the data collection the researcher was able to do analysis to identify findings on how to maximize future mandatory online training effectiveness.
- Dependability. The study can be replicated using the methods detailed in this study.
- Confirmability. The perceptions of the participants rather than researcher bias guided analysis of the findings, which were achieved by having the committee review the data for inaccuracies.

Summary

Training effectiveness is linked to training transfer, and therefore, researching the motivation to transfer training and to the extent to which employees apply skills and information from mandatory trainings helps maximize workplace training. Social exchange theory also helps
explain if the motivation to transfer mandatory online training positively related to perceived utility and training self-efficacy. The literature supports the need for analysis of the perceptions of mandatory online training transfer and this study fills that gap.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this research was to investigate how social exchange theory and self-efficacy theory to inform faculty university participants’ motivation to transfer knowledge and skills from mandatory online training to their workplace practices. Faculty who attended mandatory online training were asked to complete a survey about their motivation to transfer such training to their workplace practice, perceived utility of training, and training self-efficacy. This study shows the extent to which motivation to transfer mandatory online training information to workplace practice is related to employees’ perceptions about the utility of such trainings, and training self-efficacy.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extent are the demographic variables related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy?

2. To what extent is the frequency and type of mandatory online training related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy?
3. To what extent is mandatory online training self-efficacy (the belief in one’s capability to perform successfully in mandatory online training) related to faculty members’ motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge/skills?

4. To what extent is perception of mandatory online training utility related to faculty motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge and skills?

5. How do faculty describe their mandatory online training experience?

Introduction

This chapter presents findings for each research question. QDA Miner Lite software was used to code the qualitative responses, and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) v.26 application was used to compute statistics from the survey responses. I will address data screening, demographics, the frequency of specific trainings attended, and the analysis of the constructs used to explain the extent that motivation to transfer mandatory online training information to workplace practice is related to employees’ perceptions about the utility of such trainings, and training self-efficacy.

Data Screening

A total of 897 survey invitation emails were sent to faculty from a large public university and a community college in the Midwest United States. A total of 111 survey participants responded, resulting in a 12.3% response rate. Survey data were reviewed for missing responses. Five cases were excluded from the study because these individuals had not attended a mandatory online training in the prior 12 months (which was a requirement for inclusion). Cases corresponding to six participants who had completed only a minimal portion of the survey were
removed. Because the target population investigated in this study included faculty members and instructors, one participant who indicated their role as Administrator and another who indicated their role as Other were excluded from this study. The analytic sample thus consisted of N=98 participants, resulting in a 10.9% response rate. In this analytic sample, there were seven missing values. One person did not answer item 6, two persons did not answer item 3, one person did not answer item 17, and person case did not answer item 21. Because of the very small amount of missing data, hot deck imputation was used to impute these missing values. Two participants were missing data for gender and thus were assigned the Prefer Not to Answer response.

Of the survey participants, 24 participants indicated willingness to be interviewed and provided their email addresses. These individuals were contacted, and 8 persons replied, so interviews were conducted with these persons.

Demographics

In this section I will present the demographic profile of the participants [i.e., gender, organizational setting, years of employment, time in current position, and types of mandatory online training(s) attended]. The categorical demographic variables were described using frequency distribution tables, and the other demographic variables were described by computing descriptive statistics.

Sample Characteristics

Table 1 shows demographic distributions for the participants as well as distributions for their mandatory online training participation. There were 41 males (41.8%), 45 females (45.9%), and 12 (12.2%) individuals who preferred not to answer. There were 14 (14.3%) participants
who worked for the community college and 84 (85.7%) participants who worked for the university. There were 41 participants (41.8%) who said they supervised others and 57 participants (58.2%) who responded they do not supervise others in their current position. In the 12 months prior to the survey, 93 participants had attended sexual harassment training (94.9%), 87 participants had attended workplace ethics training (88.8%), 90 participants had attended cybersecurity training (91.8%), 29 participants had attended safety training (29.6%), 38 participants had attended discrimination training (38.8%), 9 had attended other trainings (9.2%), including (1) blood borne pathogens training, (1) Clery Act training, and (1) faculty advisor training. Table 1 also shows the distribution of mandatory online training type attended.

Table 1
Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Answer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online training (Sexual Harassment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online training (Work Place Ethics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding work experience, the participants reported working for their current organizations for up to 34 years, with a mean employment length of 11 years. The participants reported working in their current position for a mean of 10.4 years. Of the total, 10% had been in their current position for a single year or less and 4% had been in their current position for 30 or more years (Figure 2).

![Histogram](image-url)

**Figure 2**: Histogram of the participants time in current position.
Frequency of Trainings

Table 2 shows the distribution for the number of mandatory online training the participants had attended in the 12 months prior to the survey. The participants had attended 1 to 15 trainings in the past 12 months. Specifically, 2% attended one training, 4.1% attended two trainings, 35.7% attended three trainings, 21.4% attended four trainings, 13.3% attended five trainings, 10.2% attended six trainings, 1% attended seven trainings, 6.1% attended eight trainings, and 6.1% attended ten or more trainings in the past 12 months, for a mean of 4.57 mandatory online trainings attended in the 12 months prior to the survey.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Trainings Attended</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instruments

The training self efficacy (TSE; Guthrie & Schwoerer, 1994), perceptions of training utility (PTU; Madera et al., 2011), and motivation to transfer training (MTT; Machin & Fogarty, 1997) constructs were measured using scales consisting of six Likert items (specifically, items with response options 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree). The training self efficacy (TSE) instrument had six items, the perceptions of training utility (PTU) instrument had five items, and the motivation to transfer training (MTT) instrument had seven items. Composite scores for each scale were computed as the mean score across items. Each instrument had a robust internal consistency with Cronbach’s alpha values above .80. Specifically, the results show internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) values for the Training Self-Efficacy scale, Perceptions of Training Utility scale, and the Motivation to Transfer scale as .84, .93, and .92, respectively. The mean TSE score across participant was 2.93 (SD = 1.04. The mean PTU score was 3.84 (SD = 1.35. The mean MTT score was 3.38 (SD = 1.20). Figures 3 shows the distribution of MTT, PTU, and TSE composite scores.
Figure 3: Histogram of TSE, PTU, and MTT composite scores.
Research Question 1 Results

Regression analysis was carried out to address research question 1, “To what extent are the demographic variables related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy?” Table 3 shows the results from linear regression of each outcome (TSE, PTU, and MTT) on the demographic characteristics of the participants (gender, organizational setting, years in current position). Due to the excessively high correlation between years of experience and years in current position \((r=0.913)\), I decided to remove the later variable from the regression analysis. Table 3 shows effects of each demographic characteristic (gender, organizational setting, years in current position) on each of the three outcomes (TSE, PTU, and MTT). Overall, the linear regression was statistically significant for the outcomes of TSE \([F(3, 94) = 3.25, p = .025, R^2 = .094]\), PTU \([F(3, 94) = 4.49, p = .005, R^2 = .125]\), and MTT \([F(3, 94) = 4.32, p = .007, R^2 = .121]\). Examining each demographic effect separately, after controlling for the other predictors in the model, the university organizational setting showed significant positive effects on TSE \((\beta = 0.223, p = 0.026)\), PTU \((\beta = 0.270, p = .006)\), and MTT \((\beta = 0.233, p = .019)\). Additionally, years in current position setting showed significant positive effects on PTU \((\beta = 0.231, p = .019)\) and MTT \((\beta = 0.258, p =.009)\). No other demographic characteristics showed significant effects on the outcomes. Figure 4 shows the histogram of residuals for each model, while Figure 5 shows the scatterplot of the residuals on the predicted values, indicating the assumptions of normality and the homoscedasticity were met. Figure 6 shows a scatterplot of each outcome on the regression predicted values, indicating that the assumption of linearity was met for each model.
Examination of variance inflation (VIF) statistics showed no evidence of excessive multicollinearity, with no VIF value exceeding 1.02.

Table 3
Results for the Regression of TSE, PTU, and MTT on Demographic Characteristics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics characteristics</th>
<th>Training self-efficacy (TSE)</th>
<th>Outcome Perceived training utility (PTU)</th>
<th>Motivation to transfer training (MTT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female)</td>
<td>-0.129 .197</td>
<td>-0.016 .870</td>
<td>-0.025 .798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational setting (university)</td>
<td>0.223 .026</td>
<td>0.270 .006</td>
<td>0.233 .019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in current position</td>
<td>0.144 .148</td>
<td>0.231 .019</td>
<td>0.258 .009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training self-efficacy

Figure 4: Histogram of residuals from the regression of TSE, PTU, and MTT on demographic characteristics of participants.

Perceived training utility

Motivation to transfer training

Figure 5: Scatterplot of residuals on predicted values of TSE, PTU, and MTT.
Figure 6: Scatterplot of TSE, PTU, and MTT on predicted values.
A linear regression analysis was carried out to address research question 2, “To what extent is the frequency and type of mandatory online training related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy?”

A separate linear regression was conducted for each outcome (TSE, PTU, and MTT). Table 4 shows the results from the linear regression of each (TSE, PTU, and MTT) on the number of trainings attended. The previously discussed demographic characteristics (gender, organizational setting, years in current position) were employed as control variables. Overall, the linear regression was statistically significant for the outcomes of TSE \[ F(4, 93) = 2.493, p = 0.048, R^2 = .097 \], PTU \[ F(4, 93) = 3.498, p = 0.010, R^2 = .093 \], and MTT \[ F(4, 93) = 3.213, p = 0.016, R^2 = .121 \]. However, after controlling for the demographic characteristics, the number of trainings attended showed no statistically significant effect on TSE \[ \beta = 0.053, p = 0.593, \Delta R^2 = 0.003 \], PTU \[ \beta = 0.074, p = 0.451, \Delta R^2 = 0.005 \], or MTT \[ \beta = -0.013, p = .891, \Delta R^2 < .001 \].

Figure 7 shows the histogram of the residuals for each model, while Figure 8 shows the scatterplot of the residuals on the predicted values, indicating that all assumptions of normality and the homoscedasticity were met. Figure 9 shows a scatterplot of each outcome on the regression predicted values, indicating that the assumption of linearity was met for each model. Examination of variance inflation (VIF) statistics showed no evidence of excessive multicollinearity, with no VIF value exceeding 1.03.
Table 4
Results for the Regression of TSE, PTU, and MTT on Number of Trainings Attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Demographics characteristics</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Training self-efficacy (TSE)</th>
<th>Perceived training utility (PTU)</th>
<th>Motivation to transfer training (MTT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td>Demographics characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.134</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational setting (university)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in current position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 2</td>
<td>Number of trainings attended</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Histogram of residuals from regression of TSE, PTU, and MTT on number of trainings attended.
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Figure 8: Scatterplot of residuals on predicted values of TSE, PTU, and MTT.

Figure 9: Scatterplot of TSE, PTU, and MTT on predicted values.
Table 5 shows the results from linear regression of each outcome (TSE, PTU, and MTT) on the type of training attended. The previously discussed demographic characteristics (gender, organizational setting, years in current position) were employed as the control variables. Overall, the linear regression was statistically significant for the outcomes of PTU \[ F(9, 88) = 2.143, p = .034, R^2 = .180 \], and MTT \[ F(9, 88) = 2.493, p = .014, R^2 = .203 \]. However, the regression model was not statistically significant for the outcome of TSE \[ F(9, 88) = 1.732, p = 0.093, R^2 = .150 \]. Further examination showed that, after controlling for the demographic characteristics (gender, organizational setting, years in current position), the type of training attended showed no statistically significant effect on TSE \[ F(6, 88) = 0.975, p = .447, \Delta R^2 = .056 \], PTU \[ F(6, 88) = 0.972, p = .449, \Delta R^2 = .054 \], or MTT \[ F(6, 88) = 1.508, p = .185, \Delta R^2 = .082 \]. However, when examined individually, sexual harassment training showed a significant negative effect on MTT \( \beta = -0.207, p = .046 \) and cybersecurity training showed a significant negative effect on MTT \( \beta = -0.204, p = .041 \). No other type of training showed significant effects on the outcomes. Figure 10 shows the histogram of residuals for each model, while Figure 11 shows the scatterplot of the residuals on the predicted values, indicating the assumptions of normality and the homoscedasticity were met. Figure 12 shows a scatterplot of each outcome on the regression predicted values, indicating that the assumption of linearity was met for each model. Examination of variance inflation (VIF) statistics showed no evidence of excessive multicollinearity, with no VIF value exceeding 1.25.
### Table 5

Results for the Regression of TSE, PTU, and MTT on Type of Training Attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td>Training self-efficacy (TSE)</td>
<td>Perceived training utility (PTU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female)</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational setting (university)</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in current position</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 2</td>
<td>Type of training attended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Place Ethics</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybersecurity</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10: Histogram of residuals from regression of TSE, PTU, and MTT on type of training attended.

Figure 11: Scatterplot of residuals on predicted values for TSE, PTU, and MTT.
Figure 12: Scatterplot of TSE, PTU, and MTT on for predicted values.
Research Question 3 Results

A linear regression analysis was carried out to address research question 3, “To what extent is mandatory online training self-efficacy (the belief in one’s capability to perform successfully in mandatory online training) related to faculty members’ motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge/skills?”

Table 6 shows the results from the linear regression of MTT on TSE. The previously discussed demographic characteristics (gender, organizational setting, years in current position) were employed as control variables. Overall, the linear regression was statistically significant \[F(4, 93) = 95.805, p < .001, R^2 = .805\]. Further, after controlling for the demographic characteristics, TSE showed a statistically significant positive effect on MTT \((\beta = 0.869, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .683)\). Figure 13 shows the histogram of the residuals for each model, while Figure 14 shows the scatterplot of the residuals on the predicted values, indicating the assumptions of normality and the homoscedasticity were met. Figure 15 shows a scatterplot of each outcome on the regression predicted values, indicating that the assumption of linearity was met for each model.

Examination of variance inflation (VIF) statistics showed no evidence of excessive multicollinearity, with no VIF value exceeding 1.10.
Table 6
Results for the Regressions of 1) TSE on MTT and 2) PTU on MTT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>RQ3</th>
<th>RQ4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to transfer training (MTT)</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female)</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational setting (University)</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in current position</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 2</td>
<td>Training Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Block 1 | Block 2 |
| | Demographics | Perceived Training Utility |
| Gender (Female) | -0.011 | 0.908 |
| Organizational setting (University) | -0.012 | <.001 |
| Time in current position | 0.049 | 0.721 |

Figure 13: Histogram of residuals.
Figure 14: Scatterplot of residuals on predicted values.

Figure 15: Scatterplot of MTT on predicted values.
Research Question 4 Results

A linear regression analysis was carried out to address research question 4, “To what extent is perception of mandatory online training utility related to faculty motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge and skills?”

Table 6 shows the results from linear regression of MTT on PTU. The previously-discussed demographic characteristics (gender, organizational setting, years in current position) were employed as control variables. Overall, the linear regression was statistically significant [$F(4, 93) = 123.881, p < .001, R^2 = .842$]. Further, after controlling for the demographic characteristics, PTU showed a statistically significant positive effect on MTT ($\beta = 0.908, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .721$). Figure 13 shows the histogram of residuals for each model, while Figure 14 shows the scatterplot of the residuals on the predicted values, indicating that the assumptions of normality and the homoscedasticity were met. Figure 15 shows a scatterplot of each outcome on the regression predicted values indicating that the assumption of linearity was met for each model. Examination of variance inflation (VIF) statistics showed no evidence of excessive multicollinearity, with no VIF value exceeding 1.14.

Qualitative Data Analysis

Each participant agreed to a 20-minute interview that took place over Zoom. Gideon did not enable his camera; however, the other seven participants agreed to video and audio recording. The conversations were recorded and transcribed into Microsoft Word documents that were then uploaded to the QDA Miner software. A codebook was created for four categories:
trainings, motivation to transfer, perception of training, and training self-efficacy. the trainings category included training type and training frequency.

The coding of the transcripts shows training types attended by the participants were (8) sexual harassment, (7) cybersecurity, (7) workplace ethics, (3) discrimination, and the (3) Clery Act, as shown in Table 7. Two participants mentioned attending COVID safety training, but their attendance was outside the 12-month span of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% Codes</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>% Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Place Ethics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybersecurity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – Clery Act</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 5 Results

Eight interviews were conducted to investigate research question 5, “How do faculty describe their mandatory online training experience?” At the end of the online survey an item was added to solicit participants willing to/interested in being interviewed to provide additional context regarding their perspectives. There were 24 participants who responded to this item with their email address. The volunteers were sent an email to schedule an interview. Eight participants replied, and those interviews were conducted. The participants consisted of four females and four males who had attended two to five mandatory online trainings in the past 12
months. Six of the interviewees were employed at the university and two at the community college, with an employment range of 1 to 22 years of service. There were two supervisors interviewed and two adjunct faculty. See Table 8 for the participants’ demographics and pseudonyms.

Table 8

Interview Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Org</th>
<th>Org Yrs</th>
<th>Position Yrs</th>
<th>Supervise Others</th>
<th># of Trainings</th>
<th>Types of Trainings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priscilla</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Uni</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>2 Years Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment, Cybersecurity, Sexual Harassment, Workplace Ethics, Cybersecurity, Safety, Clery Act – not ONLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Uni</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>3 Years Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment, Workplace Ethics, Cybersecurity, Safety, Clery Act – not ONLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Uni</td>
<td>11 Years</td>
<td>11 Years Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment, Workplace Ethics, Cybersecurity, Clery Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Uni</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>2 Years Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment, Workplace Ethics, Cybersecurity, Discrimination - DEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Uni</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>1 Year Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment, Workplace Ethics, Cybersecurity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continued on next page
Table cont. from previous page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Years Faculty</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ishmel</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cybersecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clery Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necho</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cybersecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Uni</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Workplace Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cybersecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Implicit Bias in Hiring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priscilla**

Priscilla, a female faculty member, had attended two mandatory online trainings in the past 12 months and has worked for the university for two years. Priscilla was confident she could do well in mandatory online training. “I normally pass them. Um. Most of them normally have a couple of different attempts for different, like, if there are quizzes. But normally, I do pretty well on them, if they require a hundred percent. Sometimes I might have to redo like a quiz of the set of five. But normally it goes well.” Because Priscilla is a faculty member who creates learning aids for students, she was confident in being able to successfully complete online training (i.e., training self-efficacy). “The reason I feel confident in doing online training is probably because I’m an academic. I’ve spent a lot of time in school. I’ve done a lot of tests. So, I think, it’s just familiarity with um that type of testing.”; “But I do online learning modules as a faculty member,
so like it’s the world in which I live in.” Priscilla’s goal was not to learn from mandatory online training but to know where to look if she needed the information. “I feel like relatively confident, and also know that I might need to go back because some of the things that we do on like mandatory training for are things that might be useful if the thing comes up, and I need to be able to go back to know, like I treat the training more like, Okay, this comes up. This is the information I need to know, so that I can go find it again. I don’t need to like, know, and like, memorize all this. I just need to know, at least how to figure out how to deal with this if this comes up.” She felt the cybersecurity training helped her perform better in the workplace.

When asked if mandatory online training was useful for her professional development (i.e., perceptions of training utility), Priscilla said, “I don’t normally think of mandatory online training as being part of my professional development. Like, I don’t report that on my Faculty Service report every year.” She thought some trainings were more relevant to her role than others.

It is good to know how to use um to be aware of cybersecurity training, and I appreciate the updated training every year because there’s new things that I don’t know about in terms of like the Title IX training. Yes, I want to know how to be able to file a report if I need to. Um, relevant, it’s relevant in the fact that I know I need to know these things. I’ve never had to fill out a Title IX report, so that’s not something that is direct, like it’s relevant, and that it could be useful, but not in a way that same. With the cyber security it’s relevant, and that it could be useful.

Priscilla thought the time spent in trainings was worthwhile and she had specific instances of using what she learned from training. “I think the skills the first time I took it I was actually really impressed with that online training. Um, I learned a couple of things.”

Priscilla said, “The most important thing that I consider before I start doing the online training is how long it’s going to take and how much time I need to block out of my day to do it.”
“I also know that they send out the one, like, email that looks like a spam so that they can test people at the university, and I appreciate those little checkups because they caught me once.” She stated her perception of the utility of cybersecurity training as “I do apply that often. Um. In terms of Title IX. Um, I’ve never had an opportunity to, um, use that information which I guess is probably a good thing.”

Priscilla felt it was important to apply the information from mandatory online training to the workplace (i.e., motivation to transfer training). However, she stated that “it’s just challenging, some of the online training, mandatory, that we do are more or less relevant to my day-to-day work. So, the ones that aren’t as relevant, are while important, don’t have that direct like impact on what I do day-to-day.” When asked if she intended to use the information from training she stated, “I like to think, when I’m doing it, that I intend to use them. Whether or not that actually happens in practice. Given that we do a lot of them annually, varies. Um, but I’d like to think that it’s useful.”

Robyn

Robyn, a female faculty member, had attended four mandatory online trainings in the past 12 months and has worked for the university for three years and supervise others. Robyn was confident she could do well in mandatory online training (i.e., training self-efficacy). She stated, “I think I can do just fine. Um, I’m a self-paced self-motivated learner.” She shared she does rush through the trainings. “I just do a lot of times, kind of click through things. Um. I’ll, I’ll scan, I’ll skim it, or scan it, so I would say the cybersecurity is probably meant more to me. Um, a little bit with the sexual harassment.” She addressed the repetition of the mandatory online
trainings: “Oftentimes it’s material that I’ve already gone over because we have to do annual trainings, or if I’m doing it for multiple things, so I get it more than once. Um, also, you know, I know that the structure is pretty similar.”

When asked if mandatory online training was useful for her professional development (i.e., perceptions of training utility), Robyn said, “I wouldn’t consider any of the mandatory training things that have helped me grow as a professional, necessarily.” Robyn said she learned from some training, “Cybersecurity, definitely. And then yet I still get phishing. I still click on the phishing emails.” She somewhat thought the time spent in training was worthwhile, depending on the training topic,

If I can speed up the video so I can listen to it faster. Um, because sometimes, I’m like my brain can handle that. And actually, it’s better. It maintains my attention because I actually do have to listen more. Um, if I can speed it up to be like two times or whatever, and then I can listen. So, if I can’t do that, then no. Because If you figure how many trainings we have to take annually, add an hour a pop, if not more. It’s depending on the subject.

Robyn felt it was important to apply the information from mandatory online training to the workplace (i.e., motivation to transfer training). She stated, “I understand that they’re necessary… Sometimes, it just feels like there’s a lot of them, and they happen all the time. It’s like they happen all at once.” However, she questioned the importance of the training to the organization.

My question would be, what’s the expectation of us applying the information and skills from the online training, like, what is the people who are creating the trainings, what are they hoping as a product from us? Or is it just to check off the box like ‘we told them about it?’ They sign that they did it. ‘So, we covered our butts.’

Robyn felt her performance in the workplace was improved by the sexual harassment mandatory online training. “I’m speaking about a very, you know, specific thing. But I think that yeah, it’s
helped me better support students. Not just, you know, specifically female students. But um, I think that that particular one has helped me perform better.”

Alice

Alice, a female faculty member, who attended four mandatory online trainings in the past 12 months and has worked for the university for 11 years. Alice was confident she could do well in mandatory online training until she had a glitch trying to complete her latest mandatory online training (i.e., training self-efficacy). She stated,

I’ve done that Clery one. The last time I took Clery, I just couldn’t even pass it. I did so many times and just couldn’t get it over. And every time, it sends me back to the beginning of the training, and it just wasn’t helping me. I even reached out to someone, I think in HR, and the person was encouraging me to finish.

Alice is very engaged in the training: “Yes I take notes. I usually make notes because I’m afraid I might forget some of what they are talking about.”

When asked if mandatory online training was useful for her professional development (i.e., perceptions of training utility), Alice said about sexual harassment training, “More on the ethics side. With the whole active reporting. Knowing my responsibility. That uh. Whether you have seen this thing yourself or if it was told to you in some form or the other. You still have a responsibility.” She felt the information was relevant and useful.

I can say sexual harassment very much so. Not that I didn’t know even in defining some of the terms. … the difference between the dating violence and the domestic violence. And all those things. And what consent mean. Consent can return even during an act, consent doesn’t mean that every act – you have given consent. So, a lot of clarity is in that video. It’s pretty good. It’s pretty good. Pretty well presented. It’s just at the end is the confusing part, taking the quiz and there’s really no quiz.

“The cybersecurity one. I had to do that for this year too. Cybersecurity is a lot of useful information but there are so many different sections of it so that gets boring.” Alice was
frustrated by the length of the trainings and being unable to work the computer well to complete the trainings successfully. She did not finish the Clery training at all. She said she did not have opportunities to apply the information from some trainings. “I would say I have an opportunity… for Cybersecurity one where I’m more aware and … I haven’t had anything to do with the sexual harassment and so on.” When asked if she felt mandatory online trainings was worthwhile, Alice said, “I prefer the sexual harassment one to the ethics one. Ethics one is now becoming déjà vu. Some of the stuff I just don’t…yes, it’s important to understand about the gifting, and all of those things and whistleblowing, and stuff like that. But I’ve been doing it so many years.”

Alice felt it was important to apply the information from mandatory online training to the workplace (i.e., motivation to transfer training). She stated, “Yes, as along as the situation arises. It’s important to do what we’re supposed to do. If it’s reporting, if it’s like pointing the students, or whoever it is, to the resources, it’s important we do our part.”

Iris

Iris, female adjunct faculty member, had attended four mandatory online trainings in the past 12 months and has worked for the university as an adjunct for two years. Iris was confident she could do well in mandatory online training (i.e., training self-efficacy). She stated, “Maybe because I had it before and I had that format before. But um, but, also, I feel like they’re not that difficult. I mean like you know they’re not tricky. (laugh) Maybe they are for other people, they’re not hard for me.” Iris felt the information from the training, “It furthered information I already sort of like knew. Ok this sort of, add confidence to that I already knew to do that. At the same time, most of it, was you know, it’s the same general stuff.” She did not feel the training improved her performance in the workplace. “I mean the only thing that I would say is the
Cybersecurity. I would say I’m more vigilant. But at the same time, I’m now because I’m just more, um, I’m exposed to more stuff.”

When asked if mandatory online training was useful for her professional development (i.e., perceptions of training utility), Iris said,

No cause again, it’s like, and maybe it’s my perception, but like, this is… I see it as a HR mandatory requirement. Like this is not something I, and maybe that’s my own fault, but like that’s not something I’m trying be around and like put on my resume. And being like I am, you know, trained in cybersecurity and sexual harassment practices. Like I don’t, I don’t feel as though I have come out with like a certification that does anything than check a [organization] checkbox. You know. I feel like if I were to work for any other organization they’d make me do all the same things all over again. Like I am not certified in DEI stuff, you know, like. So, it’s not like. So, when I think of professional development, I think of its furthering skills on my resume.

Iris did not feel she had opportunities to apply the information she learned from training to solve any workplace problems. She stated this was due to her limited time on campus as a faculty member.

Iris felt it was important to apply the information from mandatory online training to the workplace (i.e., motivation to transfer training). Iris was asked if she considers how she’s going to use the content from training,

Not really. I’m being honest here. Um, I don’t really, and honest, mostly it’s because I’ve had the trainings before. It’s not the first time I’ve ever been exposed to them, so I don’t really think about it because I’ve done it before. I mean maybe if I went back to the beginning, the first time I ever had these trainings many years ago. Yes. But now, I don’t, no.

Iris was unsure of how confident she was using the information from mandatory online training.

Like with the Cybersecurity in particular, um, I don’t remember what, like, I’m supposed to do other than I think this is a questionable thing, I need to send it somewhere. And then it will take me five or ten minutes to figure out where am I supposed to send this again. And then I’ll like forward or notify whoever it needs to be. So, on one hand, like I do know, like, there is a process to this, but I never actually remember what the process is when I need it. I have to go back in and like look for it. Which I guess is, I mean that half
the battle, you know, of knowledge. Of at least knowing what I don’t know and I know there’s something out there that I’m actually, I’m supposed to do.

Because she has experience with sexual harassment in the workplace, she has a different view on that training.

Sexual harassment I think is a lot trickier. I think that one is a lot more nuanced. Um, I think that one is, that one, I think is a hard on, to, to really take the information online and put it into practice and really probably any training and put it into practice. Because I have 100% been in situations where I was technically like what I was experiencing was sexual harassment.

Iris felt she knew what to do if a sexual harassment case presented itself, but she attributed her knowledge to her prior experience with sexual harassment and not based on the information she received during the training.

Iris intends to use the information from training.

I mean in theory yes. But again, if it’s something that I feel, I know we don’t know what we don’t know. But if it’s something that I recognize oh well I am weak in this area. I will naturally seek that out myself. Like I said, I went through, it was like a four-month DEI intensive workshop training program that was much more beneficial than the like 20-minute video trainings that I got from [organization]. That again just feels like their checking a box.

Individual perceptions of current topics such as sexual harassment, the Me Too social movement, and discrimination as well as the ethics surrounding political views were not accounted for in the survey questions. After conducting the qualitative interviews, it was evident diverse viewpoints add another component to this study. When trying to explain which training she felt would be helpful, Iris mentioned, “It is for cybersecurity for sure. Um, with the DEI, I mean, I have a different perspective on that because I am a White woman. So, I’m like, I’m not going to have the same sort of experience as someone who’s in a larger majority.”
Simon, a male faculty member, had attended three mandatory online trainings in the past 12 months and worked for the university for four years. He spent one year in a faculty position where he supervised others. Simon was confident he could do well in mandatory online training (i.e., training self-efficacy). He said, “Because their mandatory, university wide, uh, you know that they are going to be, need to be, relatively easy frankly. You know it, uh, they want to set up something that’s going to let the vast majority of people pass through. So, you know, these things aren’t known for being critical.” Simon was confident in applying the information from the training. “Yeah. Because usually the information is stuff that rarely comes up anyway.”

Simon’s confidence in using the information from training was rooted in his assumption he would not have a situation to use the information from training. “I generally don’t figure that I’m going to be applying these skills right away. Uh. What they generally are is they are informing me about what to avoid doing to stay out of trouble. You know. So, so, it’s more of a preemptive thing than it is a teaching me what to do. It’s teaching me what not to do.”

When asked if mandatory online training was useful for his professional development (i.e., perceptions of training utility), Simon said he had a situation where the training became relevant as a supervisor,

I was like wow, ‘Thank God I just had that training’, because I screenshots all these slides at the end about who to report this stuff to. And so, we were able to go through that process and uh get to the proper people with the information and then I was able to take all that and incorporate into my orientation manual.

Simon found the mandatory online trainings relevant to his role and useful. He feels trainings are important but,
I moan and groan because I know I have to do it. I know it’s a reason it has to be done and I am understanding of that reason. It’s just so, you know, I’m busy, so I hate to break into my day. But you know, in the end it’s not like I’m fighting it because I don’t think we should be doing it.

Simon thought the time spent in trainings was worthwhile.

As much as I hate to admit it because you know, everyone feels like this is an imposition on their day. I do know that you know these things are important and I certainly don’t want to get, um, into some sort of trouble that could cause me to lose my job or cause me to get audited or something like that. So, uh, you know. I definitely know that there’s a reason for these things so yeah, I do feel the time spent is worthwhile.

Simon felt it was important to apply the information from mandatory online training to the workplace (i.e., motivation to transfer training). He says, “We have to do it because there’s reasons you know there’s valid reasons for us to have this information and skills.” Simon did not feel mandatory online training improved his performance in the workplace.

No, I wouldn’t say it improved my performance … in an ideal world I won’t have the need to actually use any of the information they’re giving me. Right. This is information that they’re giving me in the situation, in situations that I don’t want to be in. And so, so, in general, I’m, I’m taking this stuff to be aware of situations to avoid.

Ishmel

Ishmel, a male faculty member, who attended five mandatory online trainings in the past 12 months and has worked for the community college for 22 years. Ishmel was confident he could do well in mandatory online training (i.e., training self-efficacy). He said, “I can do it again if I fail it. So, my confidence is pretty high that I could just keep doing if needed.” He felt he learns something from the training,

The deepness of the learning might not have been all that deep. But I like to think that I learned somethings. Like for sexual harassment, who do I go to or who is my, I might get my titles wrong, who is the Title IX or at [organization] who would I report to. I’m better on the things that I was supposed to learn.
When asked if mandatory online training improved his performance in the workplace (i.e., perceptions of training utility), Ishmel said,

I think the truth is complicated. I wasn’t sure where the truth lies actually. I like to think that it does. I like to think the training makes me more aware, and an observer, of hey maybe this not appropriate. So, I like to think in a more general way, raises my level of my radar, oh, I should be aware of these things. Like bullying or just a workplace is free of harassment and discrimination.

Ishmel found some mandatory online training information relevant to skills he hoped to develop, “In my better moments, yes. I think, I do, hoped to be an employee who is aware and sensitive to all sorts of transgressions bullying, what, whatever it might be. Sexual harassment, quid pro qo, or just whatever it might be.” Ishmel did say the time spent on mandatory online trainings was worthwhile. “Well yes, it’s worthwhile for me as an individual who must take it. I don’t want to lose my job or whatever.”

Ishmel felt it was important to apply the information from mandatory online training to the workplace (i.e., motivation to transfer training). He said,

Gosh. Well. I do. I think the topics are valuable. I think they’re important. And if you don’t get it from these trainings, I hope you get it from somewhere else. We all want to work in workplaces that are free from the various bad things that are talked about in the video in the trainings.

He says he is more aware of information from training when he is a witness, but he does not use the information to address those problems: “Have I witnessed language that I would consider demeaning, or you know, insensitive? Or just unaware? Yeah. I’m sure, yeah.” But when asked if the training helped him solve the situation or address the problem he said, “Not really. I want to say that just having that period of time. That thirty-minute window of exposure, you know, somebody doing a scripted thing, it makes me more aware. You know. Like watching a Barney video. (laughing)” When Ishmel discussed the use of the information from the cybersecurity
training, he said he was more cautious and refused to click on a suspicious email. Ishmel says he goes into some trainings with the intention to use the information, “Well some of them. Like the cybersecurity. I have good intentions… So, if I’m following through on my good intentions. I’m unsure.”

Necho

Necho, a male adjunct faculty, had attended two mandatory online trainings in the past 12 months and worked for the community college as an adjunct for six years. Necho was confident he could do well in mandatory online training (i.e., training self-efficacy). He said, “Oh yeah. Absolutely, I mean to me it’s all correct information so it’s kind of easy to go through. It’s not very hard.” The repetition made him confident he could be successful. Although Necho did not feel he learned much, he said: “This is the same stuff every year. Um, and then, as far as the ethics, um, yeah, I don’t think I learned a lot from the ethics because I’ve been through a lot of ethics trainings at all the different companies.” Necho said about sexual harassment training, “The technicalities of observing the workplace sexual harassment and the responsibilities, I learned, well, mean the first time I heard them I was like oh yeah, yeah, yeah that’s interesting.” Necho said he was confident using the information from training.

I know what to do. I hope I never have to actually engage any of those processes or procedures. Um but um, I feel confident I can follow through on something if that did crop up. Um. And I mean yeah. Because I know that there’s uh, uh, a process and a procedure, uh, that does make it better, uh, for me to perform as you say or better in the workplace.

When asked if mandatory online training was useful for his professional development (i.e., perceptions of training utility), Necho said,
It’s always useful to hear this stuff over and over for sure. And definitely realizing that there’s an entire process and procedure, uh, especially related to, um, sexual harassment for sure and, uh, you know. Even you know some of the information on the ethics and how to report ethical problems and issues.

Although, Necho did not see the information as relevant to him, he felt it was useful.

Yeah, I think they are useful in life period, uh, the workplace being one part of it. Absolutely. And it’s good to hear it you know get it reinforced, cause sometimes people can forget and they don’t do the right thing sometimes and, uh, but when you hear it um (laughing) it’s kinda like training a dog. (laughing) Just keep doing it over and over, right, and eventually they kinda get the hang of it.

Necho did not feel he had opportunities to practice the information and skills from mandatory online training. “No, nothing as far as sexual harassment. I have not seen anything like that, uh, in any of my classrooms, or at any point. Now, I’m hardly ever, I mean it’s all virtual for me.”

Necho did say the time spent on mandatory online trainings was worthwhile: “Oh, yeah. It’s only 45 minutes or something like that. Yeah. It’s not long. It’s worth it once a year. (laughing) For sure.”

Necho felt it was important to apply the information from mandatory online training to the workplace (i.e., motivation to transfer training). He stated,

It is for the ethics from my standpoint. Um. I said, uh, with the sexual harassment, I mean I’m just so, I mean it’s all remote (laughing). You don’t even bump into anybody by the watercooler. And the students most of them are just watching my video after the fact and sending me emails and text messages. So, no I, the sexual harassment stuff is just good knowledge to know for life in general. Um. But the ethics is, is, important to learn, uh, well in life in general but (laughing) a lot of the uh political things that go on lately, uh, ethics, I think should be a lot more important.

Necho intended to use the information from some training: “I don’t actually bring up sexual harassment, uh, in any of my classes, but the ethics, um, and behavior I absolutely do.” Necho was asked if he felt he could resolve workplace problems with the information from training. He
said: “Definitely, for sure, I would. But, like, I said, I hope I never have to go through a process like that that’s for sure.”

Gideon

Gideon, a male faculty member, had attended four mandatory online trainings in the past 12 months and worked for the university for six years. Gideon was somewhat confident he could do well in mandatory online training (i.e., training self-efficacy). He said,

I never really thought about it. It’s something we could do well or poorly at.” He shared he will multitask during the trainings. “I do the mandatory online trainings because they’re mandatory. And uh, I just do them when, and basically, when I have time, when I’m not doing anything, you know important. Um. So, I’ll kind of do them when folding laundry, or when doing something else.

Gideon said the time spent on mandatory online trainings was not worthwhile. But he did not always feel that way. “The first year I took the cybersecurity, I would say, I actually learned things. And then taking the exact same thing year after year has not helped.”

When asked if mandatory online training was useful for his professional development (i.e., perceptions of training utility), Gideon said, “I mean the skills that I’d hope to develop in my career have nothing to do with the online trainings.” He felt he did not learn anything from mandatory online training and nothing from training applied to his role with the organization. When asked about opportunities to apply the information from training Gideon said, “Well, it doesn’t apply. So, I guess I don’t have that opportunities to apply it” – even though Gideon was on a hiring committee that required him to attend the implicit bias in hiring training.

Gideon felt it was not important to apply the information from mandatory online training to the workplace (i.e., motivation to transfer training). He did not see how the trainings helped
solve any workplace problems, “The information from the online trainings is basically common sense. It’s stuff I already know. So, it doesn’t tell me anything that I don’t already know or can’t already do.” Gideon mentioned going to the implicit bias training before conducting interviews and stated he did not have an opportunity to apply the information from training, he would not apply the information from the training, and there was nothing useful from that particular training to apply to the interview search or hiring process.

Overview

After coding, the quantitative data results from the surveys were combined with the qualitative data from interviews to see if the qualitative findings triangulated the quantitative results (See Table 9).

Table 9

Data Collection and Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Collection Method</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are the demographic variables related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy?</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Linear regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is the frequency and type of mandatory online training related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy?</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Linear regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is perception of mandatory online training utility related to faculty motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge and skills?</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Linear regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do faculty describe their mandatory online training experience?</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Code themes, subthemes, quotations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research investigated how social exchange theory and self-efficacy theory can inform university faculty participants’ motivation to transfer knowledge and skills from mandatory online training to their workplace practice. The current study used a sequential triangulation mixed-methods design. After data from participant interviews were coded and analyzed, results from the surveys were compared to consider the extent that qualitative and quantitative results, in tandem, may further explain the study findings, interpretation, and suggested implications.

Research Question 1 Discussion

The quantitative and qualitative results to research question 1, “To what extent are the demographic variables related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy” were triangulated.

The quantitative analysis found demographic variables (gender and organizational setting) were statistically related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy.
Gender

Gender was not related to TSE, PTU, or MTT. However, during the qualitative interviews, two females raved about all they learned in the sexual harassment training. Iris had strong feelings about the training because of a known workplace violator. The other female, Alice, was interested in the sexual harassment training because of the current atmosphere surrounding sexual assault in the mainstream. Iris mentioned the MeToo social movement when expressing the usefulness of sexual harassment training. One male, Necho, could not see how the sexual harassment training was relevant to his role given that he taught online and would not be physically present in class. Ways in which sexual harassment can occur in an asynchronous or synchronous class did not occur to him. However, Necho indicated the importance of ethics training in the workplace because of the current atmosphere surrounding the questionable ethics of politicians in the mainstream. His concerns aligned with research (Gramlich, 2019) that showed 91% of Americans surveyed felt the executive office of the president should be ethical, however, they varied in their opinion of the degree of ethics actually upheld by the office based on their political party. Furthermore, Iris thought her role as a faculty member made the trainings irrelevant because of her limited interactions with students and co-workers, “I go to campus I teach my classes, and like, I leave. Like really, I don’t have as many instances, that, that would even be an issue. But I do know what I would need to do to resolve it, but it’s more so because of my past experience, than the training per se.”

It is possible that “utility value” (how useful employees perceive the task) and motivation to transfer such information influenced participants’ interest to transfer such practices to the workplace (Gegenfurtner, 2020). Although perspectives were not unique to gender as
participants shared their own experiences with the training topics, it may be that because Iris had experienced sexual harassment, she did not see the training as useful to her role because she did not feel she could be a violator.

**Organizational Setting**

Employment type had a positive effect on each of the three observed outcomes, with faculty members employed in university settings showing higher perceived utility of mandatory online training, higher motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and higher training self-efficacy than those employed in community college settings. A faculty member who worked at the university may have more investment in mandatory online trainings because of the difference in their student population. The students attending a university commonly live on campus and are more involved in the campus environment than students at the community college. Also, the university may express the importance of training more due to its rigorous accreditation restrictions when it comes to ensuring faculty are properly trained. There were two participants employed at a community college and their statements were contextually similar to the other six university employees. Similar to the majority of the university employees interviewed, both community college employed males, Necho and Ishmel, were confident they could do well in mandatory online training (i.e., training self-efficacy), thought mandatory online training was useful for professional development (i.e., perceptions of training utility), and felt it was important to apply the information from mandatory online training to the workplace (i.e., motivation to transfer training). This can be explained because of the role of a faculty member where the goal in creating classroom content is to get students to apply the information and develop during the course. Faculty members come into training as an opportunity to learn
because they are in the field of helping others gain knowledge. A more involved student environment at the university level means those faculty members are more invested in the student population and could explain the higher perceived utility of mandatory online training, higher motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and higher training self-efficacy.

**Research Question 2 Discussion**

Quantitative and qualitative results were used to answer research question 2, “To what extent is the frequency and type of mandatory online training related to faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, and training self-efficacy?”

**Frequency of Training**

The quantitative analysis found no significant relationships between the number of trainings attended and faculty members’ perceived utility of mandatory online training, motivation to transfer training knowledge/skills, or training self-efficacy. However, the qualitative responses expressed a negative association with too many mandatory online trainings and the length of them. “Iris,” who had attended four mandatory online trainings 12 months before the survey, saw the training as worthwhile the first time around, but her feelings changed after seeing the same training every year. “Robyn,” who had four mandatory online trainings and an in person Clery Act training did not agree that the time spent in training was worthwhile because “it just feels like a lot of them” and “It’s like they happen all at once. So, like you get five of these trainings…figure it’s probably about an hour each.” The participants’ change in viewing the trainings as worthwhile can be explained by Bandura’s (1994) third source of
efficacy, the persuasion to succeed in a task due to social expectations. When participants first engage with the content they feel it is valued by the organization and they are expected to do well in the completion of the mandatory online training. Once the participants are given the exact same training repeatedly, they then feel the social expectation is no longer to learn the material, but for them to just complete the training.

The length of trainings was discussed several times in “Alice’s” interview about unsuccessfully completing the trainings due to her inability to navigate the online training tools, “If there’s a way it could be shorter, I would appreciate that,” she added as her recommendation. Alice felt overwhelmed because as explained in Hode et al. (2018) study, faculty are more likely to learn if they are confident in the hardware.

Moreover, Alice attended four mandatory online trainings 12 months before the survey. Necho, who attended two mandatory online trainings 12 months prior to the survey, said he was overconfident in attending mandatory online trainings because he attends the same ones every year. Priscilla, who attended two mandatory online trainings prior to the survey, appreciated having the training every year. Ishmel, who attended five mandatory online trainings prior to the survey (the most of the participants interviewed), did say the time spent on mandatory online trainings was worthwhile because it was important to his job security. Social exchange theory posits that individuals’ perceptions about the rewards and costs are important when considering a given action, and for Ishmel the reward of keeping his job may explain why attending five mandatory online trainings in the past 12 months was worthwhile.
Type of Training

The quantitative analysis found sexual harassment training and cybersecurity training were significantly related to the participants’ motivation to transfer training, with those who had attended these trainings showing mean motivation scores approximately 0.20 points lower than those who had not attended the trainings. The cybersecurity and sexual harassment trainings are offered annually and the participants reported no changes in the content of the material. Due to the repetitive content, participants likely had little investment in the training and therefore didn’t assign much importance to use the material. Some stated they didn’t expect to encounter situations where the training would be useful and the training was not specifically tailored to anything they deal with as a faculty member. This supports research (Santos, 2006) that showed employees’ perceptions of training outcomes and work environment influence training transfer.

Qualitative results in the current study revealed that the motivation to transfer training varied among participants, Gideon had no intention of using the “unimportant” information from the implicit bias in hiring training, although he was taking the training specifically for his role on a hiring committee. He did not see the information as being helpful for solving problems on the hiring committee or improving his selection process. This is the opposite of Iris, who felt discrimination training was important. She sought out training outside of the mandatory online training offered by the organization to improve her professional development. The training offered by the organization was seen as a means to satisfy a Human Resources requirement. Iris said, “I do it as I’m checking an HR box.” Robyn had the same feelings about the importance of training to the organization. Simon did not see how the training improved his performance, but he had a situation arise immediately and was able to solve the problem by referring back to the
material from the mandatory online training. This explains the diverse viewpoints in the faculty shaped how they felt about particular training topics. The vast difference between Gideon and Iris was due to Iris interest in the topic. As discussed in Gegenfurtner et al. (2016), Iris goals for mandatory online diversity training were more positive because she was voluntarily seeking more training on the topic, versus Gideon who indicated that he loathed the idea of any diversity training and was more irritated by the fact that there was a mandatory training on the topic.

As for the cybersecurity mandatory online training, Priscilla and Iris felt their workplace performance improved from the training. Alice and Ishmel felt cybersecurity was a useful training. Robyn shared that she learned from the cybersecurity training, the same as Gideon, however, he felt that he gained knowledge the first year of taking the training. The sexual harassment training was perceived as useful to Alice and Robyn, and Necho felt he learned from the training. This supports the earlier mentioned gender difference giving little explanation as to how participants will feel about training.

Research Question 3 Discussion

The quantitative and qualitative results to research question 3, “To what extent is mandatory online training self-efficacy (the belief in one’s capability to perform successfully in mandatory online training) related to faculty members’ motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge/skills?” were triangulated.

The quantitative analysis found mandatory online training self-efficacy (the belief in one’s capability to perform successfully in mandatory online training) was significantly and positively related to faculty members’ motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge/skills. Overall, the interviewed participants had high training self-efficacy. They felt
they were familiar with the mechanics and the content of the mandatory training. Common themes emerged, as most were confident they were successful in mandatory online training. However, the interviews revealed that their “overconfidence in the training” caused them to not pay attention, multitask, and skip through the training sections. During the interviews, some participants stated they had multiple jobs and had to recall which training they took with which organization I was interviewing them about. Necho, Alice, and Robyn all expressed the repetition of training -- exposure to the exact same content year after year. Gideon mentioned that the repetition of the same training was a “total waste of time.” This may be explained by participants’ expectation that the organization views the training to be important enough to invest in updating the content. The faculty members expressed disappointment in having the repetitive content because it made them feel the organization did not care if they actually learned anything or planned to use the information from training. As previously stated, when employees receive quality training, they feel they are valued by the organization and their commitment to the organization’s success increases (University of Texas at Austin, 2017).

Research Question 4 Discussion

The quantitative and qualitative results answered research question 4, “To what extent is perception of mandatory online training utility related to faculty motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge and skills.”

The quantitative results indicated that perception of mandatory online training utility was significantly and positively related to faculty motivation to transfer mandatory online training knowledge and skills. During the qualitative interviews, their perceptions of the usefulness of training were influenced by the perception that the trainings were not specific to the participant’s
role in the organization. If the training is something they were likely to encounter as a faculty member (like cybersecurity training that emails participants spontaneous follow up spam knowledge checks), the participants were more engaged with the training. If the participants felt they were taking an organization-wide training for the entire employee pool and it was not tailored to their role, their perception was that it was not useful. In Gideon’s case, he was on a hiring committee and took the implicit bias in hiring training and did not see how the training was useful in his selection process of candidates. Gideon did not feel the time spent in any training, after the first year of cybersecurity, was worthwhile. Alice thought the time spent in sexual harassment training was worthwhile because of the currency of the topic. Simon thought training was worthwhile because they were mandatory and saw them as a way to keep his job. Ishmel agreed that the training was worthwhile because he did not want to lose his job. This adds to Guthrie and Schwoerer’s (1994) research which found training self-efficacy has a positive effect on perceptions of training utility. Perception of training utility does influence motivation to transfer training and in Gideon’s case, he was given a training specifically to use in his current role, but his personal beliefs on how useful the training was to his position on the hiring committee stopped him from using the information from the training.

Overall Discussion

The qualitative results found supportive relationships between the specifics of training and participants’ perceptions of training utility, training self-efficacy, and motivation to transfer information and skills from training (see Table 10). For some of the participants, there were negative associations with training, which aligned with the negative statistical effects on motivation observed for some types of training (sexual harassment training and cybersecurity
Participants viewed training as a preventative measure by the organization to address problems that have occurred in the past. For Simon and Ishmel, motivation for attending the training was to keep their jobs, avoid doing the wrong thing and become more aware of the organization’s rules for violations and compliance. The interviewed participants agreed the training increased their awareness but varied on the worth of the training and the level of learning that actually occurred.

Table 10

Summary of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/Construct</th>
<th>QUAN Results</th>
<th>QUAL Results Major Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Trainings</td>
<td>No relation to Training Utility, Training Self-Efficacy, or Motivation to Transfer Training</td>
<td>Familiar with the mechanics and the content from the mandatory training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 4.57 trainings attended by the participants in 12 months prior to survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Training</td>
<td>Cybersecurity and Sexual Harassment Training negatively related to Motivation to Transfer Training</td>
<td>Motivation to transfer training varied among participants, depending on their viewpoints about particular training topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Positively related to Motivation to Transfer Training</td>
<td>High training self-efficacy. Overconfidence in training led to less engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| $M=2.93$  
$SD=1.04$ |

Table continued on next page
Table cont. from previous page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Training Utility</th>
<th>Positively related to</th>
<th>If the participants felt they were taking an organization-wide training not tailored to their role, their perception leaned toward the training was not useful.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation to Transfer Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M=3.84$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD=1.35$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Transfer Training</td>
<td>$M=3.38$</td>
<td>Participants agreed the trainings increased awareness. Opinions varied on the worth of the training. Participants varied on applying information from mandatory online training in their everyday workplace practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD=1.20$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implications for Practice

This section explains the implications for the social exchange theory, self-efficacy, and motivation to transfer training.

The first implication in this study agrees with the Cropanzano et al. (2017) model. According to the Hode et al. (2018) study, faculty are more likely to learn if they are confident in the hardware. In the current study, TSE was high; however, the learning was low. The assumption using the Cropanzano et al. (2017) model was that if employees’ training self-efficacy and perceived utility were low, they might be less motivated to transfer such knowledge and skills acquired through mandatory online training in the workplace. The findings show PTU and TSE had a significant impact on MTT.

The second implication is to calculate a person’s self-interest, the rewards minus the cost equals the worth of committing to an organization or committing to using the information learned in a training. Building on existing research investigating motivation to transfer training to
the workplace, this study operationalized “reward” as a factor that positively influence employees’ desire to transfer training and “cost” as a factor that negatively affected employees’ desire to transfer such training to their workplace practice. Social exchange theory acknowledges that rewards are centered around a person’s self-interest. This was evident with Iris, who sought out additional discrimination training for her personal development. Curando et al. (2015) found employees who attended training voluntarily were more intrinsically motivated to use their skills learned in training on the job. Additionally, Gegenfurtner et al. (2016) found goals for training were more positive when participation in training was voluntary, compared to mandatory.

The third implication of this study found job security, an extrinsic reward, to be influential on MTT of mandatory online training. Although Social Exchange Theory holds that individuals’ perceptions about the rewards and costs are important when considering a given action, it is unclear the weight these variables contribute to subsequent decision-making (e.g., rewards and costs of transferring mandatory online training in the workplace). Kontoghiorghes’s (2001) study examined the transfer climate and found that training transfer was more likely with intrinsic rewards (e.g., praise, recognition) and supervisory support than extrinsic rewards (e.g., pay, promotion). In contrast, this study found mandatory online training transfer was more likely with extrinsic rewards, such as job security because the training is a condition of employment with the organization. Additionally, the participants were less engaged when they felt they were simply “checking a box” for Human Resources. The conclusion of Salamon et al.’s (2021) study of managers was that employees who perceive supervisor support to be limited are less motivated to transfer their training to the workplace and when employees feel supported, they are more likely to incorporate training into their workplace practice. Therefore, this study agrees with Santos and Stuart’s (2006) study that showed the employees’ attitudes toward the training
influenced the effectiveness of the training. If there were extrinsic motivations like job security involved, employees would likely transfer their training and use the new skills/ or knowledge in the workplace.

The fourth implication of the current study found TSE does predict MTT of mandatory online training. That is, the more confident faculty are in their ability to successfully complete the training the more likely they are to use the information from training in their everyday workplace. The current study aimed to explore participants’ confidence (Bandura, 1994) during training and the influence training self-efficacy had on motivation to transfer training. Similarly, Ford et al.’s (1992) survey found that the airmen’s confidence was positively related to their ability to transfer information and skills from training.

Lastly, there were implications for the content of trainings. The findings show the importance of refreshing the content by differentiating training for employees with one year of experience from employees with 22 years of experience. For practitioners, the employee experience with the organization must be taken into consideration to help designers develop content relevant to the employees and increase perception of training utility and motivation to transfer training. The frequency of mandatory online trainings did not impact faculty TSE, PTU, or MTT. However, the interviewed participants expressed annoyance with the length of training, the repetitive content, and the lack of content relevant to their role as reasons for lower PTU. The qualitative results found relationships between the specifics of training and participants’ perceptions of training utility, training self-efficacy, and motivation to transfer information and skills from training, and for some of the participants, there were negative associations with training. They saw the training as a preventative measure by the organization to address problems that occurred in the past, but they did not feel were relevant to their everyday
workplace practice. Practitioners should work toward aligning trainings with a participant’s specific role and experience with the organization. Customized trainings can help the designers, developers, and employers increase buy-in from those who are mandated to take these trainings. In this study, the participants’ motivation for attending the training was to keep their jobs, avoid doing the wrong things and be aware of the organization’s rules for violations and compliance. Practitioners can use that information in their introduction to trainings to gain more investment from the participants and universities can implement this strategy to possibly increase the faculty investment in mandatory online training. This section explained several implications found however it is necessary to address the limitations as well.

Limitations

This section explains four limitations of this study related to the survey, individual interpretations, and response rate.

The first limitation could be that because participants were informed about the research topic, they may have been tempted to tailor their responses to what they thought would be socially desirable. In fact, during interviews, although participants were informed that their perspective would not be connected to them personally and that their identity would be protected, still several participants asked if their participation was confidential before responding to questions. To address the honesty of participants, I assured them they would be given pseudonyms and would not be individually identified in the study. One interviewed participant chose not to use the camera during the Zoom interview and disclosed the most disagreement with mandatory online training.
The second limitation of this study may include the expanded interpretations of who considered themselves as faculty. The assumption was only full-time faculty would respond to the survey, but several adjunct faculty members participated and two of them were interview participants. If conducting this study again, I would include additional category options on the survey for adjuncts to explore if this category yields different findings.

The third limitation of this study may include the different attitudes and demographics not accounted for in the original study design. The diverse viewpoints of participants may account for how the mandatory online trainings were perceived.

Lastly, although the sample size obtained from survey respondents (N = 98) provided adequate power (80% or more) for each of the regression analysis, a larger sample size would increase power and enhance the validity of the observed findings. If conducting this study again, I would leave the survey open for a month to increase the response rate and send out a reminder each week. These limitations of the study can be addressed by future researchers.

Recommendations for Future Research

There were several participants with multiple jobs and were therefore taking twice as many trainings; some of them included the exact same content, videos, and format. This population could be researched separately in future studies to understand the need for mandatory online training for a participant with multiple jobs. Because only a few participants disclosed they worked multiple jobs, this research study could not identify that as a variable to add to the investigation. Practitioners reading this study should consider participants with multiple employers when requiring mandatory training. There may be an exception these participants are awarded, or a test only option, to avoid overwhelming them with the same content. This will also
save organizations money by no longer paying employees to attend mandatory online trainings they previously attended.

Although the trainings list in this survey instrument included the primary online mandatory trainings in this area, future research using this tool should carefully tailor “training names” to those required that are required in the targeted region, university, and/or State. The discrimination training selection was not enough of an umbrella for those who attended implicit bias training or DEI training. The participants also marked “other” and typed in those trainings in addition to selecting the discrimination training as an option on the survey. Therefore, discrimination as a category should include examples in a parenthetical note. Clery Act training was another training some participants named separately. If this study were conducted again, I would include the Clery Act, implicit bias, and DEI training as category options.

Additionally, the diverse viewpoints of the faculty shaped how they felt about particular training topics. In future studies, questions related to the participant’s experience with mandatory online training topics should be included. The differences in the findings based on the type of training could be explained with answers to questions similar to “Have you ever experienced sexual harassment?”, “Have you ever experienced discrimination?” or “Have you ever been a victim of a cyberattack?”

Leadership and coworkers’ positive attitudes tie in with employee engagement, job satisfaction, and a favorable view of workplace e-learning systems (Lin et al., 2019), which align with rewards or benefits for an employee (Chanana & Sangeeta, 2020). I recommend expanding research that found satisfaction with job training leads to overall job satisfaction, which leads to better job performance (Huang, 2019) and research that the higher the extrinsic rewards, the more commitment the employee has to the organization (Chanana & Sangeeta, 2020). I
recommend a further look into mandatory online training satisfaction and faculty commitment to
the organization. Additionally, research could investigate if faculty received incentives for
successful completion of mandatory online training does the incentive increase faculty
commitment to the organization. Researchers should note it would be beneficial to the field to
find if higher extrinsic rewards lead to more commitment from employees in relation to
mandatory online training.

Conclusion

In conclusion, faculty motivation to transfer mandatory online training information to
workplace practice is related to employees’ perceptions about the utility of such training and
training self-efficacy. This study contributes to the small amount of research on the growing
trend of mandatory online training. Higher education Center for Excellence in Teaching and
Learning (CETL) and corporate Learning and Development Human Resource Development
(HRD) professionals devote extensive efforts to producing effective mandatory online trainings.
The insight into how faculty perceived the mandatory online training can help with future
development. Training effectiveness is linked to training transfer, and therefore, increasing the
motivation to transfer knowledge and skills from mandatory training helps to maximize
workplace training, organizational resources, and employee output.
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APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANT SURVEY
1. Have you attended ONLINE mandatory training in the past 12 months?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

2. I have attended the following mandatory trainings with my organization in the past 12 months? (Select all that apply)
   - [ ] Sexual Harassment
   - [ ] Work Place Ethics
   - [ ] Cybersecurity
   - [ ] Safety (e.g. COVID-19 safe guards, Active Shooter, sexual assault reporting, etc.)
   - [ ] Discrimination
   - [ ] Other

3. How many mandatory trainings have you attended in the past 12 months?

Instructions: Please answer the survey questions using the following ratings: Strongly agree, Agree, Somewhat agree, Somewhat disagree, Disagree, and Strongly disagree.

4. Mandatory ONLINE training has been useful for my professional development.
   ○ Strongly agree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Somewhat agree
   ○ Somewhat disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Strongly disagree

5. I do well in mandatory ONLINE training.
   ○ Strongly agree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Somewhat agree
   ○ Somewhat disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Strongly disagree

6. The information in mandatory ONLINE training has been relevant to skills I had hoped to develop.
   ○ Strongly agree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Somewhat agree
   ○ Somewhat disagree
Disagree

Strongly disagree

7. I am able to apply information and skills from mandatory ONLINE training to the workplace.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

8. The time spent to complete mandatory ONLINE training was worthwhile.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

9. It is important that I apply the information and skills from mandatory ONLINE training in the workplace.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

10. Using mandatory ONLINE training content will be helpful in solving work-related problems in my everyday work.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

11. I have been able to apply what I learned in mandatory ONLINE training in the workplace.

Strongly agree

Agree
12. I know of work situations in which I plan to use what I have learned in mandatory ONLINE training.

13. I have opportunities to practice the skills emphasized in the mandatory ONLINE training in the workplace.

14. I am able to learn information and skills in mandatory ONLINE training.

15. Using the information and skills learned in mandatory ONLINE training will improve my work performance.
16. I intend to use the information and skills from mandatory ONLINE training in the workplace.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Somewhat agree
   - Somewhat disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

17. I am confident that mandatory ONLINE training helps me perform better in the workplace.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Somewhat agree
   - Somewhat disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

18. I am able to apply what I have learned from mandatory ONLINE training to the workplace.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Somewhat agree
   - Somewhat disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

19. I feel capable of using the skills developed in mandatory ONLINE training in the workplace.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Somewhat agree
   - Somewhat disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

20. The information and skills I learned during mandatory ONLINE training will be helpful in solving work-related problems.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Somewhat agree
21. I am confident that I can succeed in mandatory ONLINE training.
   - Somewhat disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

22. What type of organization do you work for?
   - Community College
   - University

23. How long have you been employed with the organization?

24. What is your current position?
   - Administrator
   - Faculty
   - Graduate student
   - Instructor
   - Support staff
   - Other

25. How long have you been in your current position?

26. In your current position, do you supervise others?
   - Yes
   - No

27. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Prefer not to say
   - Other

To participate in a follow up interview, please provide your email address for the researcher to contact you.

Link to survey in Qualtrics: https://niu.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_4TMfAmIRxbE UdjU
APPENDIX B

IRB APPROVAL
Exempt Determination

23-Sep-2022
Tori Austin
Educational Technology, Research and Assessment

RE: Protocol # HS22-0487 "University faculty perceptions of mandatory online training as related to training self-efficacy, motivation, and utility.”

Dear Tori Austin,

Your application for institutional review of research involving human subjects was reviewed by the Office of Research Compliance, Integrity, and Safety on 23-Sep-2022 and it was determined that it meets the criteria for exemption 2.

Although this research is exempt, you have responsibilities for the ethical conduct of the research and must comply with the following:

Amendments: You are responsible for reporting any amendments or changes to your research protocol that may affect the determination of exemption and/or the specific category. This may result in your research no longer being eligible for the exemption that has been granted.

Record Keeping: You are responsible for maintaining a copy of all research related records in a secure location, in the event future verification is necessary. At a minimum these documents include: the research protocol, all questionnaires, survey instruments, interview questions and/or data collection instruments associated with this research protocol, recruiting or advertising materials, any consent forms or information sheets given to participants, all correspondence to or from the IRB, and any other pertinent documents.

Please include the protocol number (HS22-0487) on any documents or correspondence sent to the IRB about this study.

If you have questions or need additional information, please contact the Office of Research Compliance, Integrity, and Safety at 815-753-8588.

Please see the RIPS website for guidance on the impact of COVID-19 on research (including face-to-face data collection) https://www.niu.edu/divresearch/covid/index.shtml
APPENDIX C

PERMISSION TO USE INSTRUMENTS
From: Ford, J
Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 2:18 PM
To: Tori Austin
Subject: RE: Motivation to Transfer Scales Permission Request

1. The perceptions of training utility – the five item measure is in the Ford & Nov paper – Table 1 – 7 point scale from 1 – strongly disagree to 7 – strongly agree
2. Training Self Efficacy – (seven point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree)
   I have confidence in my ability to do my job
   I am usually successful when I strive to accomplish a goal
   I feel that I can perform all the tasks of a specialist at this skill level 5
   I do not feel very confident when attempting to solve difficult problems (reverse)
   I expect to be successful most of the time
   When I make plans to solve problems, I am certain to make them work
3. Want to continue to improve my skills
   I want to continue to improve my skills
   I am sure that my skills will improve
   My supervisor is interested in helping me complete tasks which will qualify me for 5 skill level
   My supervisor makes sure that mistakes I make are made into a learning experience for me
   My supervisor communicates his/her expectations for my performance
   My supervisor looks for what I do right rather than only for what I do wrong
   My supervisor describes how a new work assignment is like previous assignments
   There is an atmosphere of support and trust in my workplace
   The members in my shop work well together
   My coworkers encourage me to try out my skills
   It is easy to get other people to help me when I need it
   The people I work with cooperate to get the work done

Hope this helps.

Kevin

J. Kevin Ford, PhD
Department of Psychology
Michigan State University
E. Lansing, MI 48824

From: Nce. Raymond
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 10:14 AM
To: Tori Austin
Subject: RE: Motivation to Transfer Instruments Permission

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of NIU. Do not click links, open attachments, or provide personal or account information, unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Tori:

See attached. You have my permission to use these scales. Are these the scales you want to use? If not, can you refer to the journal articles in which we used the scales you are requesting?

Best,

Ray
APPENDIX D

PARTICIPANT EMAIL
Dear Faculty,

My name is Tori Austin, I am a PhD candidate in the Educational Technology, Research and Assessment (ETRA) department at the College of Education at Northern Illinois University.

You’re invited to participate in a survey about mandatory online training. This invitation is being extended to all current faculty at NIU.

The study is expected to add to literature surrounding faculty training confidence, perception of training usefulness, and motivation to incorporate the knowledge and skills from mandatory online training. Therefore, you are asked to share your perception of mandatory online training.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and there is no known risk expected by participating in this study. The collection of personally identifiable information will be kept to a minimum to minimize the risk of participation in this study. The data collected through the Qualtrics system will be kept confidential in an effort to maintain your anonymity and will only be used for the research purposes authorized for Northern Illinois University.

This survey will be used to improve mandatory online training and will take about 10 minutes or less to complete. Completion of the survey instrument constitutes consent to participate in the survey.

Please click on the link and complete the survey.

SURVEY LINK

Upon completion of the survey, if you would like to volunteer for a follow up interview, please provide your email address for the researcher to contact you. For more information about the survey or this research, please email taustin2@niu.edu.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,