DOCENT TRAINING PROGRAM FOR THE KIDSBRIDGE MUSEUM

Author:
Dyana Reisen

Faculty Sponsor:
Jean Kirnan,
Department of Psychology

ABSTRACT

The impact of online training on volunteers' knowledge and experiences working as docents in the KidsBridge Museum at The College of New Jersey was investigated in a pre-post study. Participants reported that the online training was easy to use, and provided clear, concise information. Results also indicated that participants' self-efficacy beliefs about their knowledge of KidsBridge Museum and about their ability to perform certain museum tasks improved after taking part in the online training program. While no differences were found between experimental and control groups in postdocent measures of comfort, this may be traced back to nonrandom assignment of participants to these groups and ensuing pre-existing differences. Online training provided an effective method of training when volunteers' schedules complicated the delivery of more traditional training systems such as classroom or on-site.

INTRODUCTION

Companies that use training and development programs for their employees report better financial performance and greater ability to meet competitive challenges than their competitors who do not use such techniques (Noe, 2008). The goal of such programs is for employees to learn information, skills, and behaviors that can be applied to their daily lives, in or out of work. Training programs can result in workers feeling more satisfied and productive, which is beneficial to both the worker and the organization (Grant and Anderson, 1977). Training has become more focused on how it can change employees' behaviors and improve their performance (Noe, 2008). By being more performance-focused, the training may lead not only to improved performance, but improved business results as well.

In addition to training, research indicates that advancing self-efficacy should lead to better performance (Lent, Brown, and Hackett, 1994; Manz, 1986). Self-efficacy is a person's perception of how successfully he or she can perform a task or behavior (Frayne and Geringer, 2000; Noe, 2008; Saks, 1995). In his Social Cognitive Theory, Bandura (1986) defined self-efficacy as people's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute actions required for various types of performance. Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) expanded on Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory by addressing the relevance of the social cognitive mechanisms, i.e. self-efficacy beliefs, to career development (Lent, Brown, and Hacket, 1994). SCCT proposes that self-efficacy influences people's choices about which behaviors to undertake, how to overcome obstacles, the amount of effort to use, and ultimately their performance. According to SCCT, self-efficacy directly impacts performance because of its effect on how people organize and use their skills and indirectly influences performance through people's actions.

Gist and Mitchell (1992) claimed that self-efficacy was dynamic and changed in response to new experiences and information. Furthermore, it was noted that an important component of changing one's self-efficacy beliefs was the information and experience acquired through training. Training can increase a person's self-efficacy and training outcomes are considered more effective when perceived self-efficacy is improved (Gist, 1989).

Various training methods are used by today's organizations. The more traditional training methods, which are not delivered using technology, are more frequently used than programs that involve technology (Noe, 2008). Some of the traditional methods include instruction-led classrooms, workbooks, role-playing, and on-the-job training. While relatively new, technology-based training programs are

gaining momentum as they are increasingly used both as a new medium to deliver traditional content and as unique training methods in their own right. Such new technologies include providing information via the Internet, simulations, and video conferencing. These technology-based methods offer several benefits, such as easier administration of training to employees (self-paced learning, wider geographical reach, and simplified scheduling), reduced cost, and an ability to track employees' accomplishments. This use of training technologies is expected to increase in the near future.

Online training, better known as e-learning, is delivered via the internet (Rosenberg, 2001). E-learning has many advantages over traditional training methods. For instance, e-learning allows trainees to have control over the date/time, location, and pace at which they receive training (Burgess and Russell, 2003; DeRouin, Fritzsche, and Salas, 2005; Noe, 2008). Online training also permits faster delivery and easier updates to the training program. More importantly, research indicates that reactions towards and the effectiveness of e-learning are generally positive (DeRouin, Fritzsche, and Salas, 2005).

Training evaluation is just as important as the training itself. Evaluation is crucial in the planning, selection, and improvement of a particular training method (Snelbecker, 1993). Companies invest millions of dollars in training programs. Therefore, it is important to assess the benefits of training programs (Noe, 2008). Training evaluation provides a way to understand the financial resources invested in the training (Purcell, 2000). The evaluation also provides the data needed to demonstrate the benefits the training brings to the company.

There are numerous outcomes that are used in the evaluation of training programs, which include cognitive outcomes, skill-based outcomes, affective outcomes, and results outcomes. D. L. Kirkpatrick developed a four-level framework that categorizes these outcomes (as cited in Noe, 2008). The framework consists of Level 1 criteria, trainees' reactions to the training; Level 2 criteria, knowledge, skills, attitudes, or behaviors trainees gain; Level 3, changes in trainees' behavior; and Level 4, results or payoff of the training for the company. The hierarchal framework of levels implies that lower level outcomes should first be measured and show positive changes before higher level outcomes are addressed (Noe, 2008). For instance, if trainees do not like the training method (reaction or Level 1 outcomes), then an evaluation of their attitudes (affective or Level 2 outcomes) should not take place.

According to Noe (2008), affective outcomes are a person's attitude and motivation for the task at hand and can be Level 1 or 2 criteria. Reaction outcomes are a type of affective outcome that refer specifically to a person's perception of the training program itself and are Level 1 criteria. They focus on how well the trainer performed, if sufficient information was provided, and if the training method was appropriate. As indicated by Morgan and Casper (2000), the trainee's satisfaction with the training materials and opinions of the clarity and usefulness of the information are necessary parts of a reaction measure. The second-level evaluation is learning and consists of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors the trainees gain. Affective outcomes become Level 3 criteria when trainees' behavior is evaluated. If trainees are assessed on their improvement of behavior or acquisition of a new skill, this is a third-level evaluation.

Level 4 criteria of the framework help organizations determine the payoff of the training. This measure would be used to evaluate the increase in production and reduction of costs based on employee tasks. If employees received safety training, an organization would use Level 4 criteria to determine if costs were reduced by fewer accidents on the job. Again, Level 3 and 4 criteria cannot be evaluated until an organization has first addressed any concerns revealed by Level 1 and 2 criteria.

The current study focused on how training could add to volunteers' knowledge and improve their experiences in the KidsBridge Museum at The College of New Jersey. KidsBridge Museum is a nonprofit organization dedicated to teaching students, families, and educators in the Mercer County region of New Jersey about diversity and tolerance. The museum emphasizes understanding and appreciation of the opportunities that are inherent in the diverse cultures of the community and the world. It also provides character education programs that promote civility, kindness, conflict resolution, mediation, and antibullying. These life-skill programs are designed to prepare children to be successful in a global society, while instilling values of cooperation, peaceful interaction, teamwork, and leadership (Azarchi, n.d.).

Visitors to the museum learn about stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination and their effects on others. They are taught to respect themselves and others through an interactive and experiential process and to develop skills to deal with prejudice and the emotions that arise from prejudice and discrimination. Children who visit the museum are students in second through eighth grades. Groups visiting the museum include school groups, scouts, leadership groups, clubs, day camp groups, and religious school groups (Azarchi).

Over the past few years, KidsBridge has relied on many volunteers who have received varying degrees of training (L. Azarchi, personal communication, March 21, 2008). In order to provide the best experience for the children who visit the museum and the volunteer docents, a formal training process was necessary. Not all docents at the museum received training. For those who did receive training, the training consisted of a short walk-through of the exhibits given by the museum's director. Other docents experienced the museum for the first time only when they arrived to work in the museum. There was no formal orientation to educate docents about the museum or the overall purpose of KidsBridge. The purpose of the present study was to develop and evaluate a training program for docents at the KidsBridge Museum.

The main goal for training docents was to provide information about the KidsBridge Museum in order to reduce role ambiguity, or unclear expectations of one's behaviors, when working in the museum. Many researchers consider ambiguity as one of the antecedents of occupational stress (Ivancevich, Matteson, and Preston, 1982; Manning, Ismael, and Sherwood, 1981; Rosse and Rosse, 1981). Motowidlo, Packard, and Manning (1986) concluded that interventions that reduce stress might improve interpersonal and motivational aspects of job performance.

It was assumed that the e-learning module would decrease the ambiguity of the docent task resulting in an increase in positive self-efficacy beliefs about their knowledge of KidsBridge. This increase in knowledge would presumably lead to an increased belief in their ability to perform as docents, improving self-efficacy. Hypotheses 1 and 3 reflect this assumption.

Hypothesis 1: Participants' self-efficacy beliefs about their knowledge of KidsBridge Museum would increase after taking part in the online training program. Specifically, measures of self-efficacy taken immediately after the training program would be higher than pretraining measures for those who completed the online training program.

Hypothesis 2: Participants who completed the online training program would evaluate the program favorably on a posttraining reaction outcome evaluation, indicating e-learning is an effective training method.

Hypothesis 3: Participants who completed the online training program (experimental group) would demonstrate higher levels of comfort about their knowledge or ability to perform certain docent tasks than participants who did not complete the online training (control group).

METHOD

Participants

Thirty-two undergraduate students at The College of New Jersey participated in the study. Four of the 32 students were eliminated from the study because they had previously volunteered as docents, reducing the number of usable participants to 28. Of these 28, 18 participants were education majors, 2 each were psychology, biology, nursing and English, 1 was sociology and one was unspecified. The participants represented all levels in college with 3 freshmen, 2 sophomores, 17 juniors, 5 seniors and one unspecified. Other demographics were not collected.

Materials

This study consisted of training measures assessing pre and post self-efficacy beliefs, as well as a training evaluation measure for those who participated in the training module. Additionally, a postdocent measure of comfort was administered to all participants after they served as docents in the museum.

Training measures

A measure of participants' self-efficacy beliefs about their knowledge of the KidsBridge Museum and their perception of their ability to perform particular tasks was administered only to those who participated in training immediately before and after the e-learning module. Participants responded to the same items on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Agree), to 5 (Strongly Disagree). Items included statements such as "I know who comes to the KidsBridge Museum" and "I know the types of activities at the KidsBridge Museum" (see Appendices A and B for pre- and posttests, respectively). These items comprise Level 2 criteria in Kirkpatrick's four-level framework for organizing training outcomes (Noe, 2008). A comparison of these pre and postmeasures would address Hypothesis 1. The e-leaning group also participated in a second posttraining survey that was again administered online immediately following training. This measure comprises Level 1 in Kirkpatrick's framework for organizing training outcomes, which were reaction outcomes (Noe, 2008). This measure of a person's perception of the training program would address questions raised by Hypothesis 2.

Docent measure
While only some of the participants in the study were exposed to the e-learning, all participants served as docents in the KidsBridge Museum. All were administered a paper and pencil survey, measuring their perceived level of comfort with a variety of museum tasks. Docents responded on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Agree), to 5 (Strongly Disagree) to describe their level of comfort for items such as "Knowing the overall purpose of KidsBridge Museum" and "Knowing the purpose of the individual exhibit(s) that I was responsible for" (see Appendix C). A comparison of experimental (e-learning) and control groups on the postdocent measures of comfort would address Hypothesis 3.

An identification code consisting of the last four digits of the participant's college ID number was also obtained for every measure. These codes facilitated the matching of the different survey measures while ensuring anonymity and confidentiality.

Training Module
Microsoft Powerpoint was used to create the training module. The Powerpoint was displayed on the Internet via Microsoft Internet Explorer. E-learning was used to provide training for the KidsBridge Museum since it allowed participants the flexibility of accessing the training module at their convenience using their own computers.

In order to enhance the e-learning experience, pictures were included in the training module. Clark and Mayer (2003) note that the combination of text and graphics allows the learners to be more engaged with the material. The pictures that were used featured the various KidsBridge Museum exhibits so that trainees could see what the museum and exhibits looked like without having to be physically there. Several of the people who piloted the training program stated that it felt as if they were in the museum when they were completing the training module.

Moreover, the module began with the objectives of the KidsBridge program because objectives outline what trainees are expected to gain from the training (Byars and Crane, 1969; Noe, 2008). Furthermore, these objectives offer guidelines for performance and training evaluation. For instance, one objective was to "provide docents with the knowledge and skills needed to engage in conversation with visitors" (see Appendices A and B). To evaluate this objective, items on the pre and posttests asked about the participants' perceived ability to empower children, handle a disruptive child, or how to handle a child making fun of another student.

Procedure
Before the training module was created, a needs assessment was conducted to determine what information should be included. According to Noe (2008), no one method of needs assessment is better than another, so different methods should be used. Observations, questionnaires, and research on training and e-learning were therefore all employed.

Observation was carried out in the museum to help determine the work environment of the exhibits. The observation helped to identify the various tasks performed by a docent. A pilot study was also conducted in which questionnaires were sent to people who had been docents for KidsBridge in

previous years. In addition, the questionnaires were given to two subject matter experts (SMEs), the Director of KidsBridge and a training specialist. The SMEs were familiar with the knowledge, skills, and abilities that were needed to work in the museum and how the training could meet the needs of the docents. Finally, we collected information about training programs and the various ways they can be used in order to determine which training method would be best for the KidsBridge Museum.

Once the pretest, posttest and training program were created, they were reviewed by students who had worked in the museum and the SMEs. Feedback was provided on the layout of the module, the ease of use of the program, and any additional museum-related information that needed to be added. The students and SMEs believed that the training module was easy to navigate and provided sufficient information. The Director of KidsBridge mentioned that more FAQs and answers be provided, which were added to the module.

Participants were recruited by the Director of KidsBridge, through various campus organizations, and from courses that emphasized learning or tolerance issues. Several education courses required students' participation in the museum and thus many docents were education majors. Because of scheduling conflicts, participants could not be randomly assigned to the experimental and control conditions. Instead, a nonrandom, convenience assignment was used. There were two distinct participant groups: 1) An experimental group that took part in the training module (completed an online consent form, pre and postmeasures, training, and debriefing) and acted as docents ($n = 10$); and 2) A control group that did not receive online training but served as docents ($n = 18$). All of the participants also completed a postdocent survey measuring their degree of comfort with docent tasks. Since a non-random convenience assignment was used, a disproportionate number of education majors were in the control group.

After recruitment, we provided participants who were going to take part in the training an informed consent form and a link to the online training module, which began with the premeasure of knowledge. Participants were then directed to an online Powerpoint training module, which consisted of 24 slides and took no more than 30 minutes to complete. Following the training module, participants were directed to the postknowledge assessment as well as the reaction evaluation. Once the postmeasure was completed, participants were sent the debriefing form. All data collection was anonymous and confidential.

The participants then read and signed informed consent forms before serving as museum docents. Docents worked in the museum for about four hours. Afterwards, they completed a postmeasure of comfort with docent tasks. This was done anonymously and confidentially, and all surveys were collected separately and placed in an envelope for later analysis. Docents then read and signed debriefing forms, which were put into another envelope. Copies of the debriefing forms were offered to docents upon leaving.

RESULTS

To assess change in participants' self-efficacy beliefs about their knowledge of KidsBridge Museum and their ability to perform various tasks in the museum, dependent *t*-tests were performed (see Table 1). The *t*-tests revealed an increase in participants' self-efficacy beliefs, comparing pre and post e-learning measures, for all 12 items, and a statistically significant increase for 7 of the 12. These data support Hypothesis 1 that participants' self-efficacy beliefs would increase following training. Mean differences between pre and posttest scores ranged from a positive change of 0.10 to 1.60. Two additional items, "types of activities" and "who uses stereotypes," achieved marginal significance.

Table 1
Change in self-efficacy beliefs comparing pretraining and posttraining responses for participants who took part in e-learning

Item	Mean	*t*	*p*

Who comes to KidsBridge			
Pretest	4.00	-2.33*	.045
Posttest	4.70		
Types of activities at the KidsBridge[A]			
Pretest	4.00	-2.25	.051
Posttest	4.60		
What topics are covered			
Pretest	4.00	-4.00**	.003
Posttest	4.80		
Understand a stereotype			
Pretest	4.20	-1.63	.138
Posttest	4.70		
Who uses stereotypes[A]			
Pretest	4.10	-2.09	.066
Posttest	4.80		
Name calling is a form of prejudice			
Pretest	4.70	-1.00	.343
Posttest	4.80		
How to respond to name calling			
Pretest	3.40	-3.97**	.003
Posttest	4.50		
What it means to be a silent bystander			
Pretest	4.40	-2.45*	.037
Posttest	4.80		
Exclusion is a form of prejudice[B]			
Pretest	4.70	0.00	--
Posttest	4.70		
How to empower children			
Pretest	3.70	-3.67**	.005
Posttest	4.30		
Child is disruptive in my group			
Pretest	3.10	-5.24***	.001
Posttest	4.70		
Child is making fun of student			
Pretest	3.60	-3.87**	.004
Posttest	4.60		

Note. $N = 10$. Values ranged from 1-5 on a Likert scale. Higher numbers indicate participants' belief they knew the item. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. [A]The increase for these items had marginal significance. [B]The means did not differ.

In order to evaluate attitudes toward the online training module, mean scores for participants' reaction outcomes were obtained after participants completed the training, as shown in Table 2. All of the scores were 4.20 or higher on a Likert scale of 1 to 5, and the highest score was a 4.80. These reaction outcomes supported Hypothesis 2, suggesting that the material was appropriate and e-learning was an effective method of training for KidsBridge Museum.

Table 2

Mean scores for reaction outcomes of training module for participants who took part in e-learning

Item	Mean
Powerpoint was an effective method	4.30
Material was presented in an organized fashion	4.80
Length of the Powerpoint was appropriate	4.50

Amount of information was sufficient	4.40
Skills/knowledge have increased	4.40
Will be able to use what I learned	4.60
I was interested and engaged	4.20
Overall, the presentation was very good	4.40

Note. N = 10. Values ranged from 1-5 on a Likert scale. Higher numbers indicate more agreement with the statement.

Independent *t*-tests were performed to determine if docents who received e-learning had higher levels of comfort when working in the museum than a control group of docents who did not receive training (see Table 3). The *t*-tests revealed that there was no significant difference in docents' level of comfort about their knowledge or ability to perform certain docent tasks, failing to support Hypothesis 3.

Table 3
Differences in level of comfort for control and experimental groups

Item	Mean	*t*	*p*
Overall purpose of KidsBridge Museum			
Control	4.33	-0.91	.372
Experimental	4.60		
Purpose of the individual exhibit(s)			
Control	4.50	0.17	.869
Experimental	4.44		
How to work the exhibit(s)			
Control	4.39	0.23	.818
Experimental	4.30		
Able to answer factual questions			
Control	4.00	0.22	.828
Experimental	3.90		
Able to respond to emotional/feeling statements			
Control	4.06	0.40	.696
Experimental	3.90		
Able to pose questions			
Control	4.28	-0.09	.927
Experimental	4.30		
Able to engage in conversation			
Control	4.44	0.19	.848
Experimental	4.40		
Children learned what they should			
Control	4.11	-0.28	.785
Experimental	4.20		

Note. N = 28, 18 in control and 10 in experimental. Values ranged from 1-5 on a Likert scale. Higher numbers indicate participants' had higher level of comfort for the item. The differences were not significant.

DISCUSSION

The dependent *t*-tests indicated that participants' perception of their ability to perform in the KidsBridge Museum was higher for the posttest than the pretest. These data revealed that after completing the KidsBridge online training program, participants' self-efficacy beliefs about their ability to perform in the

museum increased. These findings supported the hypothesis that participants' self-efficacy beliefs about their knowledge and ability would increase after completing the training module. The data were thus consistent with previous research that claimed self-efficacy was dynamic and changed in response to new experiences and information, especially the information gained through training (Gist and Mitchell, 1992). Interestingly, the items with the greatest increase dealt with learning the docent's behavior in the museum and not with simple acquisition of knowledge. Specifically, the items covering "how to respond to name calling," "what to do with a disruptive child," and "what to do when a child makes fun of others" revealed mean differences of at least 1.00. This further supports our belief that self-efficacy improved, a result that upholds Gist's (1989) and Saks' (1995) findings that training increased a person's self-efficacy.

Evaluation of reaction outcomes indicated that trainees were satisfied with their training experience. As mentioned earlier, reaction outcomes focus on how well the trainer performed, if sufficient information was provided, and if the training method was appropriate (Noe, 2008). The present data revealed that participants were satisfied with the training module, so there is no need to modify the training program itself. The Powerpoint and e-learning format will continue to be used. If any changes are made to the training program, e.g. programs are added to the KidsBridge Museum and this information is not in the training module, the electronic format makes it easy to add any needed components. The present study provides support for previous research on effectiveness and ease of online training (Burgess and Russell, 2003; DeRouin, Fritzsche, and Salas, 2005; Noe, 2008).

The independent *t*-tests revealed that participants who completed the online training module prior to serving as docents in the museum (experimental group) did not differ from participants who did not complete the module (control group). These data failed to support Hypothesis 2 that participants who completed the training program before volunteering as docents would have higher comfort and self-efficacy ratings than those who did not.

This lack of significance may be partly explained by inherent differences in the experimental and control groups caused by our inability to randomly assign participants to these groups. Of the 28 docents, 18 were education majors, and 15 of these students were in the control group. Since the education majors have a background of working with and teaching children, they were at an advantage over other participants prior to any training at KidsBridge Museum. In addition, education majors learned about the various aspects of KidsBridge by visiting the museum with their professors and speaking with the Director of KidsBridge Museum. Consequently, these students received information about the museum prior to serving as docents, which may have contributed to the high levels of comfort observed in the control group.

The large number of education majors involved with the study may account for the lack of variability in data between the experimental and control docent groups. If random assignment had been used instead of convenience sampling, as well as ensuring that none of the participants had knowledge of the KidsBridge Museum prior to the study, the hypothesis might have been supported.

Alternatively, since there was no difference in docents' level of comfort regardless of whether or not they had received training, more information on the museum could be added to the module or other methods could be used in addition to e-learning in order further to increase docents' level of comfort. Perhaps the online training was insufficient in its content and ability to enhance self-efficacy beliefs.

According to SCCT, self-efficacy contributes directly to people's performance accomplishments (Lent, Brown, and Hackett, 1994). Future research might include measures of performance to determine whether or not docents' performance increases when their self-efficacy beliefs increase. Bandura (1986) also identified numerous factors that affect the relationship between self-efficacy and performance behaviors. These factors include providing feedback and ensuring people having an accurate appraisal of their capabilities. Feedback from visitors, as well as the KidsBridge Director, could provide docents with information about their performance and whether or not it needs improvement. This information could increase their self-efficacy about their museum knowledge and ability to perform the various tasks. Performance may then improve as a result.

Future measurement of performance is also supported by Kirkpatrick's framework. As indicated by Kirkpatrick, Level 2 criteria, or the acquisition of attitudes, should not be measured unless positive

changes occur at Level 1 (Noe, 2008). Since the study showed that the trainees thought the training module was successful (Level 1 criteria), it supports our efforts to measure a change in the trainees' self-efficacy beliefs (Level 2 criteria). The next step in this research would be to measure whether or not docents' behaviors change while working at the KidsBridge Museum because change in behavior is Level 3 of the framework. Furthermore, Anderson, Ball, Murphy, and Associates (1975) believe that it is important to determine whether or not knowledge learned in the training program is demonstrated and if the training solves the problems it was intended to. A final evaluation for the training program would address Level 4 criteria to show the results of the training. To accomplish a Level 4 evaluation, changes in KidsBridge Museum visitors' knowledge about prejudices and tolerance would be measured since that is one of the objectives of the museum.

       This research documents the successful creation of an online training program designed to train undergraduate students as docents at KidsBridge Museum. Participants reported that the online training was easy to access and use, and it provided clear, concise information. Improvement in self-efficacy beliefs was noted in pre and posttraining measures. While no difference was found between experimental and control groups in postdocent measures of comfort, this may be traced back to pre-existing differences. In this case, online training was an effective method of training when schedules complicated the delivery of more traditional training systems such as classroom or on-site. Thus, other organizations faced with scheduling issues may wish to consider e-learning as an alternative to more traditional methods.

REFERENCES

Anderson, S. B., Ball, S., Murphy, R. T., and Associates. (1975). *Encyclopedia of educational evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Azarchi, L. (n.d.). *KidsBridge Tolerance Museum at The College of New Jersey*. Retrieved August 10, 2007, from http://www.kidsbridgemuseum.org/main/.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Burgess, J. R. D., and Russell, J. E. A. (2003). The effectiveness of distance learning initiatives in organizations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *63*, 289-303.

Byars, L. L., and Crane, D. P. (1969). Training by objectives. *Training and Development Journal*, *23*, 38-48.

Clark, R. C., and Mayer R. E. (2003). *E-learning and the science of instruction: Proven guidelines for consumers and designers of multimedia learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

DeRouin, R. E., Fritzsche, B. A., and Salas E. (2005). E-learning in organizations. *Journal of Management*, *31*, 920-940.

Frayne, C. A., and Geringer, J. M. (2000). Self-management training for improving job performance: A field experiment involving salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*, 361-372.

Gist, M. E. (1989). The influence of training method on self-efficacy and idea generating among managers. *Personnel Psychology*, *42*, 787-805.

Gist, M. E., and Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review*, *17*, 183-211.

Grant, D. L., and Anderson, S. B. (1977). Issues in the evaluation of training. *Professional Psychology*, *8*, 659-673.

Ivancevich, J. M., Matteson, M. T., and Preston, C. (1982). Occupational stress, Type A behavior, and physical well being. *Academy of Management Journal*, *25*, 373-391.

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., and Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *45*, 79-122.

Manning, M. R., Ismael, A. H., and Sherwood, J. J. (1981). Effects of role conflict on selected physiological, affective, and performance variables. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *16*, 125-141.

Manz, C. C. (1986). Self-leadership: Toward an expanded theory of self-management myths. *Academy of Management Review*, *11*, 585-600.

Morgan, R., and Casper, W. (2000). Examining the factor structure of participant reactions to training: A multidimensional approach. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *11*, 301-317.

Motowidlo, S. J., Packard, J. S., and Manning, M. R. (1986). Occupational stress: Its causes and consequences for job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*, 618-629.

Noe, R. A. (2008). *Employee Training and Development* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Purcell, A. (2000). 20/20 ROI. *Training and Development*, *54*, 28-33.

Rosenberg, M. (2001). *E-Learning: Strategies for Delivering Knowledge in the Digital World*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rosse, J. G., and Rosse, P. H. (1981). Role conflict and ambiguity: An empirical investigation of nursing personnel. *Evaluation and the Health Professions*, *4*, 385-405.

Saks, A. M. (1995). Longitudinal field investigation of the moderating and mediating effects of self-efficacy on the relationship between training and newcomer adjustment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *80*, 211-225.

Snelbecker, G. (1993). Practical ways for using theories and innovations to improve training. In G. Piskurich (Ed.), *The ASTD Handbook of Instructional Technology* (pp. 19.3-19.26). Burr Ridge, IL: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

APPENDIX A

Thanks for participating in our training module. Please complete the following anonymous questionnaire to help us improve our presentation.

KidsBridge Museum	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I know who comes to the KidsBridge Museum.	1	2	3	4	5
I know the types of activities at the KidsBridge Museum.	1	2	3	4	5
I know what topics are covered in the KidsBridge Museum.	1	2	3	4	5
I understand what a stereotype is.	1	2	3	4	5
I know who uses stereotypes.	1	2	3	4	5
I understand that name calling is a form of prejudice.	1	2	3	4	5
I know how to respond to name calling.	1	2	3	4	5
I understand what it means to be a silent bystander.	1	2	3	4	5
I know that exclusion is a form of prejudice.	1	2	3	4	5
I know how to empower children.	1	2	3	4	5
I know what to do if a child is disruptive in my group.	1	2	3	4	5
I know what to do if a child is making fun of another student.	1	2	3	4	5

Thank you!

APPENDIX B

Thanks for participating in our training module. Please complete the following anonymous questionnaire to help us improve our presentation.

KidsBridge Museum	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Powerpoint was an effective method of presentation.	1	2	3	4	5
The material was presented in an organized fashion.	1	2	3	4	5
The length of the Powerpoint was appropriate for the material.	1	2	3	4	5
The amount of information presented was sufficient.	1	2	3	4	5
I believe my skills/knowledge have increased because of this presentation.	1	2	3	4	5
I believe I will be able to use what I learned.	1	2	3	4	5
I was interested and engaged during the presentation.	1	2	3	4	5
Overall, I thought the presentation was very good.	1	2	3	4	5
I know who comes to the KidsBridge Museum.	1	2	3	4	5
I know the types of activities at the KidsBridge Museum.	1	2	3	4	5
I know what topics are covered in the KidsBridge Museum.	1	2	3	4	5
I understand what a stereotype is.	1	2	3	4	5
I know who uses stereotypes.	1	2	3	4	5
I understand that name calling is a form of prejudice.	1	2	3	4	5
I know how to respond to name calling.	1	2	3	4	5
I understand what it means to be a silent bystander.	1	2	3	4	5
I know that exclusion is a form of prejudice.	1	2	3	4	5
I know how to empower children.	1	2	3	4	5
I know what to do if a child is disruptive in my group.	1	2	3	4	5
I know what to do if a child is making fun of another student.	1	2	3	4	5

Is there any other feedback that you would like to share with us regarding the training presentation? Thank you!

APPENDIX C

Thanks for working as a docent at KidsBridge. Please complete the following confidential questionnaire to help us improve the program.

Select the number that best describes the degree of comfort you had in your role as a tour guide for the following:

1 Very uncomfortable
2 Uncomfortable
3 Neither uncomfortable nor comfortable
4 Comfortable
5 Very Comfortable

___ Knowing the overall purpose of KidsBridge Museum
___ Knowing the purpose of the individual exhibit(s) that I was responsible for
___ Knowing how to work the exhibit(s)
___ Being able to answer factual questions posed by the children
___ Being able to respond to emotional/feeling statements posed by the children.
___ Being able to pose questions of my own to the children.
___ Being able to engage in conversation with the children.
___ Ensuring that the children learned what they should from the exhibit(s)

Did you participate in the online museum training program?

____Yes ____ No

Have you volunteered as a docent (museum guide) at KidsBridge in the past?

____Yes ____ No

How did you learn about the docent opportunity with KidsBridge Museum?

__Education Course   __Psychology Course   __Circle K   __Psi Chi

__Psychology Club   __Bonner

__Other Community Service: _____

__Other Organization: _____

PLEASE TURN SHEET OVER TO CONTINUE QUESTIONS ON REVERSE

What is your Major? _____

Which of the following best describes your academic standing?

__Freshman   __Sophomore   __Junior   __Senior

How likely are you to return as a docent for KidsBridge?

        1   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**

Definitely will not   Might or might not   Definitely will

     -If no, why not?_____

_____

_____

_____

Is there any other feedback that you would like to share with us regarding your experience as a docent?

_____

_____

_____

When you are finished, please place this questionnaire in the manila envelope marked "Docent Questionnaires."

Thank you!