Satisfaction with Face-to-Face and Self-Study Training Formats for the QPR Certified Instructor Training Program

Authors: Matthew Schumacher, MA, Doctoral Candidate, Northern Illinois University, Department of Psychology, Peter M. Gutierrez, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Northern Illinois University and Paul Quinnett, Ph.D., CEO, the QPR Institute.

Data were available and analyzed for 333 evaluations (n = 284 for instructor delivery and 46 for the self-study), involving multi master trainers at multi training sites delivering a standardized training protocol. All data was provided by adult trainees, 21-years or older.

Nine Likert-like items were analyzed to determine inter-relationships between evaluation domains, teaching sites, and course delivery method. All zero-order correlations among evaluation domains were significant at the .01 level, positive, and ranged from weak to modest in magnitude (r = .25-.67, see table 1, appendix). This suggests that while these domains were related one to another, they are adequately independent to warrant further analyses of group differences.

A one –way ANOVA was completed comparing mean scores for evaluation domains by instruction site. Means and standard deviations for evaluation domains are shown in table 2. Self-study course was included in this analysis as a separate "site" to increase the parsimony of the analysis. A main effect was found for instruction site. Post-hoc mean comparisons indicated the following significant differences:

Evaluation Domain	Higher rated sites	Lower rated sites
Organization	Anchorage Owensbrook Utah	Boston Self-study
Content	Atlanta Utah Owensbrook	Boston Havre
Presentation1	Utah	Havre
Value	Atlanta	Boston Havre
Expectations	Atlanta	Boston

	Utah Owensbrook	Havre
Knowledge	Anchorage Atlanta Austin Centerville Owensbrook Scottsdale Sioux Falls St. Louis Warsaw	Boston Self-study Holyoke
Presentation2	Atlanta Austin Owensbrook Scottsdale	Self-study (table continues)
Evaluation Domain	Higher rated sites	Lower rated sites
	St. Louis Utah	
Practical	Atlanta Austin Owensbrook	Centerville
Overall	Anchorage Atlanta Austin Owensbrook Scottsdale Utah	Boston

Point biserial correlation between delivery mode and overall satisfaction was significant (rho = -.104, p = .05). The direction of this difference suggests a small overall preference for the live instructor version and is consistent with other analyses reported below. Similar preferences for the live instructor version were evident in the domains of knowledge (rho = -.263, p<.001) presentation2 (rho= -.227, p=.001), and organization (rho = -.171, p=.002). All other point biserial correlations were non-significant.

A follow up, one –way ANOVA was completed comparing mean scores for evaluation domains by instruction delivery method. Please note that 1.0 is the highest possible satisfaction rating with greater numbers indicating decreases satisfaction. A main effect was found for delivery method. Live instructor was deemed superior to self-study in terms of organization, presentation1, knowledge, presentation2, and overall – see table below.

Evaluation Domain	Self-Study	Live Instructor
Organization**	**1.72**	**1.42**
Content	1.52	1.42
Presentation1*	**1.59**	**1.39**
Value	1.46	1.45
Expectations	1.74	1.57
Knowledge**	**1.57**	**1.17**
Presentation2**	**1.71**	**1.29**
Practical	1.57	1.58
Overall*	**1.57**	**1.38**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$

Summary

In general, all delivery methods and sites were rated highly by course trainee participants. However, some initial trends were revealed. In general, participants appeared to prefer the live instructor version of the course due to greater organization, presentation quality and knowledge increases. Participants also preferred the live instructor version overall. In addition, participants seem to rate the Boston and Havre sites less favorably than the other sites. Again, interpretation of these statistical results should be tempered by the recognition that QPR was, on average, rated extremely well by participants at all sites and in all presentation formats. In short, while these statistics support the conclusion that differences exist between sites and participants in the subjective evaluation of QPR, it is less clear in what way these differences may be meaningful.

Appendix

Table 1: Table of zero order correlations for satisfaction content areas

	Organization	Content	Presentation1	Value	Expectations	Knowledge	Presentation2	Practical	Overall
Organization	**1.0**	**.548**	**.582**	**.402**	**.521**	**.373**	**.564**	**.314**	**.580**
Content		**1.0**	**.629**	**.622**	**.612**	**.393**	**.545**	**.441**	**.627**
Presentation1			**1.0**	**.528**	**.590**	**.395**	**.602**	**.345**	**.627**
Value				**1.0**	**.628**	**.335**	**.389**	**.521**	**.682**
Expectations					**1.0**	**.327**	**.469**	**.464**	**.666**
Knowledge						**1.0**	**.527**	**.253**	**.454**
Presentation2							**1.0**	**.298**	**.556**
Practical								**1.0**	**.523**

All correlations coefficients (r) significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Table 2: Means scores in evaluations domains by site and delivery method

Evaluation Domain	Anchorage(27)	Atlanta(18)	Austin(25)	Boston(20)	Centerville(16)	Havre(19)	Holyoke(21)
Organization	1.15	1.67	1.40	1.80	1.25	1.68	1.52
Content	1.37	1.11	1.36	1.75	1.38	1.89	1.57
Presentation1	1.26	1.22	1.32	1.65	1.38	1.84	1.52
Value	1.33	1.11	1.36	1.80	1.44	1.89	1.67
Expectations	1.52	1.33	1.48	2.10	1.56	2.00	1.71
Knowledge	1.15	1.00	1.04	1.60	1.06	1.16	1.48
Presentation2	1.37	1.17	1.16	1.65	1.25	1.53	1.43
Practical	1.48	1.06	1.32	1.90	2.25	1.89	1.86

Evaluation Domain	Owensbrook(24)	Scottsdale(15)	Sioux Falls(12)	St. Louis(35)	Utah(22)	Warsaw(29)	Self-Study(47)
Organization	1.21	1.27	1.42	1.49	1.18	1.45	1.72
Content	1.17	1.40	1.33	1.33	1.18	1.45	1.52
Presentation1	1.25	1,27	1,25	1.26	1.18	1.62	1.60
Value	1.29	1.40	1.33	1.57	1.32	1.31	1.49
Expectations	1.29	1.40	1.58	1.60	1.23	1.59	1.74
Knowledge	1.13	1.00	1.08	1.14	1.00	1.17	1.60
Presentation2	1.17	1.13	1.25	1.14	1.09	1.45	1.72
Practical	1.21	1.47	1.50	1.80	1.32	1.55	1.57

Number of participants in parentheses; participants in the self-study also included in sites for descriptive purposes.