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Abstract

Corporate organizations are turning to Virtual Instructor Led Training (VILT) in order to fulfill a training need while saving on costs, increasing productivity, and capabilities. There has not been much research about VILT initiatives in a corporate environment. However, a rising number of corporations undertaking VILT prove the need for this research. Much can be learned from the academic research of synchronous forms of distance education and from the practical experience of corporate learning partners who have taken on similar initiatives in the past. While barriers to adoption exist, learning organizations can benefit from approaching this change strategically, actively educating and involving their business partners as well as learning from the lessons of organizations who have already adopted VILT.
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Guidelines and Considerations when Developing, Defining, and Deploying Live, Virtual Instructor Led Training as a New Training Modality in a Corporate Organization

The purpose of this research is to assist corporations who are considering adding live, virtual instructor led training as a new training modality. Organizations considering ways to improve on an existing VILT implementation can also benefit from this research. What are the guidelines and considerations must corporations take into account in order to develop, define, and deploy live, virtual instructor led training as a new training modality? The intended audiences are corporate learning organizations and training professionals. The major goals of the research are:

1. Discuss the drivers that have caused other organizations to adopt live, virtual instructor led training as a learning modality,
2. Examine the obstacles to adoption,
3. Explore strategies that contribute to successful adoption
4. Discuss how to develop a strategy to incorporate this new modality into the organization,
5. Determine the situations where live (synchronous) training is superior to on-demand (asynchronous) training in a corporate setting, and
6. Discuss the lessons learned by other organizations.

Corporate organizations are turning to technology to assist with providing training. The “2017 ATD research report Virtual Classrooms Now reveals that 86 percent of all organizations already are using virtual training or planning to start soon” (Huggett, 2018, p. 61). The increasing need for virtual instructor led training (VILT) by corporate organizations also increases the need for research on this topic. Organizations need to understand how to transition from face-to-face instructor led to virtual instructor led training. The skills and training needed for each modality are different and organizations must plan and prepare to ensure a successful transition (Canuel, & White, 2014; Hall, 2010; Huggett, 2018; Jagger, 2013; Turmel, 2012). The “virtual classroom is here to stay and will become an increasingly important aspect of workplace learning delivery bringing, as it does, so many immediate benefits to the learner, their employer and the commercial learning provider” (Jagger, 2013, p. 47).

**Literature Review**

**Connections**

Research in synchronous distance education can inform the questions raised in this paper. Synchronous distance education shares a real time component with VILT events. Some findings related to this type of instruction can transfer to the topic of virtual instructor led training.

The majority of corporate organizations are pursing VILT as a modality (Huggett, 2018). This increases the need for research on this topic. Organizations need to understand how to successfully implement this new modality.

**Definitions**

“Virtual instructor-led training (VILT) refers to training that is delivered in a virtual or simulated environment, or when instructor and learner are in separate locations. Virtual instruction environments are designed to simulate the traditional classroom or learning experience” (Training Industry, 2013, para. 1). For the purposes of this paper, VILT will refer to synchronous training only. The terms *VILT* and *synchronous training* are used interchangeably in this paper.

VILT platforms include features that encourage interaction and engagement. These features include breakout rooms, chat, emoticons, polling, webcams, and whiteboards (Clay, 2012; Huggett, 2013; Kreie, Johnson, & Lebsock, 2017). *Breakout rooms* allow the instructor to break the class into small groups which work independently of the main virtual classroom to complete course work (Kreie, Johnson, & Lebsock, 2017). The instructor has the ability to visit each virtual breakout to provide guidance, if needed. *Chat* allows the participants to send instant text messages between each other and the instructor within the virtual platform during the live event (Clay, 2012). Public chats are discussions shared with all participants. *Private chats* are discussions shared between only two people (Clay, 2016). *Emoticons* are graphics that learners can use to provide a non-verbal, non-textual cues. These can include smiley faces, frowning faces, and the raise hand icon (Huggett, 2013). *Polling* allows the instructor to warm up and re-engage participants with the subject matter (Clay, 2012). *Screen sharing* allows instructors to share desktop contents with participants (Huggett, 2013). *Webcams* allow the instructor and participants to share a live video feed of their faces (Clay, 2012). *Whiteboards* allow participants to annotate ideas as part of a class discussion (Clay, 2012).

There are other types of synchronous events that are confused with VILT (Huggett, 2017). Online meetings between peers may use webcams and transfer information and are not training (Huggett, 2017). Webcasts are used for presentations to larger audiences and are not training (Huggett, 2017). Webinars may be held for large or small audiences and may include some interactivity (Huggett, 2017). Facilitators interact with a small group of learners during VILT events (Huggett, 2017).

**Common Themes**

The common themes found in the literature related to virtual instructor led training are found in Table 1. The Findings portion of this paper explores the themes in more depth.

Table 1

*Virtual Instructor Led Common Themes Found in Literature Review*

|  |
| --- |
| Themes |
| There are multiple drivers for organizations switching from instructor led to virtual instructor led training (Jagger, 2013; Virtual class, 2005). |
| Successful VILT initiatives prepare instructors for facilitating in this new environment (Canuel, & White, 2014). |
| Advanced planning and communication are needed for well-attended virtual instructor led events that encourage learning transfer (Hofmann, 2016; Freifeld, 2016; Kreie, Johnson, & Lebsock, 2017). |
| VILT tools include interactive tools to assist with learning engagement and interaction (Huggett, 2013). |

**Methodology**

The research for this paper started by searching UMUC’s virtual library and http://scholar.google.com/ for terms related to the research question and goals. Sources that were not deemed by the student author as relevant to the question or goals were excluded as sources. Table 2 provides the search terms used when gathering the relevant literature for this paper.

Table 2

*Literature Review Search Terms*

|  |
| --- |
| Terms |
| Online Learning |
| Polling |
| Synchronous Distance Learning |
| Virtual Instructor Led Training |
| Virtual Online Learning |

References for this paper are taken from authoritative sources. Articles and short pieces from academic journals are included. Sources from highly regarded learning and development associations are included. The Association for Talent Development, the eLearning Guild, and Training are highly regarded professional associations in the learning and development space. Conference speaker sessions and association publications are represented in this research. Publications from the practices of authors who have written for these associations or presented at association events are also included.

The data from the approved articles were categorized by student author in the Findings section of this paper. The research questions and goals are the sole guideposts used to determine where the relevant data from the research sources are presented. The correlation between the research goals and the related finding sections are given in Table 3.

Table 3

*Research Goals and Related Finding Section*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Research Goals | Findings Section |
| Discuss the drivers that have caused other organizations to adopt live, virtual instructor led training as a learning modality | Drivers for VILT |
| Examine the obstacles to adoption | Obstacles to Adoption |
| Explore strategies that contribute to successful adoption | Adoption Success Factors |
| Discuss how to develop a strategy to incorporate this new modality into the organization | Developing a Strategy |
| Determine the situations where live (synchronous) training is superior to on-demand (asynchronous) training in a corporate setting | Synchronous Training Superiority |
| Discuss the lessons learned by other organizations | Lessons Learned |

**Findings**

**Drivers for VILT**

Drivers for VILT include cost savings and increased productivity. Travel, lodging, and meal costs add up quickly to allow participants and instructors to attend instructor lead events (Jagger, 2013; Virtual class, 2005). VILTs are held wherever the instructor and participants are physically located reducing or eliminating travel costs associated with face-to-face training (Jagger, 2013; Virtual class, 2005). Productivity increases are made possible as participants can attend a VILT and then immediately return to work(Jagger, 2013; Virtual class, 2005).

VILT provides additional capabilities not possible with face-to-face training sessions. Virtual sessions are scheduled multiple times in a week accommodating multiple time zones providing flexibility not possible with instructor led training (Jagger, 2013; Virtual class, 2005). VILT platforms provide the ability to record and playback the session at a later time at no additional cost (Jagger, 2013; Virtual class, 2005).

**Obstables to Adoption**

Organizational thriftiness can cause a barrier to successful adoption of VILTs. The drivers of saving money may lead some leaders to believe that implementing VILTs does not cost anything. However, a new software platform may be needed adding an additional cost (Jagger, 2013). Additional training for learning professionals to work in the new modality and use any new technology may not be factored as necessary costs (Canuel, & White, 2014). The cost of curriculum design never disappears regardless of the modality employed (Salopek, 2002), a fact that business leaders may forget. The concept that two people are needed to run successful VILTs may come as a rude shock as ILTs generally only require one person to act as the trainer (Salopek, 2002).

Another example of organizational thriftiness occurs when business partners confuse owning meeting software with the ability to delivery VILTs (Turmel, 2012). Meeting software can support online meetings, webcasts, and webinars (Huggett, 2017). However, meeting software lacks the tools that allow interaction needed for VILTs (Turmel, 2012). “There is a clear distinction to be drawn between virtual meeting tools and virtual classroom tools, the later providing a much richer suite of interaction and management facilities than the typical virtual meeting tool” (Jagger, 2013, p. 47).

For business leaders who realize that a VILT implementation involves different costs and new technology, the planning fallacy may still pose an obstacle to successful adoption. Kahneman (2011) discusses how our inherent bias toward optimism contributes to the planning fallacy. This combination of creating plans based on best-case scenarios without taking into account what others have encountered in the same situations leads organizations to undertake projects that are delivered late and exceed projected costs (Kahneman, 2011).

Finally, resistance to change can cause another barrier to any change initiative which applies to the successful adoption of VILTs. 50% to 90% of change initiatives fail (Hoopes, & Kelly, 2004). “At its core, managing change is an individual issue, and successful change depends on whether you as an individual can adapt, and whether a critical mass of individuals in an organization can adapt together” (Hoopes, & Kelly, 2004, pp. 15-16). Seasoned face-to-face trainers struggle with transitioning to VILT for three reasons: (a) the possibilities and limitations of the new tools are not understood, (b) low levels of comfort are encountered when using this new modality, and (c) low motivation to make the transition to the new modality (Turmel, 2012). Garnering momentum for adding VILT as a new modality poses additional challenges as many see VILT “as a poor and distant relative to the ‘real’ thing, the physical classroom, especially when it comes to learner engagement and business impact” (Lewis, 2011, p. 76).

**Adoption Success Factors**

How can VILT teams address obstacles to adoption? In the case of organization thriftiness, the learning organization must make a realistic business case around the true cost savings. Developing a realistic business case could make a good starting point. For example, build a budget for a VILT for a class or program previously delivered as a face-to-face class. Comparing and contrasting the two budgets can assist business leaders with understanding the true costs involved with VILT. The productivity savings still comprise a compelling reason for VILT initiatives.

A practical demonstration can convert doubtful business leaders about the differences between an online meeting and a VILT. The student author participated in a follow up session of the 2012 Association for Talent Development (ATD) meeting. The speaker at the conference and leader of the virtual session, Cynthia Clay, used the full arsenal of virtual classroom tools to engage remote participants for an hour. This session convinced the student author that a properly designed VILT session can engage learners as much as any face-to-face session.

The single more difficult barrier to overcome revolves around the planning fallacy. For organizations without any internal expertise with VILT, hiring an outside expert may remain the best option for addressing this concern (Williams, 2017). Interview the expert extensively. Gather recommendations from the expert and follow up on the delivery and costs for previous projects. Setting up a small task force to build up this capability internally can comprise another option for smaller organizations. However, this team could still fall victim to the planning fallacy without adequate research and networking with other organizations to set realistic expectations (Kahneman, 2011).

Clearly communicating changes increases the odds of success for any change effort (Hoopes, & Kelly, 2004). The start of communications about a VILT change effort starts with developing a strategy. A strategy helps the learning organization educate business stakeholders on the difference between online meetings, webcasts, webinars, and VILT. A strategy forms the basis for justifying the cost and change needed for implementation. A strategy helps the learning organization articulate the change to the professionals who are the leaders in helping the larger organization embrace this new modality.

**Developing a Strategy**

AFLAC implemented a strategy to include VILT as part of their learning delivery (Williams, 2017). Six workstreams were initiated in preparation for VILT (Williams, 2017). The strategy workstream built a robust virtual learning strategy (Williams, 2017). Designing and delivering training for virtual trainers and delivery coaching comprised the design and delivery workstreams (Williams, 2017). The Learner Centricity workstream determined how to handle adminstration of the technology, messaging, and value proposition (Williams, 2017). Leadership provided sound bites endorsing the change as part of the communication workstream (Williams, 2017). Finally, the evalutation workstream determined ongong support and evaluation (Williams, 2017).

The student author has also been involved in change efforts in implementing VILT as a new modality at IQVIA. The AFLAC VILT project impacted 70,000 sales professionals (Williams, 2017). The IQVIA project impacted only a fraction of that scale. The student author was heavily involved with the strategy, design, and development workstreams. The AFLAC project had a much larger team (Williams, 2017).

The overall lessons learned about strategy from both organizations were similar even with the difference in scale. Involve the business and invove the learning team in all phases of the project from strategy creation through delivery and deployment (Williams, 2017). Remember, individual people make this change happen (Hoopes, & Kelly, 2004). People who are heard, people who are involved from the beginning are people who are invested in the completion of the project (Hoopes, & Kelly, 2004).

How can other learning organizations develop a strategy? Before the strategy stage, learning organizations considering a VILT initiative should make a frank assessment of the size of their overall organization, a realistic budget to undertake the inititve, the number of learning professionals that can be involved in the effort, the willingness of the business leadership to lend support and financial resources, a clear understanding of all relevant stakeholders including information technology, and the priorities the business has for the type of learning best suited to VILT.

A pre-strategy assessment ensures the invovlement of the correct team members to build the strategy and set the stage for a rewarding implementation. Global organizations are well-served to involve stakeholders from all parts of the organization. Consider the waste of resources to implement a VILT strategy only to find sites in developing nations cannot participate due to the lack of internet bandwidth. Clay (2012) encourages organizations about to undertake a VILT inititive to “thoughtfully consider how to achieve similar learning objectives with engaging, interactive, peer-to-peer learning” (p. 4).

**Synchronous Training Superiority**

The live nature of VILT events has advantages over asynchronous learning events. Synchronous components increase participant satisfaction with training (Kreie, Johnson, & Lebsock, 2017). Peterson, Beymer, and Putnam (2018) found that students engaged in synchronous rather than asynchronous learning events encourage cooperative learning. Ghufron and Ermawati (2018) found cooperative learning encourages learners to participate and raising their motivation to learn. When training requires social interaction and collaboration, brainstorming, demonstration, discussion, or debate, synchronous training provides a superior learning experience (Lewis, 2011; Salopek, 2002).

**Lessons Learned**

Lessons learned for VILTs fall into four categories:

1. The pre-implementation category covers lesson learned before actual implementation of a VILT initiative.
2. The design category discusses lessons learned about VILT design.
3. The VILT platform feature usage explores lessons learned for each of the unique VILT features defined in the Literature Review section of this paper.
4. The design category discusses lessons learned around the delivery of VILT sessions.

**Lessons Learned: Pre-Implementation**

One pre-implementation consideration involves the evaluation and purchase of licenses to a virtual learning platform. The VILT strategy may drive this evaluation or the evaluation and license purchase may precede any thought of strategy. Regardless, the same assessments and stakeholder engagements used in the pre-strategy assessment are required for this evaluation. The learning organization must take the lead to ensure the platform fully meets the learning requirements for the virtual sessions that are held. Ideally, prior to purchase, the learning team business, and information technology stakeholders will develop evaluation criteria for testing the candidate platforms. After testing completes, the same team meets to choose the final platform.

Organizations need to prepare instructors for facilitating in this new environment (Canuel, & White, 2014; Turmal, 2012; Williams, 2017). Trainers must learn new skills for delivering in a virtual classroom (Jagger, 2013). Instructors need to practice and gain a level of comfort using the virtual classroom prior to running a VILT for a learning audience (Freifeld, 2016; Turmal, 2012). “The instructor remains the single most flexible and important aspect of the virtual classroom delivery system” (Jagger, 2013, pp. 46-47).

**Lessons Learned: Design**

The need for advance preparation and design plays a key role in virtual sessions (Clay, 2016; Hofmann, 2016; Freifeld, 2016; Kreie, Johnson, & Lebsock, 2017). Allow four hours of preparation for each 1 hour of virtual classroom time (Clay, 2016). Leaders should create a script for running the session to ensure all learning content (Turmel, 2012).

A strategy might specify the ideal class size for a VILT. If not, the learning team should determine the maximum number of participants allowed before design projects are undertaken. Turmel (2012) states that “the class size depends on the learning, not the technology” (p. 33). LogMeIn’s GoToTraining VILT platform allows for a maximum number of 200 attendees to participant in a session (https://www.gotomeeting.com/training/pricing). The higher number of participants, the more likely the event turns into a lecture and does not encourage true learning (Turmel, 2012). Huggett (2017) recommends a maximum VILT class size of 20 participants.

Design should take into account that VILT participants are only one click away from leaving the session and getting back to real work. Interactions should be planned for every three to five minutes to keep learners engaged in the session (Clay, 2012; Hofmann, 2016). Polls, Q&As, games, and pop quizzes help make the content more engaging and keep learners involved (Hall, 2010). Start interaction early in the session so participants understand that they need to pay attention and contribute to learning from the start (Turmel, 2012).

Slide design plays a crucial role in engaging participants. Limit text on each slide and add compelling graphics to generate an emotional connection with learners (Clay, 2012; Turmel, 2012). Spread the presentation of complicated ideas over multiple slides (Clay, 2012). Add icons to signal the start of an interaction such as a poll (Clay, 2012). Share instruction for activities using slides (Clay, 2012). Present no more than five key points in a 60 minute session to avoid cognitive overload (Clay, 2012).

VILT design makes the difference between a session where learning takes place and a session that learners merely suffer through. Design activities to utilize the tools in the virtual classroom (Freifeld, 2016). Application and practice need to remain an important part of session design (Clay, 2012). “Virtual training design should be just as engaging and interactive as if it were delivered in person” (Huggett, 2018, p. 62). Start with learning objectives (Salopek, 2002), select the best activities for each objective, and engage participants with tools and dialogue (Huggett, 2018). “The flow of a virtual classroom course must give ample time for interaction between students and the instructor, with the emphasis being on delivering few slides and more time spent on discussion, individual, and group exercises” (Jagger, 2013, p. 47).

**Lessons Learned: VILT Platform Feature Usage**

Breakout rooms are ideal for small group work. Breakout rooms are used for brainstorming session (Clay, 2016; Turmel, 2012). Virtual instructors need to spend more time monitoring virtual breakout than face-to-face trainers (Turmel, 2012). If breakout rooms are not included in a platform, small groups can meet after a virtual class and report back to the entire class at the next session (Turmel, 2012).

The only limitation on chat usage is the limit of a designer’s or trainer’s imagination. The student author considers chat as the feature of VILT classroom most participants are already familiar with as it works as many popular instant messages platforms work. At the beginning of a session, ask participants to provide a virtual introduction (Huggett, 2018). Chat provides a way for participants to talk and get to know each other during the session (Huggett, 2013; Turmel, 2012). Never disable chat as this feature encourages participants to stay in the virtual classroom and keeps participant’s attention engaged (Clay, 2012). Participants can offer ideas using chat (Clay, 2012). Leader should use participants name during chat debriefs and avoid singling any incorrect responses (Clay, 2016). Huggett (2018) uses chat to select a volunteer for an activity. Once the activity is complete, the initial volunteer uses chat to select the next volunteer (Huggett, 2018). Another suggestion involves using chat to complete a paired discussion activity (Clay, 2016; Huggett, 2018). Gather participant’s answer via chat (Huggett, 2018) and also respond to participants questions (Turmel, 2012). Producers can use private chats to remind leaders to pick up the pace, if needed (Clay, 2016).

The raised hand remains icon most popular emoticon in VILT literature. Participants use the raise hand emoticon to signal completion of class exercises (Huggett, 2018). Instructors can get input from the class using the raise hand emoticon (Turmel, 2012). Raise hands are ideal for getting feedback on yes/no or agree/disagree questions (Huggett, 2013)

Polling can serve a variety of uses in a virtual classroom. Use polling to ask challenging questions, encourage reflection, test knowledge, share experiences, and set up debate over key issues (Clay, 2012; Clay, 2016; Huggett, 2013). Polling provides instant feedback on participant’s responses and allows participants to compare responses with classmates (Clay, 2012). Divide the class into teams and use polling answers as part of a virtual competition (Clay, 2018) “As you design your next virtual training, consider how you ask questions in the face-to-face classroom to engage, enlighten, and energize your learners. Then transfer those questioning techniques to the virtual classroom by creating polls” (Clay, 2012, p. 12).

Screen sharing can show software programs or websites on the instructor’s system (Huggett, 2013). The student author uses the screen sharing feature in computer software application training. LogMeIn’s GoToTraining platform also allows participants to take over control of the leader’s system. The leader demonstrates the application’s functionality and then can transfer control to a participant. This allows participant hand-on practice during the VILT and avoids the creation of extra logins required for face-to-face sessions.

Webcams reveals the person behind the voice. Webcams allows instructors to simulate eye contact with participants (Clay, 2012). Webcam use builds rapport with learners, creates a sense of immediacy, and engages the virtual audience (Clay, 2016). For sessions with multiple presenters or when demonstrating a physical product, the use of webcam can help the participants understand the flow and content presented in class (Huggett, 2013). To make the best use of webcams: (a) position the your image shown in the virtual classroom under the camera so your eye movement is minimal when checking your appearance, (b) center yourself in the frame, (c) your background can show your personality but be sure to remove any clutter, (d) look directly into the camera lens and mimic non-verbal cues when participants are speaking (Clay, 2012). A poll held to determine how participants feel about watching the presenter in a VILT platform found that 95% felt seeing the instructor created the feeling of participating in a virtual classroom (Clay, 2012). Webcams “can personalize the participant’s experience and help them connect to the trainer” (Huggett, 2013, p. 5).

Whiteboards are another tool useful for collaboration and gathering feedback. Whiteboards can serve as a flipchart in the same fashion as in a face-to-face classroom (Clay, 2012). Whiteboard annotation tools such as text, highlighter, shape, or pointer arrow can focus learners on key points or complete whiteboard activities (Clay, 2012). The student author created a slide with responses to a question and invited participants to use the annotation tools to select correct responses.

**Lessons Learned: Delivery**

There are multiple lessons learned in the area of delivery for the training team. The first lesson revolves are the nature of the training team. A producer or moderator should attend the event to help participants connect to the session, handle the technology, respond to chats, and advocate for participants (Freifeld, 2016; Hoffman, 2016; Kreie, Johnson, & Lebsock, 2017; Turmel, 2012). Producers can serve as backup instructors in the event technical difficulties occur (Clay, 2012). Producers employ dual monitors to watch the participant’s view in order to detect potential technical problems (Freifeld, 2016). The student author has joined the VILT as a participant using a personal cell phone to accomplish the same goal.

Preparation for the event consist the second delivery lesson. Prior to the session, run a rehearsal to touch base that every person on the training team knows the role to play. This rehearsal ensures the audio, chat, polls, and slides work as expected (Clay, 2016). When using webcams, make sure the background behind you is uncluttered and visually pleasing (Clay, 2012).

The third delivery lesson for the training team involves getting participants comfortable in the virtual classroom. Instructors must help familiarize students with using virtual classroom features at the beginning of the session (Freifeld, 2016). The training team should let students know how to contact the producer or moderator regarding technical difficulties (Freifeld, 2016). Instructors set the expectation up front that learners are expected to actively participate during the learning event (Freifeld, 2016).

The fourth delivery lesson for the training team involves preparing for technical difficulties. When inevitable technical difficulties occur: (a) take a few deep breaths, (b) calmly acknowledge the difficulty to the audience, and (c) work towards resolving the problem (Clay, 2012). Potential resolutions include: (a) asking everyone to disconnect and reconnect to the audio, (b) having the producer take over the instructor role, (c) verbally present while participants follow along in the participant guide (Clay, 2012). The teaching team’s main focus dealing with technical problems should be on staying calm and professional while creating the most effective learning experience possible for participants.

A virtual leader’s skills comprise the fourth delivery lesson. Instructors should speak slowly and loudly for participants to follow along (Huggett, 2013; Turmel, 2012). Leaders should use webcams as part of the introduction and ending Q&As to build rapport with participants (Hofmann, 2016). Hugget (2013) recommends that virtual trainers frequently acknowledge people by name and make connections between participant’s comments and the learning content. Watching the recording of the VILT can help instructors to improve future sessions (Freifeld, 2016).

There are delivery lessons learned for participants. Participants need to follow instructions on how to pre-test the computer environments prior to attending the event (Freifeld, 2016). Participants need to create a distraction free environment to ensure they get the most from the event (Salopek, 2002).

Additional delivery considerations exist for VILT sessions where both face-to-face and remote students are attending. Instructors need to pay attention to both set of students equally (Freifeld, 2016). Instructors should encourage interaction between in-room and virtual students using chat (Freifeld, 2016).

**Conclusion**

The majority of corporations across America have adopted VILT. Cost benefits, additional capabilities, and ease of use ensure that VILT will endure as a standard modality. Organizational thriftiness, the planning fallacy, and resistance to change create significant barriers to adoption. To ensure a successful implementation of a VILT initiative, business partners and learning leaders must work together to understand true costs savings, explore the capabilities of the new modality, form realistic plans for implementation, and clearly communicate this change to the larger organization. Developing a strategy, using VILT for the learning subject matter best suited to the modality, and understanding the lessons learned in relation to pre-implementation, design, platform feature usage, and delivery are recommended practice when implementing a VILT initiative

References

(2005). Virtual class delivers worldwide. *Communications News, 42*(9), 40-43.

Canuel, M. J., & White, B. J. (2014). Modeling pedagogy for teachers transitioning to the virtual classroom. *International Association for Development of the Information Society.* Retrieved from http://www.iadisportal.org/digital-library

Clay, C. (2012). From chalkboard to keyboard: Transitioning to the virtual classroom. Retrieved from https://netspeedlearning.com/contact/?p=ebook&r=virtual-classroom

Freifeld, L. (2016). For a successful virtual instructor-led training (ILT) event. *Training, 53*(5), 6. Retrieved from https://trainingmag.com/

Ghufron, M. A., & Ermawati, S. (2018). The strengths and weaknesses of cooperative learning and problem-based learning in EFL writing class: Teachers’ and students’ perspectives. *International Journal of Instruction*, *11*(4), 657–672. Retrieved from https://www.e-iji.net/

Hall, S. O. (2010). Virtual instructor-led training: Powerful, not powerpoint. *T and D, 64*(7), 72–73. Retrieved from https://www.td.org/td-magazine

Hofmann, J. (2016). Making virtual learning work! *Training, 53*(3), 58. Retrieved from https://trainingmag.com/

Huggett, C. (2013). The virtual trainer’s guide to content delivery: 5 techniques to deliver an effective virtual class. Retrieved from https://www.cindyhuggett.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/5-TECHNIQUES-to-DELIVER.pdf

Huggett, C. (2017, March). Virtual 2020: What to expect and how to prepare. Presentation at Learning Solutions Conference & Expo, Orlando, Florida

Huggett, C. (2018). Convert your classroom training to virtual Training. *TD: Talent Development, 72*(2), 61-64. Retrieved from https://www.td.org/td-magazine

Jagger, P. D. (2013). Enter the virtual classroom. *ITNOW, 55*(2), 46–47. https://doi-org.ezproxy.umuc.edu/10.1093/itnow/bwt021

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow* [Kindle DX version]. Retrieved from http://www.amazon.com

Kreie, J., Johnson, S., & Lebsock, M. (2017). Course design and technology for synchronous interaction in an online course. *Information Systems Education Journal*, *15*(5), 60–67. Retrieved from http://isedj.org/

Lewis, M. (2011). Moving into the live virtual classroom. *T+D, 65*(7), 76–77. Retrieved from https://www.td.org/td-magazine

Peterson, A. T., Beymer, P. N., & Putnam, R. T. (2018). Synchronous and asynchronous discussions: Effects on cooperation, belonging, and affect. *Online Learning*, *22*(4), 7–25. Retrieved from ttps://olj.onlinelearningconsortium.org/index.php/olj

Salopek, J. J. (2002). Virtually face-to-face. *E-Learning, 3*(2), 16-19. Retrieved from https://www.2elearning.com/

Training Industry. (2013, February 21). Virtual instructor-led training (VILT). Retrieved from https://trainingindustry.com/wiki/content-development/virtual-instructor-led-training-vilt/

Turmel, W. (2012). Virtual Presentations: Techniques for Moving Training Online. *T+D, 66*(11), 32. Retrieved from https://www.td.org/td-magazine

Williams, D. (2017, March). We’re ducks, not dinosaurs: AFLAC’s shift from ILT to virtual. Presentation at Learning Solutions Conference & Expo, Orlando, Florida