

Implementation and Reflection

Ronnie S. Saturno, Jr.

College of Education, Grand Canyon University

EID-500 Introduction to Instructional Design

Jackie Pelegrin

January 21, 2026

Implementation and Reflection

Story of Implementation: The implementation of the instructional solution took place on January 19, 2026, at 5:30 PM.

The session was conducted as a synchronous, face-to-face pilot located in a home office environment, utilizing a desktop computer as the primary display device. The entire session lasted approximately ten minutes.

The participant for this pilot was a K-12 educator who uses social media but has zero experience with the X (formerly Twitter) platform and no background in content creation or analytics. This demographic profile stands in stark contrast to the ideal target defined in the needs assessment (Stefaniak, 2021): Gen Z males who are “digital natives” and active content creators seeking to monetize their presence. This significant gap in prior knowledge and motivation provided a rigorous stress test for the instructional materials, specifically highlighting how the content performs when stripped of the learner’s intrinsic motivation. While the ideal learner would approach this training with a desperate need to solve a problem (low engagement), the pilot participant viewed the content through a detached, theoretical lens.

Role During Implementation: My role during the session was that of an active facilitator utilizing a “Wizard of Oz” prototyping method. Rather than asking the learner to watch a pre-recorded video, I sat next to her and provided live narration of the script while manually advancing the slides on the desktop monitor.

While the original intent was to remain a passive narrator, my role quickly shifted to that of a tutor and subject matter expert. Because the learner lacked the domain-specific vocabulary of the target audience, I was forced to pause the narration multiple times to define platform-specific term (e.g., “impressions,” “algorithm,” “metrics”) that she was unfamiliar with. This required me to move off-script to provide analogies that bridged her background in education with the technical concepts of social media marketing.

Effectiveness of the Implementation: The implementation was partially effective, with a clear dichotomy between cognitive comprehension and effective engagement. Intellectually, the learner understood the “general ideas” of the

module, such as the concept of reciprocity and the visual difference between a “Bad Post” and a “Fixed Post.” The visual aids (diagrams and side-by-side comparisons) successfully conveyed the logic of the algorithm.

However, the effective engagement was low. The learner reported being “vaguely curious” but largely disengaged, noting that the content was not relevant to her life. This validates Knowles’ theory of Andragogy, which states that adults must know *why* they need to learn something before undertaking it (Knowles, 1984). Since the learner had no desire to build a social media following, the “hook” of the instruction failed to land.

To evaluate effectiveness, I utilized the following formative questions and observations:

1. *Comprehension Check*: “Does the difference between the two example posts make sense to you?” (Result: Yes, the visual modeling worked).
2. *Relevance Check*: “Do you feel this strategy would be useful for a user?” (Result: She acknowledged the utility for others but felt no personal connection).
3. *Assessment Feasibility*: “Does the rubric clearly explain what is expected?” (Result: Negative; she found it overly rigid).

Future Modifications: Based on the pilot feedback, the most critical modification will be a revision of the assessment instrument. The learner explicitly stated that the “Content Optimization Report” rubric felt “too formal” and “too much work” for the task at hand. She noted a disconnect between the fast-paced, informal nature of social media and the academic rigidity of the grading criteria.

For the next iteration, I will reframe the assessment from a “Formal Report” to a “Optimization Checklist.” Instead of asking Gen Z learners to submit a PDF with screenshots and analysis, which feels like schoolwork, I will create a streamlined, mobile-friendly checklist where they can simply tick off the changes they made (e.g., “Did you ask a

question? Yes/No"). This reduces the friction identified by the pilot learner and better aligns the assessment format with the psychographics of the target audience, who prioritize speed and efficiency over formal documentation.

References

Knowles, M. S. (1984). *Andragogy in action: Applying modern principles of adult learning*. Jossey-Bass.

Stefaniak, J. E. (2021). *Needs assessment for learning and performance: Theory, process, and practice*. Routledge