

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

12

AD - A134515

FINAL REPORT

Scientific Services Program

Project 0093

MOTIVATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN

by

John M. Keller

Syracuse University

Bernard Dodge

San Diego State University

September 24, 1982

for

Training Developments Institute

Fort Monroe, Virginia

Battelle Corporation

Durham, North Carolina

97 1983

DTIC FILE COPY

83 11 07 010

... for publication ... distribution is authorized

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A134515	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Final Report - Motivational Strategies for Instructional Design		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Report
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s)		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) DAAG 29-81-D-0100 Delivery Order #0093
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Keller, John M. and Dodge, Bernard		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS HQ TRADOC Training Development Institute Fort Monroe, VA 23651		12. REPORT DATE September 1982
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 101
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Intrinsic Satisfaction Milestones Satisfaction Extrinsic Reward Decisions Humanistic Approaches Strategies Achievement Reinforcement Operationalized Personal causation Contingently Attitudenal Relevance Expectancy-value		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Three major parts: (1) Describes milestones and decisions in the process; (2) summarizes results of the field studies; and (3) recommendations as to improvements, modifications, and applicability to the target audience, and other uses in the Army.		

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

RESPONSIBILITY. The controlling DoD office will be responsible for completion of the Report Documentation Page, DD Form 1473, in all technical reports prepared by or for DoD organizations.

CLASSIFICATION. Since this Report Documentation Page, DD Form 1473, is used in preparing announcements, bibliographies, and data banks, it should be unclassified if possible. If a classification is required, identify the classified items on the page by the appropriate symbol.

COMPLETION GUIDE

General. Make Blocks 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 15, and 16 agree with the corresponding information on the report cover. Leave Blocks 2 and 3 blank.

Block 1. Report Number. Enter the unique alphanumeric report number shown on the cover.

Block 2. Government Accession No. Leave Blank. This space is for use by the Defense Documentation Center.

Block 3. Recipient's Catalog Number. Leave blank. This space is for the use of the report recipient to assist in future retrieval of the document.

Block 4. Title and Subtitle. Enter the title in all capital letters exactly as it appears on the publication. Titles should be unclassified whenever possible. Write out the English equivalent for Greek letters and mathematical symbols in the title (see "Abstracting Scientific and Technical Reports of Defense-sponsored RDT/E," AD-667 000). If the report has a subtitle, this subtitle should follow the main title, be separated by a comma or semicolon if appropriate, and be initially capitalized. If a publication has a title in a foreign language, translate the title into English and follow the English translation with the title in the original language. Make every effort to simplify the title before publication.

Block 5. Type of Report and Period Covered. Indicate here whether report is interim, final, etc., and, if applicable, inclusive dates of period covered, such as the life of a contract covered in a final contractor report.

Block 6. Performing Organization Report Number. Only numbers other than the official report number shown in Block 1, such as series numbers for in-house reports or a contractor/grantee number assigned by him, will be placed in this space. If no such numbers are used, leave this space blank.

Block 7. Author(s). Include corresponding information from the report cover. Give the name(s) of the author(s) in conventional order (for example, John R. Doe or, if author prefers, J. Robert Doe). In addition, list the affiliation of an author if it differs from that of the performing organization.

Block 8. Contract or Grant Number(s). For a contractor or grantee report, enter the complete contract or grant number(s) under which the work reported was accomplished. Leave blank in in-house reports.

Block 9. Performing Organization Name and Address. For in-house reports enter the name and address, including office symbol, of the performing activity. For contractor or grantee reports enter the name and address of the contractor or grantee who prepared the report and identify the appropriate corporate division, school, laboratory, etc., of the author. List city, state, and ZIP Code.

Block 10. Program Element, Project, Task Area, and Work Unit Numbers. Enter here the number code from the applicable Department of Defense form, such as the DD Form 1498, "Research and Technology Work Unit Summary" or the DD Form 1634, "Research and Development Planning Summary," which identifies the program element, project, task area, and work unit or equivalent under which the work was authorized.

Block 11. Controlling Office Name and Address. Enter the full, official name and address, including office symbol, of the controlling office. (Equates to funding/sponsoring agency. For definition see DoD Directive 5200.20, "Distribution Statements on Technical Documents.")

Block 12. Report Date. Enter here the day, month, and year or month and year as shown on the cover.

Block 13. Number of Pages. Enter the total number of pages.

Block 14. Monitoring Agency Name and Address (if different from Controlling Office). For use when the controlling or funding office does not directly administer a project, contract, or grant, but delegates the administrative responsibility to another organization.

Blocks 15 & 15a. Security Classification of the Report: Declassification/Downgrading Schedule of the Report. Enter in 15 the highest classification of the report. If appropriate, enter in 15a the declassification/downgrading schedule of the report, using the abbreviations for declassification/downgrading schedules listed in paragraph 4-207 of DoD 5200.1-R.

Block 16. Distribution Statement of the Report. Insert here the applicable distribution statement of the report from DoD Directive 5200.20, "Distribution Statements on Technical Documents."

Block 17. Distribution Statement (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from the distribution statement of the report). Insert here the applicable distribution statement of the abstract from DoD Directive 5200.20, "Distribution Statements on Technical Documents."

Block 18. Supplementary Notes. Enter information not included elsewhere but useful, such as: Prepared in cooperation with . . . Translation of (or by) . . . Presented at conference of . . . To be published in . . .

Block 19. Key Words. Select terms or short phrases that identify the principal subjects covered in the report, and are sufficiently specific and precise to be used as index entries for cataloging, conforming to standard terminology. The DoD "Thesaurus of Engineering and Scientific Terms" (TEST), AD-672 000, can be helpful.

Block 20. Abstract. The abstract should be a brief (not to exceed 200 words) factual summary of the most significant information contained in the report. If possible, the abstract of a classified report should be unclassified and the abstract to an unclassified report should consist of publicly-releasable information. If the report contains a significant bibliography or literature survey, mention it here. For information on preparing abstracts see "Abstracting Scientific and Technical Reports of Defense-Sponsored RDT&E," AD-667 000.

This project required a review of literature, selection of a theoretical basis for the development of a motivational model for inserting motivational strategies into instruction, and the development of a handbook that lays out the method for applying the motivational model to the development of instruction. The present report describes the results of this project, and it includes three major sections. The first section describes the developmental milestones that were met, and decisions that were made in the process of the final delivery of the methodology. Section Two summarizes the results of the field studies that were made, and Section Three presents recommendations as to improvements, modifications, and applicability of the model to the target audience, and other uses in the Army.

Section One: Milestones and Decisions

A review of the literature was conducted to determine which motivational model would be most appropriate for the requirements of this project. There are several excellent models which have been used in projects that were designed to change the motivational characteristics of the participants. For example, McClelland and Alschuler's work to increase need for achievement, and deCharms work on personal causation. However, none of these models provided a direct or comprehensive approach to improving the motivational properties of instruction. Therefore, it was decided to use the ARCS model because of its direct concern with motivational design. This model would provide the



IAI

basis for the handbook that was to be developed.

The results of this review were presented orally to the COTR in a meeting at Syracuse, New York. He approved the decision, and he offered assistance in the form of manuals that could be used for examples, and recommendations for site visit locations.

At this same meeting, we decided to develop the organizational structure of the handbook around the four major components of the ARCS model (attention, relevance, confidence, and satisfaction). There would be additional chapters to describe the overall basis for the model, and how to use it. The development team then prepared a list of motivational strategies that corresponded to each component of the model.

Field work was conducted in six settings. These included meetings in New York City and Dallas with other contractors and instructional developers who were attending conferences there, with educational specialists at Forts Jackson and Gordon, with course developers at Fort Bliss, and with a combination of course designers and contractors at Cherry Hill, New Jersey. At these meetings, we received positive support for the basic ideas in the model, and we also received suggestions for improvement. It became clear, especially at Fort Bliss, that the approach based on the four categories was too abstract, and it needed to be adapted more to the direct areas of application by course

developers.

As a result fo the feedback, the development team proposed that the manual be reorganized according to the kinds of products that course developers most frequently produce. These would include such things as programs of instruction, lesson plans, instructional materials, and teaching strategies. Then, under each of these headings, strategies for accomplishing each of the four ARCS components would be presented. This revision was approved by the COTR.

While trying to implement this design, the developers found it to be unwieldy in many ways. The frequent switching back and forth from product to the four ARCS components was confusing. Consequently, a final revision was made in the design. A combination of the two preceding designs was adopted. We returned to the four part division of the manual with a chapter on each component of the ARCS model. Then, within each chapter, we used subdivisions based on the type of instructional design activity: course design, lesson design, instructional materials design, or instructional strategy design. This method proved to be both the clearest from a compositional point-of-view, and also most functional in terms of applicability.

The handbook was completed by the end of the first week in September, and was accepted by the COTR for distribution to 75 course developers and educational specialists on

September 22, 1982.

Section Two: Field Studies

Fort Jackson and Fort Gordon

The SSP met with educational specialists, visited several schools, and reviewed instructional materials. The results of this study provided the SSP with firsthand knowledge of the current state of instruction and motivation. It also provided support for the basic concepts in the ARCS model as an aid to explaining motivational conditions and strategies for course developers.

New York: American Educational Research Association

The SSP met with the COTR, several contractors who do instructional development work for the Army, and other experts who know the state of the art of instructional design and motivation. They supported the general concept of the ARCS model, and offered suggestions which helped clarify the categories and variables.

Cherry Hill, New Jersey: TDI-RCA Conference

This conference consisted of about 30 course designers working in relation to the BSEP project which was contracted, in part, to RCA. The SSP presented the ARCS model in detail to a group of the participants. They provided specific feedback which assisted in clarifying strategies that were excessively abstract, and areas where

additional strategies were needed.

**Dallas: Association for Educational Communications and
Technology**

The SSP met with several contractors and instructional design experts to obtain their comments on the most recent developments of the ARCS model. Their feedback focused, for the first time in the project, on the interface of the ARCS model with generic, process-oriented design and development models. This provided the basis for the later integration of ARCS with the IPISD.

Fort Bliss

The SSP met with course developers for an in-depth review of the model, and to collect material that might be useful for examples. It was at this meeting that the issue of product orientation was raised. The SSP noticed that many of the course developers' comments related to the connection between the ARCS model and the kinds of products they had to produce. As a result of this meeting, the SSP proposed the reorganization of the structure of the handbook.

Section Three: Recommendations

Applicability. The ARCS Model Handbook should be useful to course designers, developers, and instructors. It offers ideas and procedures for identifying appropriate motivational strategies and inserting them into instruction.

Modification 1. In its current form, the handbook provides a good foundation of information for motivational designers. However, the manual would be much more effective if professional printing formats and illustrations were used. The utilization of design features such as those described in TRADOC Pamphlet 310-10, "Designing How-To-Fight and How-To-Support Publications," would help the handbook do a better job of illustrating what it advocates.

Modification 2. An additional chapter containing the lists of strategies without explanations or examples would be a useful modification. After a person had learned the basic content, this chapter would be beneficial for skimming to get ideas.

Improvement 1. The development of more concrete, illustrated examples would be a definite improvement. Now that the complete handbook has been drafted, it would be relatively easy to produce examples from current courses, and course development projects, that would provide more interesting and relevant illustrations of the strategies.

Improvement 2. The handbook could also be improved by conducting validation studies, or field tests, which lead to the elimination of strategies not likely to be used in the Army, and to the identification of additional strategies that would strengthen the book.

Recommendation: We recommend that a series of workshops be conducted that include some in-depth work with course developers. The workshops would not need to be long in duration, but their goals and procedures would need to be clearly specified. For example, in our work at Fort Bliss, it became very clear that the course developers wanted to have the personal assistance of a consultant (either from within the Army or a contractor) in learning and implementing new approaches to development.

An intensive three-day workshop would allow the workshop leader time to become familiar with the setting, a day to present the model and procedures for using it, and a day for consulting on the application of the model. A return visit a month later would give the workshop leader the opportunity to collect case study material, and to offer follow-up assistance to the workshop participants.

There would be several benefits from this process, but three are particularly important. It would provide for the improvement and validation of the handbook, it would assist the developers in their efforts to apply the model, and it would give the workshop leader an overview of implementation

strategies from several different schools. This experience would contribute to the development of the handbook in a way that would give it broad appeal and applicability.

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF MODELS FOR DESIGNING
MOTIVATING INSTRUCTION

Submitted By:

John M. Keller

Syracuse University

September 29, 1982

Submitted To:

Training Developments Institute

Fort Monroe, Virginia

Delivery Order 0093

Disclaimer

The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other documentation.

MODELS FOR MOTIVATIONAL DESIGN

The study of human motivation has a long history, and in recent years, the number of different approaches has increased dramatically. This can be seen by the large number of researchers studying similar but different concepts that help us understand why people want to do the things they do. Weiner's (1980) recent textbook of psychological theories of human motivation, and Keller's (in press) synthesis of motivational theories related to education illustrate this diversity. However, despite the large amount of work on motivation, there are still very few theories that explain motivation in an educational context, and still fewer that are concerned with the specific problem of designing motivating instruction. Keller's (in press) paper provides a motivational design theory which synthesizes much of the current literature on human motivation, but it does not provide a comparison and contrast of alternative motivational models.

The purpose of this paper is to present the major motivational models that might serve as a basis for improving educational systems, and to critique them in terms of the specific problem of finding prescriptions and strategies for improving the design of instructional materials. In this paper, only major models will be reviewed. This refers to theories that attempt to provide a rather comprehensive explanation of motivation. Excluded are lines of research on highly specific motivational variables, such as locus of control, learned helplessness, and curiosity. These lines of research can be

helpful to a practitioner, but they do not provide a systematic model for improving motivation. An adequate model will be one that is broad enough in scope to include the specialized, narrow lines of research.

The major psychological theories of motivation fall into three general groups. There are person centered theories, environmentally centered theories, and interaction centered theories. The person centered theories are those which have a humanistic orientation. They tend to believe that people have innate potentials, values, and motives that influence personal motivation and development. In contrast, the environmental theories reflect a belief in the power of the environment to control the amount and direction of human motivation. They believe that, ultimately, it is the powerfulness of the reinforcement contingencies in the environment that controls human motivation. The third, or interactionist, position believes that neither the personal nor the environmental assumptions provide an adequate basis for understanding or explaining human motivation. In this approach, human values and innate abilities are seen to both influence and be influenced by environmental circumstances. Interactionist theories explain how both forces interact in their influence on motivation.

The remainder of this paper presents each of these three groups in turn, and then draws a conclusion about the most appropriate theory to use as a basis for an applied theory of motivational design. With one exception, the major contributors in each group are presented individually. Each of these presentations includes a description of the approach, and a

discussion of its utility and limitations. The exception occurs in the first part of the next section where a group of people are presented rather than a single person.

Person Centered Theories

This section reviews the work of several people who have concentrated on identifying the psychological needs of people, and how these influence our motivation. These theories begin with the premise that the primary potential for psychological growth and development comes from within the individual. Consequently, their work has focused heavily on efforts to identify important human needs, and on efforts to change and develop individual attitudes and values.

Murray, Edwards, Maslow, and Herzberg

This cluster of motivational theorists have contributed a body of material that has had a significant influence on the understanding and application of motivational principles, especially in a context of organizational behavior. Murray (1938) generated the concept of the human being as an active, goal directed organism with specific needs, or potentialities, that determine the direction of individual motivation. Murray generated a rather long list of specific needs, but the best known of them is need for achievement. This refers to a person's desire to do things rapidly and well, to overcome obstacles, to accomplish difficult tasks, and to attain high standards. Not all human beings are high on this need, for there are many different needs which work in combination with each other in an individual's personality. But it does seem to be one of the

predominant individual needs and it explains why many people experience pleasurable feelings following the accomplishment of a task which, for them, represents a challenge. The influence of Murray's work was enhanced by Edwards (1970), who developed a measurement instrument, the Edwards Personal Preference Scale, which made it possible to conduct more extensive and empirical research.

Another important and well known contributor in this context was Maslow. His theory reduced Murray's extensive list of needs by developing categories and a hierarchy of personal needs. These ranged from basic survival and security needs through social and self-esteem needs to self-actualization needs. His theory has had wide application in business and industry, as has the closely related developments of Herzberg. He made a distinction (Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B., 1959) between the lower order needs that must be met in order for a person to be basically satisfied with a job (hygiene factors), and the higher order needs that constitute real motivation (motivational factors). These operate independently of each other, and not in a hierarchy as in Maslow's system. For example, a person could be motivated by a job because it offered opportunities for achievement and creativity, but dissatisfied with it because of the working conditions or low rate of pay.

The work of these researchers has been influential in applied contexts such as education, business, and industry, because they offered helpful insights into why people would react differently to similar working conditions. The personal need structure that a person brings to a job includes the person's

subjectively defined needs for security, social contact, and personal advancement, to mention only a few. Therefore, different people will focus on different aspects of the job, and their motivation will depend on what they see there. Some highly skilled line workers may actually be demotivated by pressure to move into supervisory positions, because one of their primary satisfactions from the job is the social interaction with other line workers. In other cases, some individuals are very anxious to move up.

Intreging though they are, these theories have some limitations from a practical application standpoint. They have high heuristic value in that they offer us insights that sometimes help us make better decisions, but they do not lead to clear-cut strategies or prescriptions for creating motivating environments. More specifically, they offer only limited assistance in designing motivating learning materials. To their credit, they do help us understand the importance of stimulating the appropriate personal needs in learners (e.g. need for achievement) in order to improve motivation. They do not, however, tell us how to do this.

McClelland

McClelland made a major contribution to this line of research and development. He concentrated, initially, on the need for achievement, and developed a means of measuring it which has been widely used, although it has had some criticism. Even so, the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) produced data which supported McClelland's predictions (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1953). He found a person's desire to perform well, to

business and industry nationally and abroad, and for the model they provided. They have been widely copied.

In an educational context, there are some limitations surrounding McClelland's work. His workshops, as mentioned, are aimed more at management personnel and entrepreneurs than at educators. Furthermore, his programs are aimed at helping people understand and change specific aspects of their behavior. His work is not in a context of telling us how to design instructional programs to make them more motivating.

Alschuler

Alschuler's (1973) work fills some of the gaps left by the preceding models. He introduced the concept of "psychological education" as a means of providing guidance for the psychological growth of children along with their cognitive and physical growth. This concept also includes many of the humanistic approaches to such things as values clarification (Simon, Howe, & Kirschenbaum, 1978) and self-awareness (Rogers, 1969). Both Simon, et al., and Rogers provide good strategies for teachers to use in trying to help children develop their sense of values, but neither of these approaches is primarily concerned with stimulating a particular motivational response in the learner. In contrast, Alschuler incorporates the work of McClelland into a school context. His specific concern is the development of teaching strategies to improve achievement motivation.

With respect to utility, Alschuler offers the most of anyone working in the area of personal needs and values. His program is patterned after the achievement motivation workshops of McClelland & Steele (1972), but he has greatly expanded them to

apply in a school setting. He describes (Alschuler, Tabor, & McIntyre, 1971) a large number of specific strategies that he used to train teachers how to develop achievement motivation in their students, and he also presents the strategies that the teachers were trained to use in their classrooms. His program was implemented under controlled conditions, and results of this research are reported (Alschuler, et al., 1971; Alschuler, 1972).

Alschuler's work is important in that it helps us understand more about ways to systematically influence students' need to achieve. And, by extrapolation from his general approach, we could develop similar programs to influence other human motives. However, a limitation of his work is that it does not deal with the problem of how to make basic instruction more motivating. That is, if a teacher is not concerned with changing the motive structure of the students, but only with teaching a class in an effective and appealing way, Alschuler's model offers only limited assistance. By using some of the strategies in it, we can present material in a way that appeals to the achievement motivation in the students. Beyond that, however, we have to look elsewhere.

Environmentally Centered Strategies

For almost two decades beginning in the early 1960s there was a tremendous influence on education and psychological practices in general by the "behaviorist" school of psychological theories. These theories assumed that it was inappropriate to speculate about the presumed inner mental states of people, or at least they believed it was not a productive way to build a science of human behavior. Instead, they believed that it would be possible to provide adequate explanations of behavior by observing the behavior of organisms in their environments, and by noting the systematic relationships between observable events, both those acting on the organism, and those emitted by it. One of the leading researchers in this area was, of course, B. F. Skinner, and he was also an important figure in the development of instructional science.

In this section of the present review, no attempt is made to provide a comprehensive review of all of the approaches that have been taken to behavioral theories of psychology, nor to the vast number of specific applications of that theory. Instead, as in the preceding section, the work of a few people who represent the approach and its most significant contributions to the specific development of motivating instruction are presented.

Skinner

Skinner's work is often included in discussions of learning theory, but it is more properly referred to as a theory of performance. Skinner's basic assumptions and principles are concerned with rates of responding, and how schedules of reinforcement affect response rate. In dealing with performance,

Skinner's work includes motivation as well as the changes in behavior that could be called learning. One of the most important and often verified findings in the research of Skinner and his associates is the beneficial effect of positive reinforcement applied contingently to the exact behavior that is being shaped or modified. In addition to his basic, laboratory research, Skinner extended his theory and research to applied areas including education (Skinner, 1968). He is best known in education for his influence in the development of what became known as programmed instruction. This represented an application of his behavioral shapping strategies. The learners were presented with a small amount of information from the assigned subject, and were asked to make some kind of active response to the material. Immediately following the response, the correct answer was presented. This process was assumed to represent behaviorial reinforcement theory by requiring an active response on the part of the learner under conditions where the probability of effor was small (hence the presentation of small amounts of information), and the immediate positive reinforcement of seeing the right answer.

Skinner's approach had a high degree of utility. Programmed instruction became a very popular form of instruction. When used properly, it was successful, but it was often misused and resulted in some very boring instructional experiences. This resulted, in part, from efforts to reduce the probability of incorrect answers to the lowest possible level. By making the program simpler for the average learner in any given context, it made the program longer and more boring for the better learners.

Another problem resulted from the excessive use of the technique in settings where the learners grew tired of the isolatedness of purely individual, self-paced instruction. Even so, many learners found themselves able to learn material that they had never mastered in conventional textbooks, and in many settings, especially on-the-job technical areas, this approach allowed people to learn something when they needed it. It saved training time and costs. Therefore, there certainly are motivational benefits from this development.

Despite the enormous influence of Skinner's work, and the important contributions to instructional science that he made, there are some limitations with respect to designing motivating instruction. Recent research (e.g. Deci, 1975) has shown that the use of external (or "extrinsic") reinforcers can sometimes decrease the intrinsic motivation that a person has for a specific activity. Furthermore, Skinner's model tells us certain ways in which we can modify a person's motivation, but it does not help us understand the dynamics of individual preference, or self-initiated actions.

Keller, F. S.

Skinner's instructional design approach was expanded by F. S. Keller (1968) into a plan for teaching whole courses of instruction. He called it the Personalized System of Instruction, but it is often called "The Keller Plan." It has many of the features used in programmed instruction, but it includes a management strategy for the whole course, and it deals with units of instruction which do not necessarily contain materials in a programmed instruction format. In this approach,

the course is split into modules, usually one per week. Each week there is a lecture which is supposed to serve motivational purposes by stimulating the students' interest in the topic, and giving them background or other supplemental information. The required content is contained in learning packages which the students study individually at their own pace. These modules may or may not require work in a laboratory. The students may receive assistance from a monitor, or teaching assistant, and often they are expected to attend a small group meeting to discuss the material or work on a related exercise. When the student is ready, he comes to the central office to take a test on the subject. The tests are criterion referenced (mastery learning), and alternative versions may be taken after a prescribed interval if the student does not pass the first time. The tests are scored immediately in order to provide feedback at once. The central features of active responding, self-pacing, mastery learning, and reinforcing feedback are important parts of the approach.

This model has been widely used and researched. There is even a professional association based on common interests in this model. The model has met with many types of successes when it is implemented appropriately. To prepare a course and offer it using this model requires a considerable investment of time in designing the content and tests for the course, and the management structure. When people have tried to shortcut this front-end planning, the course typically does not do any better than, or even as well as, the traditional course that it replaced. When it is well planned and implemented, it often

results in performance gains.

One limitation of the model has already been mentioned. To implement the course properly is a rather complex and time consuming task. However, there are other problems that limit its utility as a model for designing motivating courses of instruction. The performance gains that accrue to people taking the course apply to those who finish it. There are significant numbers of students who simply do not like this type of course design, and who drop out from it. To some extent drop out is always a problem in a class, but it is a particular problem in this situation that is supposed to be more motivating than normal.

Another problem has to do with personal time management. Some people, given the self-pacing options, finish the course ahead of schedule. However, many do not. A typical problem in this type of course is procrastination. Too many students do not get their work completed in an orderly way, and it piles-up at the end. This causes frustration and undercuts the effectiveness of the class. On the one hand, it usually improves motivation to offer personal choice options to the students, but in a typical college setting, which is where the Keller Plan is generally used, the students have, perhaps, too many options, and they are unable to maintain an effective set of priorities.

Sloane & Jackson

The last model to be considered in this section represents a straightforward application of behavioral conditioning principles to the problem of motivating learners. These authors define motivation (Sloane & Jackson, 1974) as "a word which is usually

used to indicate whether or not a person is performing above, below, or equal to expectation" (p. 5). This is very different from the commonly used definitions of motivation, including the one used in this paper. Motivation is usually defined in terms of the quantity of behavior (amount and direction in terms of specific goals), instead of the quality of behavior. Qualitative judgments apply more to learning and adequacy of mastery of specific knowledge or skill.

Even so, this model does describe how basic concepts of conditioning and reinforcement can be used to control the motivation of students. The use of rewards, punishers, schedules of reinforcement, and classroom (socially oriented) reinforcement systems are discussed in relation to establishing and maintaining student motivation. The model also describes how to use verbal reinforcement, and other reinforcing devices such as progress charts. And, finally, the model attempts to describe how to move the students from an external reinforcement system, to an intrinsically rewarding condition.

While no research is reported on the success or utility of this specific model, it is basically a generic behavioral reinforcement approach. It is included here because of this, and its representativeness of a great many similar approaches based on behavioral reinforcement principles (see Snelbecker, 1974, for a review). Consequently, the remarks here and in the next paragraph are based on the general results of this approach.

Learning environments that are tightly controlled by externally defined reinforcement contingencies often work well when they are managed effectively. They can provide a secure

environment in which the students know exactly what to expect, and this can have a positive effect on their motivation to cooperate and complete their work. This approach more or less requires the instructor to be very systematic about classroom management and lesson planning, and testing. This alone can increase motivation by providing the students with a high expectation that they can predict exactly what specific actions on their part will affect their performance and outcomes.

As a general approach, the limitations are important. Those aspects of the management approach that contribute to creating a secure, predictable environment are probably beneficial for almost everyone. However, the use of carefully controlled, externally imposed reinforcements can cause quite a few problems. It can result in some students feeling powerless, like they have little opportunity for control over the ways in which they would like to spend their time. Sometimes this can result in outright power conflicts.

One of the areas in which reinforcement principles have been used extensively is token economy systems. These are intended to mirror the economic and social decisions one has to make in the "real" world, but they are also supposed to help the participants learn self-control and self-motivated behaviors. This typically does not work. The externally imposed controls outweigh the opportunities for individual initiative, and the newly acquired habits of the participants disappear when the system is withdrawn. Despite the beneficial aspects of this approach, there are some important aspects of motivation that are not handled adequately by it.

Interaction Centered Models

Currently, interaction centered models are probably the most widely used in the study of human learning and motivation in a context of formal instruction. Cronbach & Snow (1976), Hunt (Hunt & Sullivan, 1974), and Mischel (1973) all have offered theories and reviews of research that focus on the interactions of individual traits or proclivities and environmental influences on behavior. Often, these are called social learning theories (e.g. Bandura, 1977; Mischel, 1973; and Rotter, 1966).

In the specific context of motivation, the interaction theories are often referred to as "expectancy value theories." They combine the internal motive, or value, structures of the person with the contingencies (opportunities for success) that result from the environment. The environmental factor frequently becomes a subjective one ("expectancy") by referring to the person's subjective expectancy for success. Even so, the expectancy factor is still a direct result of the person's perception of the relationship between effort and success (response and reward). Some researchers (e.g. Atkinson, 1974; Rotter, 1966; and Weiner, 1980) believe that the person's perception, or subjective probability of success, provides a better predictor than the objective probability. For example, if a person is firmly convinced that people will ridicule him if he puts on a swimsuit, it does not matter if the actual probability is 100% that they will ignore him. He will not put on the swimsuit.

Each of the models in this section was developed for the specific purpose of understanding and influencing motivation, and

each is based on an interaction centered theory. The first one was developed and applied in a business and industry context, and the other three are apply specifically to an instructional context.

Porter & Lawler

Porter & Lawler (1968) integrated several categories of variables into an effective, interactive theory of motivation and performance. It combined motivational (personal needs or motives, and expectancies) with other important influences on behavior such as personal abilities and skills, role perceptions, reinforcement contingencies, equity theory, and intrinsic motivation. To briefly summarize how these variables combine, Lawler & Porter made a distinction between effort, performance, and satisfaction in human behavior.

The primary influences on effort, which represents motivation, are the person's motives and expectancies. These tell us what the person wants and his subjective probability of being able to get it. The higher these are, the more effort the person will exert. Effort, in combination with the person's ability, knowledge, and skill, and with the added influence of his personal role perception, determines the quality of the person's performance. Hard work, ability, and an appropriate understanding of the real goal you should be trying to accomplish will combine to produce a successful performance. The degree of successful performance then combines with the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards the person obtains, and with the person's sense of the equity of the rewards to determine the final degree of satisfaction with the experience. Built into this model are

feedback loops that provide alterations to expectancies and values based on actual experience, and make this a dynamic systems model.

The utility of this model has been especially strong in helping to explain the major influences on the motivation of managers in business and industry. Their work, even though often well paid, involves many intrinsic motivational factors that go beyond the formal fiscal or hourly arrangements of their job. This model describes how the internal motivational factors combine with other personality and environmental factors that play a role in this complex process. Based on extensive research which supports the general features of the model, it has been used as both a diagnostic and development tool. Using questionnaires, direct observation, and interviews, data can be obtained which help identify specific problem areas in the motivation and performance cycle of individuals and organizations.

A limitation of the model is that it is primarily descriptive. That is, it helps us identify specific problem areas, but it does not provide prescriptions for the solutions. These have to be developed by making inferences based on the identification of the problem area, and by incorporating the knowledge and experience of the problem solver. Furthermore, the model does not apply directly to instructional settings. At a generic level, it incorporates several categories of variables in a way that relates to the interplay of motivation and performance, and it has possibilities for being redeveloped in an educational setting (Keller, 1979). But, as developed by Lawler

& Porter it does not adequately account for the environmental influences (e.g. instructors, books, etc.) on the motivation and learning of the student. Despite these limitations, it is a powerful model, and it provides a background for the structure and content of some of the other models in this section.

deCharms

Working within the general context of expectancy-value theory, deCharms (1968) developed an approach which includes two major variables. The first is achievement motivation which represents the value component, and the second is personal causation which represents the expectancy component. deCharms built on the work of McClelland, et al. (1953) and Aschuler (1973) by incorporating the general schema for increasing a person's need for achievement. His program is similar to Aschuler's, but there is one important difference.

deCharms developed the "origin-pawn" concept to help explain how a person's expectancies about the probability of environmental events affects effort and success. A pawn is a person who believes that he has very little control over the environment, while an origin believes that he can influence the outcomes of his actions. This orientation is based on a person's subjective estimate of the probability of events, and not on the actual probability. That is, the greater a person's belief that something will happen, the greater the likelihood that it will happen. There is a great deal of research (Jones, 1977) with both people and animals that supports this assumption.

deCharms developed a strategy for motivational change, based on the need for achievement model, that incorporated specific

games and activities designed to increase a person's confidence and expectancy for success. His plan was implemented on a rather large scale in a metropolitan school in the northeastern part of the United States (deCharms, 1976). The results were not as strong as he had expected, but there was some positive support for the effectiveness of the motivational model.

The primary benefit of deCharms work is that it illustrates a method for involving teachers and students in a rather prolonged and complex process of motivational development. He also helped to create some effective strategies for increasing a person's sense of competency. Both of these benefits resulted from the combination of laboratory and field studies conducted by him and his students. His book is a good source of strategies and ideas for ways to manage classroom experiences to improve this aspect of motivation. In this sense, deCharms is similar to Alschuler. Both concentrate on psychological education, and both worked in the field in a school setting. For that reason, their work has a great deal of credibility in an applied context.

deCharms' work has some of the same limitations as Alschuler. It requires extensive training of the teachers. They must learn both the motives and the strategies for changing the motives. For this reason, they have to go through training that models the training they will provide. This helps them examine their own motivational structure, and develop a deep understanding of the motive structures that they are trying to change in their students. They must then design methods of teaching that incorporate strategies for influencing these motives. The reason for this involved commitment is that the

teachers are not just trying to make their instruction appeal to the need for achievement or a sense of personal causation, they are actually trying to change the motivational profiles of the students. This is what Alschuler means by "psychological education." This is a worthy goal, but it is a different goal from that of simply trying to create motivating instructional programs.

Wlodkowski

Wlodkowski's model (1978) is one of the first attempts to provide a comprehensive, applications oriented approach to motivation. He includes a large number of motivational factors including both humanistic and behavioral theories. In other words, he attempts to include elements that apply to the process of helping students identify and fulfill their values, and he also includes strategies for the effective use of rewards and feedback. More specifically, he divides motivational strategies into six categories: attitudes, needs, stimulation, affect, competence, and reinforcement. In addition, he organizes these into a process model which recommends things to do at the beginning, during, and end of a lesson or module of instruction.

Wlodkowski's model is written for the practitioner, especially teachers in kindergarten through twelfth grade. For each set of concepts, he offers strategies and suggestions for application that help a teacher understand how to use the concepts. He also includes illustrative dialog and descriptions of classroom activities that provide concrete examples to the teachers.

There are several important benefits to Wlodkowski's model. First, it is practical. It contains strategy prescriptions that tell a teacher what to do at the beginning, middle, and end of a sequence. Many of the suggestions are based on the needs of children at these ages. Secondly, the model is written in language that is appealing to the target audience. He includes anecdotes that are interesting to teachers. Finally, it incorporates important concepts from both traditional and recent lines of research. In contrast to the earlier models which tend to be contained within a specific area of theory, research, and application, Wlodkowski uses concepts and strategies from a number of different areas. This allows his model to offer a broader base of assistance to the practitioner who does not have time to go to each separate area of motivational research.

The primary limitation of Wlodkowski's model is eclecticism with only limited synthesis. He, as mentioned above, does an excellent job of pulling together many of the important influences on motivation, but his motivational categories, as represented by the six steps (or, questions) in his model, are somewhat overlapping and hard to distinguish. Many of the strategies could fit into more than one of his categories. Another problem concerns the focus of applicability of the model. It is designed specifically for teachers, and the strategies are written in terms of the variety of activities that a teacher performs in a classroom. The model does not distinguish between the specific things a teacher, or instructor, can do to be motivating, and the ways in which instructional materials can be designed to make them more appealing.

Keller

Keller (1979, in press) has developed a motivational problem solving model with four categories of motivational variables: interest, relevance, expectancy, and outcomes. More recently, these labels have been changed to attention, relevance, confidence, and satisfaction, and the entire model is called by the acronym "ARCS Model." The first step in motivating a learner is to arouse and sustain his curiosity and attention. The second step is to establish relevance, to connect the instruction to important needs and motives of the learner. The third step is to develop the learner's confidence in his ability to be successful. And, the fourth step is produce satisfying outcomes, to use a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards that reinforces the learner.

This model is grounded in a macro-theory of motivation and learning (Keller, 1979) which incorporates an expectancy value theory of motivation. With one exception, the categories are mutually exclusive and comprehensive to a high degree. The exception is "attention." In many ways, this category comes under the more general one of relevance. It represents the human traits of curiosity (Berlyne, 1965), sensation seeking behavior (Zuckerman, 1971), and other similar constructs. However, it also includes an element of physiological response to the environment. People, as well as other creatures, tend to respond almost automatically to unexpected and incongruous events in the environment. The magnitude of this reflexive response differs among people depending on their sensitivity, and it contributes to the development of trait level differences. Due to the

special nature of this particular characteristic, and its position as a prerequisite to further motivational stimulation, it was included as a separate category.

There are several benefits to this model, both theoretical and practical. Its theoretical foundation, which is based in part on a thorough review of theories and concepts of motivation (Keller, in press), supports the inclusiveness of the model. Each of the four major components of the ARCS model represents a category of variables, not just a single variable. These categories have proven to be an adequate system for classifying the various motivational variables in the literature. The model is also practical. Based on feedback obtained from field tests, it is both simple and intuitively appealing. The four categories can be perceived as being somewhat sequential, and as representing the perceived concerns that teachers have in regard to students. They are able to grasp and apply the concepts quickly, and then add depth to their understanding with additional study. Furthermore, field tests with teachers demonstrate that they are able to make measureable improvements in student motivation by using this model in the context of a general problem solving design model (see Keller, in press).

There are some specific limitations to the model. The primary one is that the model is fairly recent, and lacks a fully developed set of strategy prescriptions that distinguish between training design and teaching. The present lists of strategies in support of the model are based on both the research literature, and practical experiences of educators. Also, there are subdivisions under each of the four ARCS categories that provide

further guidance. However, these strategies need to be refined in terms of their their applicabilty to instructional materials design versus teaching methods. There is also a need to develop examples to illustrate the strategies, especially in the context of training in contrast to schoolrooms.

Conclusion

The model selected for the developed of the handbook of motivational strategies for course designers was the ARCS model. There are three reasons for this. It is comprehensive, it is simple, and it has the best potential of the available models for applying to the context of training. As described above, the model is based in theory, and has been tested in terms of its adequacy for synthesizing available research. It is simple in that it has only four elements, they are intuitively understandable based on the personal experience of educators, and it is easy to see their application to an educational or training setting. Finally, based on early field tests, the model has promise for providing practical, guided assistance to course designers. The constant challenge in this work is to bridge the gap between the theoretical formulations and the practical procedures that will prescribe actions. The ARCS model seems to offer a schema to help people organize their thoughts, which is one of the primary functions of theory, and it also provides the basis for developing and presenting the practical strategies. For these reasons, it should be an effective tool for use in the development of the motivational strategies handbook.

REFERENCES

- Alschuler, A. S. Developing achievement motivation in adolescents: Education for human growth. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.
- Alschuler, A. S., Tabor, D., & McIntyre, J. Teaching achievement motivation. Middletown, Conn.: Educational Ventures, Inc., 1971.
- Atkinson, J. W. The mainsprings of achievement-oriented activity. In J. W. Atkinson & J. O. Raynor, (Eds.) Motivation and Achievement. Washington, D. C.: V. H. Winston & Sons, Inc., Publishers, 1974.
- Bandura, A. Self efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 1977, 84, 191-215.
- Berlyne, D. E. Motivational problems raised by exploratory and epistemic behavior. In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: A Study of a Science, Vol. 5, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Snow, R. E. Aptitudes and instructional methods. New York: Irvington, 1976.
- deCharms, R. Enhancing motivation change in the classroom. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc., 1976.
- deCharms, R. Personal causation. New York: Academic Press, 1968.
- Deci, E. L. Intrinsic motivation. New York: Plenum Press, 1975.
- Edwards, A. L. The measurement of personality traits by scales and inventories. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.

- Hunt, D. E., & Sullivan, F. V. Between psychology and education. Hinsdale, Ill: Dryden, 1974.
- Jones, R. S. Self-fulfilling prophecies: Social, psychological, and physiological effects of expectancies. New York: Halsted Press, 1977.
- Keller, F. S. Goodbye teacher. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1, 78-79.
- Keller, J. M. Motivational design of instruction. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.) Instructional Design Theories and Models: An Overview of Their Current Status. Lawrence Erlbaum, Publisher, in press.
- Keller, J. M. Motivation and instructional design: A theoretical perspective. Journal of Instructional Development, 1979, 2 (4), 26-34.
- McClelland, D. C. Toward a theory of motive acquisition. American Psychologist, 1965, 20, 321-333.
- McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. W., and Lowell, E. L. The achievement motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.
- McClelland, D. C., & Burnham, D. H. Power is the great motivator. Harvard Business Review, 1976, 52 (2) 100-110.
- McClelland, D. C., & Steele, R. S. Motivation workshops. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1972.
- Mischel, W. Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. Psychological Review, 1973, 80, 252-283.
- Murray, H. A. Explorations on personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1968.
- Rodgers, C. Freedom to learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.

- Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 1966, 80 (Whole No. 609).
- Simon, S. B., Howe, I. W., & Kirschenbaum, H. Values clarification. New York: Hart Publishing Company, 1978.
- Skinner, B. F. The technology of teaching. New York: Appleton-Centure-Crofts, 1968.
- Sloane, H. N., & Jackson, D. A. A guide to motivating learners. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publication, 1974.
- Snelbecker, G. E. Learning theory, instructional theory, and psycho educational design. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers, 1974.
- Weiner, B. Human motivation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.
- Wlodkowski, R. J. Motivation and teaching. Washington, D. C.: National Educational Association, 1978.
- Zuckerman, M. Dimensions of sensation seeking. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1971, 36, 45-52.

MOTIVATIONAL DESIGN OF INSTRUCTION

John Keller
Syracuse University

In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.),
Instructional Design Theories and Models:
An Overview of Their Current Status.
Lawrence Erlbaum, Publisher, in press.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Problems in the Study of Motivation	2
Motivation and Learning	6
Motivational Design Model	11
Four Motivational Components	14
Interest	14
The Concept of Interest	14
Interest Conditions and Strategies	16
Relevance	22
The Concept of Relevance	22
Relevance Conditions and Strategies	24
Personal Motive Value Strategies	25
Instrumental Value Strategies	32
Cultural Value Strategies	32
Summary	33
Expectancy	34
The Concept of Expectancy	34
Expectations of Others	34
Expectations of Oneself	34
Expectancy Conditions and Strategies	36
Outcomes	41
The Concept of Outcomes	41
Outcomes Conditions and Strategies	43
Conclusion	49
Reference Notes	50
References	51

Ms. Thrush said, "Ok, that's it for the lesson. Now it's time for practice." She began handing out dittos. Each person received two. Several comments were directed to the teacher about these sheets.

"Are we gonna get more dittos?" No answer.

"How many of these do we have to do?" One boy asked.

"Twelve of them," she replied.

"BORING!" Carl said out loud.

"Ms. Thrush, how many of these do we have to do?" asked Millie from the other side of the room.

"A lot more than twelve if you keep asking me that," Ms. Thrush said. "Don't forget you've got a test on Friday."

This actual dialogue illustrates a teacher who is trying to solve several instructional design problems at once. For example, she wants the students to respond actively, and to practice with concrete examples of the concepts she has been teaching. Both of these strategies are consistent with well established instructional design principles. However, she is also trying to solve a motivational problem, that of keeping the children's attention directed toward the task during the entire class period. Her approach is familiar, as we can easily remember how we or our children have suffered through endless reams of deskwork aimed at keeping us busy.

The children's comments clearly indicate that Ms. Thrush's motivational strategy is not successful. The children are variously bored, irritated, or apprehensive. This teacher's problem, which resulted despite her well intentioned effort, simply illustrates an important problem in our knowledge of instructional design. As chapters 4-10 indicate, our understanding of how to arouse and maintain student interest in learning lags far behind our knowledge of how to facilitate learning once the student has the desire to achieve.

This lack of attention to motivation is mirrored in the assumptions of various researchers, for motivation has played a curious role in instructional design and instructional theory. It is not explicitly included in some approaches to instruction (e.g., Carroll, 1963), it is subsumed under more general terms such as "aptitude" in others (e.g., Cronbach & Snow, 1976; Walberg, 1971), it is equated with reinforcement or feedback in some (Skinner, 1968), and it is not regarded as essential to learning still others (e.g., Ausubel, 1968). More commonly, however, motivation is explicitly labelled as an element in a

given model (e.g., Bloom, 1976; Cooley & Lohnes, 1976; Gagne, 1977; Reigeluth & Merrill, 1979), but procedures for influencing motivation are never presented with the detail or precision of the procedures to facilitate concept acquisition.

Why, one might wonder, is there so much diversity, even in the definitions of where motivation belongs in a theory of instruction and learning? Some answers to this question are included in the following pages, but the primary purpose of this chapter is to offer the initial version of a systematic, theory-based approach to designing motivating instruction. For brevity, this approach is called motivational design and, in a later section, will be distinguished from other elements of instructional design.

The accomplishment of this chapter's goal requires a number of steps. The first is to clarify some of the problems faced by the instructional researcher or designer who wants to study and influence motivation. The problems that have impeded progress in this area are by no means solved, but some progress has been made. The second step is the presentation of a theory that illustrates the role of motivation in relation to other psychological and environmental factors in the learning situation. This theory provides the context for understanding the parameters of motivation in contrast to other influences on learning.

The third, and major, portion of the chapter is the presentation of a model for motivational design. This section begins with a general overview of the model and is followed by a detailed presentation of its four elements. The final section of the chapter highlights approaches to implementation, limitations of the model, and a number of areas in need of research and validation.

PROBLEMS IN THE STUDY OF MOTIVATION

There are many problems to be faced by the instructional designer who is interested in motivation. To discuss all of these issues would require a thorough historical review of the topic, and that is not the purpose of this chapter. However, there are two particular problems that warrant attention before proceeding. The first is attitudinal, while the second is technical and refers to both the theory and measurement of motivation.

A Concern for Motivation

The first problem in trying to develop and implement a systematic approach to motivational design lies in the traditional attitudes and definitions used by instructional technologists (not to mention their clients). For example, we often read that the goal of instructional technology is to

design effective and efficient instruction. Unfortunately, these criteria make it easy to exclude a specific concern for motivation, or the appeal of instruction. The assumption all too often has been that if instruction is of good quality, motivation will take care of itself. Unfortunately, this assumption has been found to be only partly true. When we examine the meaning of "quality instruction," we discover that it generally refers to results in more or better learning per unit of time than other comparable methods of instruction.

Given this definition of quality, we can illustrate that it does not adequately account for motivation. It is true that one consequence of motivation is to contribute to better learning, and this is consistent with the previous definition of quality. But, another consequence of motivation is intensity of performance at a task. People tend to persist longer, or more intensely for a shorter period, at tasks when they are motivated than when they are not. However, in several cases it has been found that high quality instructional programs resulted in superior learning when the students finished the entire course, but that large numbers of people dropped out or procrastinated excessively relative to the comparison groups. These results have been particularly noticeable in self-paced, independent study courses (e.g., Alderman & Mahler, 1973; Johnston, 1975). Thus, we can have courses which are of demonstrably better quality with respect to the learning objectives, but less appealing than the comparison groups.

This distinction is important because it helps to identify motivation as an influence in instructional design that is not subsumed by the influences on efficiency and effectiveness that have traditionally been researched by instructional theorists. The growing concern for more research in this area was noted particularly by Cooley & Lohnes (1976), who indicated the need for improved measures of motivation that can be used in survey research. This could help in the understanding of the specific nature of motivation in relation to performance, and in relation to noncognitive variables such as quality of experience in school.

A Need for Better Measures

A second more technical problem concerns the characteristics of motivation and efforts to measure it, particularly when contrasted with the concept of ability. In this chapter a rather traditional distinction between motivation and ability is maintained. This is in contrast to the tendency established by Cronbach and Snow (1976) and Walberg (1971) to subsume all human characteristics under the term "ability." In the present chapter, motivation refers, in a general way, to what a person will do, while ability refers to what a person can do. This usage is consistent with the preponderance of research and the associated technical definitions of the two terms in the literature.

In comparing the research on motivation and ability, there seems to be little doubt that people are much more stable, or consistent, in their ability to be successful at a given task once they are committed to it than they are in the commitments they make. The variability of personal choices, and the associated degree of effort exerted, is reflected in the variability shown in many of the measures of motivation. This issue of variability has been discussed by both Weiner (1974) and Mischel (1973), but from different perspectives. Weiner (1974) categorizes ability and effort respectively as stable and variable human characteristics that serve as two types of internally oriented attributions for the cause of given performance outcomes. Mischel (1973) discusses the issue more in terms of the difficulties of establishing a solid line of research and application in the area of motivation that would compare to the steadier progress in the study of ability and performance. In both cases, the characteristics of motivation as described by these two writers underscore the need to examine the concept of motivation and some of the theoretical issues that make it difficult to study.

It is difficult to operationalize the concept of motivation in as straightforward a manner as the concept of ability. Even though ability has been studied from many perspectives ranging from a general ability factor to a host of highly specific abilities, there are a number of different ways to measure ability. Furthermore, the measures of general ability tend to be consistently correlated with each other and with performance.

Motivation, by definition, refers to the magnitude and direction of behavior. In other words, it refers to the choices people make as to what experiences or goals they will approach or avoid, and the degree of effort they will exert in that respect. As such, motivation is influenced by myriad internal and external characteristics. People respond to their environment on the basis of inner reflexes, impulses, perceptions and goals, and on the basis of perceived and actual opportunities and reinforcements in the external environment. Historically, various theories of motivation have tended to incorporate specific personal or environmental variables, but until recently almost none have tried to systematically incorporate both (Weiner, 1972).

Consequently, the term motivation is interpreted in many ways. The resulting difficulties in developing an adequate theory of motivation have been accompanied by corresponding difficulties in developing adequate measures of motivation, particularly academic motivation. Surrogate measures, such as family socio-economic status, have been shown to have a substantial and consistent relationship to performance in school (Walberg, (1971), but direct measures of motivation tend not to be highly correlated with performance or with each other (Keller, Kelly, & Dodge, 1978). Direct measures are needed,

because they will assist in the process of identifying specific motivational problems and the effects of instructional techniques on motivation. Surrogate measures help only to predict initial motivation with respect to the general importance of school in one's development.

The need for more adequate measures of academic motivation has been identified by many researchers (e.g., Cooley & Lohnes, 1976), and this need is underscored in the present argument by the need for better theory upon which to base better measures. At the same time that these concerns are being expressed, there has been rapid growth recently in psychological research on a number of motivational concepts. In a recent review (Keller, Kelly, and Dodge, 1978) of measures of several of the better known of these concepts in an academic context (e.g., locus of control, achievement motivation, curiosity), several questionnaire-type, self-report measures were found for each concept. However, the availability of these instruments does not help the instructor know which one to use under a given set of circumstances. And, it would not be feasible in most instructional situations, whether for research or practice, to use a battery of instruments to measure each of several motivational concepts. Hence, there still exists the need for a measure of general academic motivation. A few of these were found (Keller, et al., 1978), and some had promise (especially Moan & Doyle, 1978), but none systematically measured specific aspects of motivation within the framework of a general theory of motivation and instruction. Such a measure is in preparation and has undergone preliminary testing (Note 1).

MOTIVATION AND LEARNING

Of equal or greater importance than the 2 problems discussed above is the need for an adequate theoretical basis for understanding motivation in education. Such a theory provides the basis for a systematic approach to developing motivational design strategies. In an earlier paper (Keller, 1979), a theory was presented that serves as the roots of the motivational design approach to be described in this chapter. The following brief review highlights the key points of the theory together with a brief discussion of its characteristics and its relationship to the motivational design model.

Motivation, as argued in the earlier paper (Keller, 1979), is the neglected "heart" of our understanding of how to design instruction. Historically, instructional science has benefitted from the work of behavioral psychology and cognitive learning psychology, but this has given us only partial knowledge of how people learn, and almost no knowledge of why they learn. Working from the perspective of behavioral psychology, early instructional scientists (e.g., Markle, 1969; Skinner, 1968) derived strategies for the organization of instruction to allow the effective use of feedback. This required active responding with minimal errors to provide a context for the contingent use of feedback and reinforcement. These approaches contributed to improvements in learning and, in a very qualified sense, to motivation. Given that a person is already interested in a subject and is actively responding, then the appropriate use of feedback will help maintain and sometimes increase that behavior.

Additional knowledge from cognitive psychology and information processing research (e.g., Ausubel, 1968; Mayer, 1977) provided the basis for a better understanding of how to organize instruction to improve the acquisition and retention of knowledge and skills. Instructional scientists then developed strategies and prescriptions for the design of instructional materials (e.g., Gagne, 1977; Merrill, 1975; Reigeluth, 1979). These characteristics are also studied in relation to individual differences in ability and learning style (Cronbach & Snow, 1976).

Keller's (1979) theory of motivation, performance, and instructional influence illustrates how motivational theory can be integrated with these other two major influences in instructional science. On the one hand, this theory illustrates how to better understand what influences a person to approach or avoid a task. On the other hand, this theory illustrates how to approach the problem of making a task more interesting. This theory, building on the earlier work of Porter & Lawler (1968), clearly distinguishes between effort and performance as categories of behavior (see Figure 1). Performance means actual accomplishment, while effort refers to whether the individual engaged in actions aimed at

accomplishing the task. Thus, effort is a direct indicator of motivation. We know that people are more or less motivated by the vigor or persistence of a behavior. In contrast, performance is a measure of learning and is only indirectly related to motivation; it is also influenced by ability and opportunity (learning design and management). Ironically, most studies of motivation in education use learning as measured by grades or some other indicator of accomplishment as the dependent variable.

 Insert Figure 1 about here

A further distinction is made between performance and consequences. Consequences include both the intrinsic and extrinsic outcomes that accrue to an individual. These include emotional, or affective, responses, social rewards, and material objects. Consequences are related to motivation since they combine with cognitive evaluation (see Figure 1) to influence changes in one's personal values or motives. These effects will, in turn, influence the degree of effort under similar circumstances in the future. This concern with the consequences of an immediate activity on future motivation for the activity has been discussed by Maehr (1976) as continuing motivation.

As illustrated in Figure 1, this theory is in the tradition of field theory (Lewin, 1935), or social learning theory (e.g., Hunt & Sullivan, 1974; Rotter, 1972), in which behavior is considered to be a function of the person and the environment:

$$B = f (P \& E).$$

Keller's theory describes the influence of these two factors on three categories of responses: effort, performance, and consequences.




Figure 1. A model of motivation, performance, and instructional influence.

This classification provides an effective means for integrating research. To illustrate, the preceding discussion of historical influences on instructional science can be quickly summarized in terms of this theory. For example, the study of reinforcement is an E variable that primarily influences consequences. There has been a great deal of research on this environmental factor, but relatively little on the P variable of cognitive evaluation. The work of Deci (1975), Condry (1977) and others suggests that there are important P factors that modify the effects of environmental contingencies.

Moving to the center of the model, there has been a great deal of research on P variables related to individual differences in performance, and there is a rapidly growing body of research and theory concerned with the optimal design of instruction (E variables) to maximize learning.

However, moving to the left, we come to the two primary areas of influence on motivation. There are many theories and lines of research on the individual characteristics of human motivation, P factors, but very little on ways to systematically influence motivation by means of instructional design, E factors.

Before elaborating further on this theory, particularly its motivational components and their relationship to the motivational design model to be presented, it is worth considering what type of a theory this is. Keller's (1979) theory of motivation, performance and school influence clearly is not in the tradition of micro theories that have been in vogue for quite a number of years in psychology and education. In contrast, the purpose of this theory is to identify major categories of variables of individual behavior and of instructional design that are related to individual effort and performance. This theory incorporates the theories and paradigms that have received the major focus of attention in instructional science, and illustrates how motivational theory will interface with the earlier work. As such, the proposed theory is, in Kaplan's (1964) terms, a macro theory, or concatenated theory**. It describes a network of relationships which provide a type of explanatory shell for the factors, or phenomena, which the theory attempts to explain.

The present theory clearly attempts to be more analytic and inclusive than particular, and for several reasons. We technologists, in contrast to scientists, tend to be working with a rather large base of knowledge and skills. We require syntheses of those areas of knowledge that are most likely to improve our decisions in practical problem solving. However, in contrast to the traditional linear view of science as discovering basic truths which then filter down to an applied level (of Hilgard & Bower, 19--), it is probably more likely that technology benefits selectively from science. Technology

will benefit from useful syntheses of scientific knowledge if particular technologists make the effort to obtain the knowledge and write the syntheses (Kranzberg, 1968). In this same vein, these syntheses will be more meaningful and effective if they are presented in the context of an organized structure that facilitates their learning and retention. This is one of the purposes of the present theory. As a concatenated theory at the macro level, it serves as a "subsumer" in Ausubel's (1968) sense: it provides a structure in which to locate and remember many of the important concepts from the study of instruction and learning.

However, this organizational purpose would not be adequately served if the theory had no validity, and would be relatively trivial if "subsumption" were the only function of the theory. The present theory also provides heuristic and predictive functions and, following Snow's (1973) argument, both descriptive and prescriptive functions. At a descriptive level of explanation, the present theory leads to predictions about the relationships among motivation, learning, and performance. At a prescriptive level, it leads to predictions about how we can influence these human characteristics by manipulating various components of the instructional environment. Furthermore, the theory has, in our experience, proven to be rich in heuristic value; that is, testable working hypotheses are readily generated as we introduce more specifically defined variables and consider their impact on the theory.

The primary concern with this theory in the present context is to illustrate a systematic basis for a motivation design model. As illustrated in Figure 1, the primary "person" influences on effort are motives (values) and effort. Together these factors represent a motivational theory generally known as expectancy-value theory (see Steers & Porter, 1975, for a review). It assumes that motivation is a multiplicative function of values and expectancies; that is, a person will approach activities or goals that are perceived to be personally satisfying and for which the person has a positive expectancy for success. Within the value category would fall the research in areas such as curiosity and arousal (Berlyne, 1965), personal needs (Maslow, 1954; McClelland, 1976; Murray, 1938; Rogers, 1969), and beliefs or attitudes (Feather, 1975; Rokeach, 1973). With the exception of curiosity, each of these areas of research is concerned with understanding how the internal structure of individual needs and beliefs is related to choices for action; that is, to the direction in which individuals will exert effort.

Curiosity, as a line of research, stands apart in some respects. Berlyne (1965) defines curiosity in one sense as an individual difference variable representing a personal motive or need. But, he also defines aspects of curiosity in terms of arousal, which is more of a physiological variable, and would be closer to a psychological explanation based in drive theory

(Hull, 1943). Without entering into the controversies resulting from shifting to various modes of explanation (cognitive versus physiological), the position taken in the present approach is to treat curiosity and arousal as somewhat different from the other variables in the "value" category. This distinction will be quite apparent in the motivational design model below.

The expectancy term in this theory of motivation also encompasses several lines of research. These include locus of control (Rotter, 1966, 1972), attribution theory (Weiner, 1974), self efficacy (Bandura, 1977), learned helplessness (Seligman, 1975), and other influences on a generalized expectancy for success or failure (Jones, 1977; Perlmutter & Monty, 1977). A common element in all these approaches is the attempt to explain the formation and effect of personal expectancies for success or failure in relation to behavior and its consequences.

While values, including curiosity, and expectancies, are the foundation of the theory to explain individual motivational tendencies, the macro theory (see Figure 1) also includes the effect of reinforcement on motivation. In this case it is represented as a joint influence of consequences and cognitive evaluation. Following a performance, a person will experience an emotional response, such as elation, pride, despair, or tranquility. The person may also receive an external reward such as applause, a smile, or cash. Deci (1975), Condry (1977), and others (e.g., Bates, 1979) have shown that the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic reinforcement is not simple. There seem to be conditions under which an extrinsic reward will actually decrease intrinsic motivation. Thus, a concern for rewards and intrinsic motivation are represented by their influence on the value a person places on a given activity.

In summary, Keller's (1979) theory of motivation, performance, and instructional influence is a macro theory that incorporates cognitive and environmental variables in relation to effort, performance, and consequences. It also distinguishes between three types of influence of instructional design. The first is motivational design, the second is learning design, and the last is reinforcement contingency design. The assumption is that any instructional event, whether it is a teacher in a classroom or a module on a microcomputer, will have these three influences; and the task of the instructional scientist is to understand and control them.

MOTIVATIONAL DESIGN MODEL

Turning now to the motivational design model, it is presumed that there are four basic categories of motivational conditions* which the instructional designer must understand and respond to in order to produce instruction that is interesting, meaningful, and appropriately challenging. The four categories, which are derived from the preceding presentation, are interest, relevance, expectancy, and satisfaction (see Figure 2). Interest refers to whether the learner's curiosity is aroused, and whether this arousal is sustained appropriately over time. Relevance refers to the learner's perception of personal need satisfaction in relation to the instruction, or whether a highly desired goal is perceived to be related to the instructional activity. Expectancy refers to the perceived likelihood of success, and the extent to which success is under learner control.

Insert Figure 2 about here

The final category, satisfaction, refers to the combination of extrinsic rewards and intrinsic motivation, and whether these are compatible with the learner's anticipations. For example, we would expect a student who finishes tenth in a class of one hundred to feel good. But, if this student had a personal competitor whom he perceived to be inferior, and if the competitor came in seventh, then the student would feel bad instead of good.




Figure 2. A model for designing motivating instruction.

Equity theory (Adams, 1965) provides another approach to understanding the dynamics of social comparisons in relation to affective responses to outcomes.


This model serves three purposes. First, it provides a relatively parsimonious, theoretically-based model for integrating the numerous strategies for increasing motivation. As indicated, this model is derived from the macro theory (Keller, 1979) that identifies the major categories of variables related to motivation.

Secondly, this model facilitates the effort to integrate motivation theory and motivational strategies with instructional design theory. Reigeluth & Merrill (1979), for example, have classified instructional variables into several sets of interrelated categories. One set of categories has three parts: conditions, methods, and outcomes. Conditions are variables that constrain or interact with methods, but which cannot ordinarily be directly manipulated by the instructional designer or educator. Methods are specific strategies for achieving different outcomes under different conditions. These are under the direct control of the instructional designer. Outcomes are the measurable influences of methods on the individual learner, a group of learners, or the learning institution. As illustrated in Figure 3, these categories are further subdivided into three types of conditions and strategies and three levels of outcomes.

Insert Figure 3 about here

The identification of motivational conditions and strategies provides a convenient structure for presenting the present motivational model. Reigeluth & Merrill's distinction between conditions and methods corresponds roughly to Keller's distinction between two types of motivational problems: those located within the individual, and those located in the instruction. When there is a severe motivational problem in the individual, such as an extreme lack of confidence, then an intervention in the form of counselling or another type of behavior modification strategy is needed. Normal instructional design approaches would not solve this motivational problem. The assumption in the present model is that the students are within a normal range on the relevant motivational variables, and that an existing motivational problem is due to problems in the instruction rather than problems in the personality of the learner.

This leads us to the third major purpose of the present model. It allows a problem solving approach to identifying and solving motivational problems. This model, when combined with a corresponding measurement approach, as discussed below, helps the instructional designer or educator to identify specific



A framework showing classes of instructional method variables and the major condition variables that influence each. The classes of condition variables are not a complete list. Rather they represent the conditions that are likely to have the strongest influence on each class of method variables.

Figure 3

problems that might be depressing the motivational level of a student, classroom, or teacher.

It can also be used in a preventative sense. The model helps to identify the critical areas on which to focus motivational design efforts to improve the probability of success in a course.

Four Motivational Components

Each of the four components of this model is a category that subsumes several specific concepts or micro-theories of motivation. Each of these concepts or micro-theories was developed in a context of understanding and predicting human behavior. As such, each concept describes a motivational condition which the instructional designer must match with appropriate parallel strategies. Each of the following four sections of this chapter describes, at a general level, the major motivational concept with its associated condition and strategy. This general introduction is followed in each section by a more specific list of conditions and strategies.

INTEREST

The Concept of Interest

Practically every theory of learning includes some assumption about interest. A student has to at least be paying attention to a stimulus for learning to occur. As a motivational variable, interest encompasses several theories of curiosity and arousal. In education, one of the more widely used definitions of curiosity is that of Maw and Maw (1964). A curious person is one who:

1. reacts positively to new, strange, incongruous or mysterious elements in his environment by moving toward them or manipulating them;
2. exhibits a need or a desire to know more about himself and/or his environment;
3. scans his surroundings seeking new experiences;
4. persists in examining and exploring stimuli in order to know more about them (p.2).

Given that these behaviors indicate curiosity, the challenge for the instructional designer is to know how to elicit them. Berlyne (1965) has been particularly interested in the properties of objects and conditions that stimulate curiosity. He found a number of such characteristics, which he called "collative" variables, including novelty, paradox, incongruity and complexity. To include these characteristics in the design of instructional materials would enhance the

likelihood of stimulating curiosity as defined in the first and third parts of the preceding definition of curiosity.

Another aspect of curiosity is reflected in the second and fourth parts of the definition. The inclusion of the collative variables in instruction will elicit curiosity, but it may be a rather passive, short-lived experience if the learners do not exercise their curiosity. Interest is more likely to be maintained if the students engage in activities that allow them to act on their curiosity by exploring and manipulating their environment. In many instructional settings, students are given very little encouragement or opportunity to explore, both in a physical and an intellectual sense.

Before looking at specific interest conditions and strategies, there are two distinctions and one caution that need to be made. These apply to curiosity in particular, and in some regards to motivation in general.

The first distinction is one which differentiates between two types of curiosity. Berlyne (1965) distinguishes between perceptual curiosity and epistemic curiosity. Perceptual curiosity is similar to attention; it refers more to a sensory level reaction and selective attention in response to particular objects in the environment. Instructors and designers often capitalize on this type of curiosity by doing something startling at the beginning of or during a presentation. Of more interest to education, however, is epistemic curiosity. This refers to information seeking and problem solving behavior that occurs as a result of the stimulation of curiosity. It is this type of curiosity that is evidenced when a child works at a jig-saw puzzle or a science problem.

A second distinction is made between state and trait curiosity. The term trait refers to the assumption that people have relatively stable proclivities with respect to such things as curiosity, need for achievement, anxiety, etc. However, we see wide variations in behavior in different situations. Hence, state refers to the manifestation of a particular characteristic in a specific situation. Even though people have given proclivities, they may not be activated in a particular situation; or due to the complex interrelationship of needs and desires, there may be motive conflicts in a given situation. A person who has a great deal of curiosity but dislikes responsibility may find that the exercise of curiosity in certain contexts leads to committee assignments. The person then may inhibit that tendency anytime he anticipates it leading to unwanted responsibility. In this case, low state curiosity would inhibit trait curiosity.

In the classroom we often say that we want to foster creativity; we want students to do original thinking. Then we punish them for giving us "wrong" answers. Berlyne (1965) and others (e.g., Keller, 1978) have shown that people generally

have to feel comfortable about the consequences of taking risks before they will exercise a great deal of curiosity. Therefore, in instructional design, we must be cognizant of whether we are designing educational situations that are consistent with the type of behavior we hope to observe.

A caution is in order that will apply throughout this model of motivation. The ancient Greek conception of balance and harmony, as exemplified in the "golden mean" of Aristotle, are very pertinent. Almost every motivational construct has an optimal level with respect to effective behavior. Stated in more modern terms, we are talking about the Yerkes & Dodson (1908) law, which suggests that the relationship between motivation and performance is, graphically, in the form of an inverted U. Too low a level of motivation results in less than optimal performance. On the other hand, excessive motivation also results in suboptimal performance due to anxiety and other sources of distortion and disorganization.

For example, achievement motivation has been shown to be at an optimal level with tasks of a moderate level of risk. Both low and high risk challenges are related to a decrease in achievement motivation. Curiosity, and the closely associated concept of arousal, are presumed to follow the same law. In summary, it should never be assumed in the context of the model of motivational design that more of something is automatically to be preferred, as educators often do in the case of general intelligence. We are concerned with achieving a match between learners with a reasonable degree of curiosity, achievement motivation, etc., and instruction which activates and fosters those characteristics.

Interest Conditions and Strategies

In general, curiosity is a condition that exists when there is an unexpected or inconsistent event in the perceptual environment, or there is a gap between a given and desired state of knowledge. This two-part description is consistent with the previously defined distinction between perceptual and epistemic curiosity. It is especially useful for purposes of analysis and research, but only limitedly useful for design. In practice, some strategies are clearly identifiable as one or the other, such as slamming a book on the table, but many strategies will have elements of both. It would be difficult, and seldom desirable, to develop a list of strategies that purported to be one or the other, especially since both types of curiosity are, within limits, desirable. Perceptual curiosity is certainly the easier of the two to arouse. There is a great deal of survival value for humans and other species in being sensitive and responsive to unexpected stimuli. However, most meaningful learning requires a sustained level of curiosity -- or wonderment, as Aristotle would put it -- that is more challenging for the educator to nurture and sustain.

The following strategies begin with those that are simpler, operating more at the perceptual level, and progress to those which would contribute more to the development of epistemic curiosity. The last two are relatively complex and are represented by somewhat comprehensive models of teaching.

Strategy 1: To increase curiosity, use novel, incongruous, conflictual, and paradoxical events. Attention is aroused when there is an abrupt change in the status quo.

An unexpected stimulus, a puzzle, or any device that creates perceptual or conceptual conflict will increase attention and curiosity. People will seek information to explain or resolve the inconsistency. A lesson which begins with a question, statement, or other device that creates an unusual perspective in the mind of the learner will capture that learner's interest. A key element in this strategy is that it puts the learner into a problem solving mode, even if the problem is nothing more than ascertaining the source and innocuousness of an unexpected stimulus (the slammed book).

The extent to which a student's curiosity can be held with this strategy depends on the frequency and complexity of its use. If students are bombarded with novel, incongruous, and conflictual stimuli, then the unusual can become commonplace and lose its effect, especially when there is insufficient time for the learner to actively respond to the situation in a problem solving manner. This problem is probably best illustrated by the results of recent research on television. Children who watch large quantities of television, which provides such a continuous bombardment of stimuli, actually suffer impairments in learning and problem solving (Singer, Singer, & Zuckerman, 1980). The structure of a typical television show does not allow time for the rehearsal and transfer of information from short to long term memory, and it is a passive medium, one that encourages the undivided, passive attention of the viewer.

In summary, this strategy must be applied judiciously. Despite the preceding example of the consequences of excessive stimulation, the situation in school is more probably one of understimulation or excessive complexity. That is, students are not likely to complain that they are being presented with too many novel and interestingly incongruous events. But, they are likely to develop confusions and misconceptions due to excessively complex and even unintended incongruities and paradoxes in the instructional material. In using this strategy, the students' curiosity must be aroused by perceiving a problem, but the students must also be given an opportunity to resolve the incongruity, or in other words, to solve the problem.

Strategy 2: To increase curiosity, use anecdotes and other devices for injecting a personal, emotional element into otherwise purely intellectual or procedural material.

People are usually more interested in the concrete than the abstract, and in real people and events rather than mankind in general or hypothetical events. Consequently, the use of personal language and concrete stories about real people can help maintain curiosity and dispell boredom. Flesch (1948) created a simple formula to measure the human interest of prose material. His formula is based on the proportion of personal words and personal sentences in a passage. Research has demonstrated the validity of his formula, and underscores the assumptions underlying this strategy.

Dramatic evidence for this strategy appears in McConnell's (1978) article entitled "Confessions of a Textbook Writer." His introductory psychology text is one of the most widely used and has a very low end-of-year return rate. He attributes this success, in part, to the use of personal anecdotes throughout the text. He conducted extensive developmental testing while writing his text, a procedure seldom employed by textbook writers (which he acknowledges) and long prescribed by instructional design theory (which he does not acknowledge). His testing demonstrated the value of the personal stories about the famous psychologists in the text, and confirmed the admonition he received from a professor, Karl Dallenbach, who was one of his mentors and role models: "If you want to capture the imaginations of young people, you have to tell them stories" (p. 160)! While we often accept this uncritically when dealing with children, the work of McConnell and Flesch suggests the strategy is also true with young people and adults.

Strategy 3: To arouse and maintain curiosity give people the opportunity to learn more about things they already know about or believe in, but also give them moderate doses of the unfamiliar and unexpected.

On the one hand this strategy seems contradictory, and on the other hand it seems similar to the first strategy. It is true that people enjoy opportunities to learn more about things they already know and are interested in. That is why people subscribe to special topic magazines, join clubs, do research, and attend political rallies of their own party persuasion rather than going to learn about their opponents. Recognition of this by educators is reflected in the frequently heard admonition to present intruction at the student's level of ability and interest.

However, despite this commonplace observation, we often find a gap between instructional content and student interest, especially in areas other than reading where the teacher has

some flexibility in selecting relevant stories. Even so, the strategy is valid and bears repeating in this context. One example of efforts to bridge the gap is provided by a teacher who uses analogies to help students find something familiar in material that might seem abstract and remote. For example, in teaching the structure of American government in seventh grade social studies, he asks the class how the three branches of government are like a two story house with a basement. The students, in talking about the specific functions of the furnace in the basement, the return air ducts, the kitchen, living room, bedrooms, etc., come up with the concepts of separate yet interdependent functions. In his experience, this almost never fails to generate general interest in the class discussion, and increased interest in the functions of government. This particular analogy works well in New York, but might not in Arizona or Southern California; however, the use of analogies is viable and is a good way to operationalize this strategy*.

The second part of this strategy is similar to the first strategy (using novel, incongruous, conflictual, and paradoxical events), but it is intended to focus more on unfamiliar, unexpected content or subject matter as opposed to novelty in approach or example. Although there are individual differences in sensation-seeking tendencies among people (Zuckerman, 1971, 1978), people seem to enjoy moderate amounts of exposure to unusual or novel subjects. The inclusion of unusual, or exotic, material can help initiate or maintain curiosity in a group. However, even here a caution is in order. If a group is already highly curious about a particular subject, the inclusion of unexpected and divergent material can be irritating. For example, a group of doctors attending a briefing on the proper use of a recently licensed drug would want the essential information, and would want to get back to their practices as soon as possible. They would not appreciate extraneous material. In contrast, most designers are working with audiences that do not have as much inherent curiosity for the subject, and "human interest" strategies will be helpful.

Strategy 4: To increase curiosity, use analogies to make the strange familiar and the familiar strange.

*Editor's note: See Chapter 10 p. , for more about the use of analogies in instruction.

An established design and teaching model that is very effective for stimulating and developing epistemic curiosity is synectics. Synectics was designed by Gordon (1961) specifically for the purpose of stimulating creativity in problem solving situations, and creativity is highly correlated with curiosity (Vidler, 1977). Although originally used in industry to stimulate creativity within groups of people who work as problem solvers and product developers, it has now been developed into teaching models (Joyce & Weil, 1972; Weil, Joyce & Kluwin, 1978) to stimulate imagination and creativity. As is

often stated in readings on the topic, synectics can be used to help make the strange familiar and the familiar strange.

At the simplest level, synectics can be used to stimulate curiosity by (1) presenting a divergent situation (an incongruous analogy) and (2) requesting convergent thinking. For example, a teacher who uses synectics in a high school social studies class uses a series of metaphorical, or analogical, exercises to loosen up the class, and to lead into a level of understanding of the content that exceeds the level of simply memorizing facts, concepts, and examples. These examples and exercises, taken from a unit on the second world war, begin with a warm-up exercise in which the teacher asks the students, "Which is deadlier, a gun or a rumor?" After a discussion of this analogy, the teacher tries to stretch their minds a bit by asking, "Who has a better sense of humor, God or Hitler?" In this case, every student gave the "right" answer at first, then someone mentioned that he had no evidence as to whether God has a sense of humor, but he had seen a film in which Hitler did a brief "dance" when told of a Nazi military victory. The class was then given a brief written exercise on the topic of "How is a rattlesnake like a dictator?", and "How is a tornado like a blitzkrieg?" Additional exercises required the students to produce their own analogies. The benefits of this approach as used by this particular teacher were cognitive as well as motivational. With respect to cognition, these exercises served an information processing function in that they facilitated the integration of this new knowledge with what the students already knew*.

The combined motivational and information processing function of synectics can be formalized by a process that might be called metaphoric organizers. It is similar to the concept of advance organizers (Ausubel, 1968) but with an important difference. The advance organizer model, as described in Ausubel's theory of meaningful learning, is concerned with a learner's cognitive structure; that is, a learner's knowledge of a particular subject matter and how well organized, clear, and stable it is. When this cognitive structure is defective, learning suffers. When the cognitive structure is effective, learning is enhanced, since new knowledge can be meaningfully integrated into, or subsumed by, the given cognitive structure.

*Editor's note: For more on such uses of analogies, see Chapter 10, p. .

However, in some cases, the material to be learned may be rather abstract and remote from the learner's experience--two factors that tend to reduce curiosity and learning. In these cases, metaphoric organizers can help the students relate the new, unfamiliar, abstract knowledge to something that is concrete and familiar. This is similar to Ausubel's use of comparative organizers to help relate new material to previously learned, related material. Common examples include comparisons between electronics and plumbing, mathematical equations and balance scales, and human cognition and computers (information processing). Joyce and Kluwin (1978) offer many examples for the effective use of analogy in the context of synectics.

Strategy 5: To increase curiosity, guide students into a process of question generation and inquiry.

A second design and teaching model that seems ideally suited to fostering epistemic curiosity is inquiry teaching*. This model, not to be confused with discovery learning, was developed (Suchman, 1966) to help students learn-how-to-learn with respect to the process of inquiry. This model produces teaching situations that provide the students with a process that is similar to the process a scientist, or any disciplined inquirer (Cronbach & Suppes, 1969), undertakes when investigating a problem. This is in contrast to traditional approaches to teaching science, in which students are presented with laws and relationships during a lecture, then go to a laboratory to go through the motions of a series of "canned" experiments to verify what the lecturer has already told them.

*Editor's note: See Chapter 8 for an example of inquiry approach in instructional theory.

It is noteworthy that the inquiry model begins with a puzzling event, something like an anomaly, a discrepancy between what is known and what will happen. This is followed by a learning process modelled after the scientific method, but it allows the students to investigate problems which are, in their eyes, original and capable of being solved at their level of understanding. The important factors in the present context are that this model both stimulates curiosity and provides the opportunity for students to exercise their curiosity. This model is well worth investigation by instructional designers (see Weil & Joyce, 1978).

In summary, one element of effective motivational design concerns the arousal and exercise of curiosity on the part of the learners. Since it is generally observed that students are under-stimulated far more often than the opposite, the instruction should benefit from efforts to incorporate the preceding strategies. The greatest danger is probably at the level of devising an extremely interesting opening, or "grabber," at the beginning of an instructional situation and not being able to follow through with an equally interesting program or presentation. That is why it is stressed in this section that the designer must be concerned with arousing and sustaining (or exercising) curiosity. To that end, the following principles have been gleaned from the work on curiosity, and are offered for the assistance they might provide to the creative instructional designer:2

With respect to curiosity, people tend to be

- a. most interested in things they already know something about or believe in, but they also find the unfamiliar and unexpected to be intriguing in moderate doses,
- b. more interested in real people and events than in mankind in general or abstract and hypothetical events,
- c. interested in anecdotes, and other devices for injecting a personal, emotional element into otherwise purely intellectual or procedural material, and
- d. interested in novel, incongruous, conflictual, and paradoxical events.

RELEVANCE

The Concept of Relevance

A second major motivational condition is that of relevance

(see Figure 2 above). Sustained motivation requires the learner to perceive that important personal needs are being met by the learning situation. This general aspect of motivation has long been recognized as a progression of theorists have offered their explanations. One explanation is that of drive theory (Hull, 1943), in which motivation is defined primarily in terms of physical deprivation. Drives can range from primary physiological states such as hunger and thirst to secondary, acquired states such as fear and competitiveness.

In contrast, Murray (1938) explained motivation in terms of needs which act as "potentialities" of an organism to respond in particular ways under given conditions. His explanation of the origin of a need is more biological than physical, and he identified a number of generalized needs. One of the best known of these is the need for achievement, which refers to a person's desire to do things rapidly and well, to overcome obstacles, to accomplish difficult tasks, and to attain high standards (Murray, 1938). Consequently, Murray viewed behavior as being goal-directed: the organism will actively seek opportunities to change and grow in keeping with its need structures. This is in contrast to a more Hullian conception of a passive organism that responds to reduce stimulation: that is, taking a drink to reduce thirst, making friends to avoid loneliness, or achieving excellence to reduce job insecurity. However, there is still a similarity between the approaches represented by Hull and Murray. Both tend to see motivation as a difficult tensional state which persists until relief, or equilibrium, is obtained.

In keeping with Lewin (1935), Tolman (1949), and the general position taken in the present chapter, Murray assumed that behavior was a function of both personal and environmental characteristics. He is often recognized for his needs-press theory. A behavioral episode results from the press of the environment and the needs of the person. "Press" refers to obstacles, facilitation, and other characteristics of a situation that relate to the opportunity for need satisfaction.

Another major theorist in this context, McClelland, was influenced by the "why" of behavior (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1953). Motives are learned and are represented by stimulus conditions that are associated with affective states. Furthermore, motives are aroused when there is a discrepancy between a present affective state and a desired or expected affective state. This theory includes the concept of equilibrium, as do the previous theories, but with a difference. In McClelland's affect arousal theory, equilibrium occurs when stimulation is at a point greater than zero. This is not, as it might seem, contradictory. It is analogous to a physiological state of equilibrium which requires a certain degree of stimulation for homeostasis. For example, understimulation, as in sensory deprivation, will cause hallucinations. In McClelland's theory, if a present level of stimulation is above or below that level, the organism will act

to decrease or increase stimulation.

The three particular motives studied most thoroughly by McClelland and his associates are the needs for achievement, affiliation, and power. His definition of achievement is consistent with Murray's as previously described. Affiliation refers to the desire for close, personal relationships with other people. These would be regarded as two-way, meaningful relationships, and not as the desire to "do things" for other people. The latter is often an indication of the need for power, which is a desire to influence other people. The study of these particular motives has helped the understanding of motivation in relationship to performance in such diverse settings as entrepreneurship, managerial effectiveness, and education.

While these are theories of the major theorists in this context, they are only a sampling. Also well known for their work in a context of identifying personal needs and values in relation to personal motivation are Maslow (1954), Rogers (1951), and Atkinson (Atkinson & Raynor, 1974).

Relevance Conditions and Strategies

The general motivational condition related to relevance is that personal motivation will increase with increases in the perceived likelihood of a task to satisfy a basic need, motive, or value. This is the basic value term in the previously discussed expectancy-value approach to explaining motivation. With the exception of curiosity, which was included in the first of the four parts of this model (see Figure 2), this category includes all of the approaches to describing particular values.

Consequently, this category encompasses a vast body of specific concepts, constructs, and attitudes. At the operational level, there is almost no limit to the number of specific desires that might impell a person to action. Without the guidance of theory, the instructional designer would be hard-pressed to determine what needs or values would characterize a particular audience, and what design strategies would be appropriate. Unfortunately, there is no single, while accepted theory that is useful in this context. However, based on the theoretical approaches covered in the brief preceding review, and the results of research in the context of education, three specific categories of value will be used in the present model.

The three categories of value, each representing a subcondition under relevance, are personal motive value, instrumental value, and cultural value. The first category, personal motive value, suggests that increased value, or motivation, results when a given task or goal is perceived to offer satisfaction of a particular need or motive. Under

personal motive value are the lists of needs identified by researchers such as Murray (1938), Edwards (1970), Maslow (1954), and McClelland (1976). Among those which seem to be most pertinent to educational performance are three which will be considered for illustrative purposes in this chapter. They are the needs for achievement, power, and affiliation. They have the advantage of a theoretical basis and a body of empirical study of their relationships to education (e.g., Atkinson & Raynor, 1979; McClelland et al, 1953).

The second category, instrumental value, refers to the increase in motivation to accomplish an immediate goal when it is perceived to be a required step for attaining a desired future goal. The effect of this future orientation and the perception of a series of contingent steps leading to a future goal has been described and studied most thoroughly by Raynor (1974).

Cultural value, the third category, is a well-known influence that parents, peers, organizations, and the culture at large have on motivation. Personal motivation increases when a desired goal is perceived to be consistent with the values of these reference groups. The values of these groups are not always consistent in a person's life, and goal conflicts can result, causing motivational problems. This is particularly noticeable with adolescents who develop peer group allegiances that are incompatible with parental values.

Each of these motivational conditions suggests strategies for instructional design. Bear in mind that we are concentrating on strategies aimed at making instruction more motivating by being responsive to these three kinds of values. We are not presenting strategies designed to modify the motivational conditions in question, although that could be a consequence. For example, instruction that provides the opportunity for achievement need satisfaction could result in increases in the need for achievement in some learners. However, such results would be regarded as fortuitous in the present context. Following are several specific strategy suggestions in relation to each of the three relevance subcondition categories.

Personal Motive Value Strategies

The following strategy descriptions are examples of the approach to take to connecting motivational principles to instructional design characteristics. They are not intended to encompass the vast amount of research that pertains to this general topic, but they do represent several of the major areas of study in an educational context.

Strategy 1: To enhance achievement striving behavior, provide opportunities to achieve standards of

excellence under conditions of moderate risk.

A person's feeling of achievement is enhanced when the person believes success to be a direct consequence of his or her effort, when there is a moderate degree of risk, and when there is feedback attesting to his or her success. Competition can also be a factor in this process when the competition serves to inspire the participants to greater degrees of accomplishment. (There is another type of competition, as will be described, that serves power needs rather than achievement needs.)

Specific approaches to operationalizing this strategy would include individual contracting with specified criteria for success, and non-zero sum evaluation methods. The principle of individual contracting can be utilized, as it traditionally is, in independent study, but it can also be embedded in a group activity. For example, deCharms (1976) described a learning activity called the Spelling Game. The instruction is designed so that each child in a classroom takes a pretest on the spelling list for the week. At the end of the week, the class is divided into two teams for a spelling bee. Each child has the choice of an easy, moderately hard, or hard word. An easy word is one that was spelled correctly by that particular child on the pretest. A moderately hard word is one spelled incorrectly on the pretest, but the child has had several days to study these words. Finally, a hard word is one of comparable difficulty which the child has not seen before. Correct spelling of the word in the contest results in 1, 2, or 3 points respectively.

This type of choice allows each child to establish his or her own contract, and to obtain immediate feedback regarding success. Furthermore, the social setting is such that the children are encouraged to do their best. There is nothing but social disapproval, another powerful form of feedback, for flamboyant, unrealistic attempts to answer difficult words, a condition that often prevails under normal contest situations. In addition, the achievement motive is stimulated in all students. Even poor spellers can earn 2 points by studying the words missed on the pretest. This type of structure can be used in other contexts to represent the general strategy description for achievement motivation, as can other approaches that stimulate moderate risk taking and the other characteristics listed in the strategy description.

A second example of design considerations in this context is the evaluation system in use. Alschuler (1973) points out that a non-zero sum scoring system is best. Many types of competitive activities use a zero-sum scoring system. These systems require a penalty on one side for every gain on the other side. For example, grading on the curve, rank-ordering, arm wrestling, chess, and standardized test taking are all zero-sum activities. In contrast, there is no automatic tradeoff in non-zero sum activities. In the spelling game each

child can be successful independently of the overall outcome of the competition. Other examples include maste' learning, archery, performance contracting, and bowling. The non-zero sum approach to evaluation allows each person to define standards of performance independently of other persons, and competition is aimed at "passing the mark" established for the particular activity, rather than simply "beating down" the rival.

In summary, there are entire books on the topic of increasing the level of achievement motivation in faculty and students (e.g., Alschular, 1971, 1973; deCharms, 1976), and it is a challenging goal to bring about those changes. In contrast, the implications are clear for designing instruction to activate the achievement motive, given its presence in the learner. The challenge for the instructional designer is to implement achievement-arousing strategies concurrently with the other motivational requirements of the learners. The following strategies, which will be presented more briefly, illustrate this problem.

Strategy 2: To make instruction responsive to the power motive, provide opportunities for choice, responsibility, and interpersonal influence.

The influence of power in learning environments is often negative. The negativity results from learning design approaches (including arbitrary requirements and teaching styles) that effect controls on the learners that are unnecessary or not clearly related to the learning objectives. Since power is the process of exerting influence, whether aggressive, persuasive, or unsolicited helping behavior, the teacher or designer who uses power inappropriately may initiate power struggles instead of learning in a given situation. This is illustrated in the excessive display of helping behavior of some teachers. One type of helping behavior is that of the Good Samaritan variety. It consists of a helping response when there is an obvious need for assistance. In contrast, the excessively helpful person is often high on need for power. A teacher who is too quick to show students how to do something, or to show them the "one right way to do it" will often generate negative reactions in the form of hostility or low effort. This teacher may not understand that the students are responding to the power influence, and do not like it since they want to "do it" for themselves.

It is important to realize that power and control are not equivalent. The power motive is revealed by a person's effort to gain a position of influence over other people. This influence could take the positive form of helping meet the dependency needs of a client or subordinate (McClelland & Burnham, 1976), or the more negative form of argument for argument's sake, classroom disruptions, or arbitrary "busywork" assignments. In both cases, the person enjoys the feeling of

having influenced another person's life, but in the latter case the goal is influence for the sake of influence without an overriding goal of trying to establish control or resolve misunderstandings. In contrast, control is a type of power that is necessary to accomplish certain goals; it is a means rather than an end. A teacher needs classroom control in order for desirable learning to occur, and a person high on need for achievement likes to have personal control over the resources necessary to accomplish a goal. The teacher, who has to be prepared to use influence and to respond to student attempts to gain influence, will be more effective if he or she understands and enjoys the use of power.

The person high on need for achievement is often irritated by power struggles and tries to avoid them. This person sees control as a means of circumventing the "political" aspects of interacting with people to gain resources and personal advantages. This conflict can be seen in some Presidents of the United States (e.g., Nixon and Carter) who had lofty achievement goals, but who tried to avoid the lengthy and demanding processes of building a base of influence with all of the key persons in congress and other parts of the government (Winter, 1976). The desire for absolute control or, in a sense, absolute power, overshadowed the skill or desire for the process of competing for influence. In summary, when the motive for power is strong, it means the person derives pleasure from the process of wielding influence, whether or not achievement-type goals are obtained (McClelland & Burnham, 1976).

In instructional design, there are two problems with respect to power. One is to avoid generating power conflicts if possible, and the second is to respond to students' power needs when possible. The former is generally accomplished when rules are established and maintained consistently, providing that the rules are in the best interests of the students and that the students perceive this to be the case. Problems inevitably arise when a teacher, or the requirement in an instructional setting, is threatening and authoritarian and appears to serve only the personal power needs of the teacher.

However, even under the best of circumstances, some students will deliberately engage in power struggles with the teacher. This is one of the aspects of teaching that too few are prepared for before entering the classroom. Teachers generally have high, even idealized, expectations for the influence they hope to have on their students' lives. These teachers tend to be unprepared for students who fail to respond and who engage them in seemingly purposeless resistance. The resistance can be active, as with hostile, disruptive, and argumentative students, or passive, as with students who simply will not do the work.

These kinds of problems, coupled with other perhaps less

dramatic signs of uncooperativeness, signal the need for more opportunities for students to satisfy their power needs. Sometimes this can be accomplished by giving positions of authority to students. We have all read stories about the social worker or teacher who converted a group of hostile opponents by identifying the leader, and winning the person over by giving the person a position of responsibility and enforcement. Similarly, elementary school children experience a pleasant sense of personal power when they are selected for safety patrol, and get to leave class early. These leadership opportunities, when there is some genuine authority attached, give students experience with the exercise of personal influence.

In designing instruction to respond to the need for power in students, there are a number of strategies that may be employed. However, before describing them, a word of caution is in order. In a power context, the primary goal is influence. In an achievement context, the primary goal is productivity. Therefore, if the power motive is elicited without a corresponding requirement for goal accomplishment, these strategies may not have a beneficial educational consequence.

Power strategies are those which provide the opportunity for influence or domination over others, whether real or implied. Instructional strategies such as debating or the argumentative essay are traditionally acceptable strategies that elicit the power motive. These strategies require the utilization of knowledge and personal style for the purpose of "upstaging" an opponent, and not necessarily for the purpose of increasing truth or knowledge. Other power motive strategies would include any types of zero-sum games or simulations. These, as indicated earlier, are games in which one person or team gains only at another's expense, as in chess and normative grading systems. This type of power motivation in curriculum design often has negative consequences since students will use whatever means they can to achieve a favored position.

In summary, the power motive is difficult to address in instructional design. Students with a high need for power may become antagonistic if they have no opportunity to exercise power, and if they perceive the teacher to be exercising arbitrary and unwarranted power. The best solution seems to be for the teacher to have well-defined standards with consistently enforced rules, and to offer opportunities for students to assume responsibility. This responsibility could be in the form of administrative tasks in the classroom, or academic positions as in debates or argumentative essays.

Strategy 3: To satisfy the need for affiliation, establish trust and provide opportunities for no-risk, cooperative interaction.

The need for affiliation is expressed as a desire for close, friendly relationships with other people, and the desire to engage in cooperative, non-competitive activities. As a motivational condition, the affiliation need is activated when friendly cooperation is the expected behavior in a group. This need is frustrated when students have to study in isolation from each other, when individual competitiveness is required, or when success is possible only at the risk of personal embarrassment or failure. Obviously, the need for affiliation seems to be in conflict with many of the typical requirements of school. Competing to achieve standards of excellence, or to gain positions of advantage are very much a part of the American classroom. Consequently, it would appear to be impossible to design instruction to simultaneously satisfy the needs for achievement, power, and affiliation; yet these are not mutually exclusive personality characteristics. A person can score high on any combination of these motives.

The point for instructional designers is that just as no one experience in life will satisfy all three motives, neither can they be satisfied simultaneously by a given instructional experience. Self-study may be a highly effective and efficient method for delivering some instruction, especially if it is appropriately challenging with frequent feedback. This would appeal to a person with a high need for achievement, but could become demotivating to persons with high needs for affiliation or power.

A solution to this dilemma is to vary the instructional strategies during a prolonged period of instruction. With respect to affiliation, this need for belongingness may be satisfied by several strategies. The first is to satisfy it as a prerequisite to more challenging risk-taking activities. Keller (1978) demonstrated how a lack of psychological security, which may be interpreted as a fear of personal rejection by others, can inhibit risk taking behavior in a learning situation. Keller (1978) used a game in which the participants had to learn the rules by induction as they individually took turns trying to solve a concept identification problem. Not until the participants learned the rules and overcame their fears of being embarrassed in front of the group did they relax and take the risks needed to find the solution. This is consistent with Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of human needs. It suggests that the need for affiliation must be satisfied before people will engage in the individual, competitive activities that lead to satisfaction of self-esteem needs.

The lesson for instructional designers is to include activities at the beginning of a learning situation that will relax students' fears of social rejection. In classroom situations this often requires no more than taking a few minutes to establish personal contact with the group. In small groups, take a few minutes for introductions and personal comments. In large groups, as expert speakers will know,

relate some human interest information or anecdotes, and try to establish personal contact with one or two people in the group. In essence, one key motivational factor in relation to the need for affiliation is a negative one. That is, if people experience a fear of rejection, it may interfere with learning in a group setting. Therefore, the instructional designer has to allay this fear prior to engaging the students in the learning activity.

Two other design strategies are the inclusion of cooperative group activities, and shared-sum scoring systems. Cooperative, as opposed to competitive, activities allow people to enjoy social contact while trying to complete a task. An important part of the nondirective instructional design mode of Carl Rogers (1969) concerns the affiliative relationship of the teacher and learners. This relationship serves as a context within which individual, self-directed behavior can occur. The cooperative activity in this context may take the form of non-evaluative activities that allow the expression of warmth and responsiveness or the genuine acceptance of others as persons. Coffee-breaks, "play" activities, and even group discussions of assigned material can serve this function, providing that the discussion leader is able to develop a sincere, positive atmosphere of acceptance in the groups. Another strategy is that of having students work in groups on an assignment. In teaching basic computing skills to children, it is helpful to have approximately three on a terminal. They tend to spontaneously work together in identifying mistakes, suggesting alternatives, and exploring options. The teacher in this setting has to ensure that the groups are compatible and that a single child does not dominate.

The final strategy to be described here is the shared-sum scoring strategy. Alschuler (1973) uses the example of team sports in which each member shares equally in the success or failure. This approach would also describe the instructional design and evaluation strategy in which students work as a team and all get the same grade on their final product. This approach assumes that affiliative, cooperative behavior is required within the group in order for it to function effectively. The effect of this is seen in the comradery that is often developed among members of a team, or among the members of a class who move through a program together. However, there is a caution here, as every teacher knows. After assigning a group of students to work on a task, it is often confusing as to how the task can be subdivided into distinct subtasks for the individual students. In the absence of meaningful divisions of labor, it all too often happens that one person ends up doing "all" the work, and this becomes demotivating. It can also happen, as it does in team sports, that there is competition for favored positions or assignments.

The problem in this strategy is that, even though the

evaluation system is shared-sum, there is an interaction of affiliation and competition (or achievement) needs. Even though the team shares in the outcome, there is individual assessment, even if it is informal, of personal contributions to the success or failure. Therefore, in designing learning activities which require group activity, and which employ shared-sum scoring, it would seem to be important to ensure a clearly defined role for each person to play and a sense that each role is important.

In summary, these are but three of the personal motive value strategies that can be identified. At present, there is no comprehensive theory that succinctly categorizes all of the human motives that might influence the perceived relevance of instruction. The important principle for the instructional designer to retain is that motivation for learning is enhanced when the perceived relevance of the instruction is increased. The preceding discussion focused on strategies for increasing perceived relevance by making the instruction responsive to basic motivational needs in the students.

Instrumental Value Strategies

Another major category of influence in the perceived value of instruction, which will be mentioned only briefly here, is perceived instrumentality. Raynor (1974) has demonstrated, as teachers have intuitively understood, that motivation is increased if a present goal or task is perceived to be an important or necessary prerequisite for the accomplishment of desired future goals. Correspondingly, design strategies which clarify the importance of a given segment of instruction should improve learner motivation. This can occur at the macro or micro level. At the broader level, teachers have traditionally used statistics and career education to illustrate how education leads to greater earning power and career choice. At the micro level, one function of learning objectives, although not generally identified as such, is to illustrate the importance of particular elements of instruction for goal accomplishment.

Cultural Value Strategies

The final condition and strategy to be presented in this context is cultural value. Individual motivation to accomplish a given task is increased to the extent that the activity is positively valued by the individual's cultural reference groups. If the individual perceives that his or her family, friends, and society all think an activity is important, then the individual is more likely to think it is important. Problems erupt when, as sometimes happens in adolescence, there is a conflict between a child's family and peer group. At a broader level, there seems to be a growth in general cynicism about the value and quality of education in our culture, as evidenced by the publicized difficulties of Ph.D.'s and other graduates in getting jobs, and by highly critical news

analyses, such as the recent report in Time magazine (e.g., Foote, 1980).

Instructional designers cannot necessarily be expected to introduce strategies that will solve psychological and social problems of this magnitude, but they can utilize strategies aimed at improving the perceived cultural value of instruction. Teachers try to use positive role models, by means of fiction and biography, in shaping student values. Similarly, McConnell (1977), in field-testing his new popular introductory textbook in psychology, found that students were very interested in the personal stories about psychologists and other scientists. In one respect, these stories provided role models that attested to the cultural value of the subject matter. This suggests that when the motivational conditions are such that students are experiencing personal conflict or uncertainty about the value of a given course of instruction, the designer may increase perceived value by using culturally relevant examples of accomplishment. The insertion of anecdotes and personal examples into instruction could benefit this effort with adults as well as children.

Summary

The concern for relevance is a major element in the motivational effect of instruction. It is not totally distinct from the earlier discussion of curiosity. As described in that section, curiosity is in one sense a motive which, when aroused by instruction, will make the instruction seem to be more relevant. Furthermore, some of the design strategies in that section deal directly with the problem of relevance, although from the standpoint of arousing and maintaining an appropriate level of stimulation. Together, the sections of this paper dealing with curiosity and relevance combine into the value term of the expectancy-value theory of motivation (see Figure 1).

The final two sections of this chapter are concerned with somewhat different motivational components. The first, expectancy, refers directly to the other half of the expectancy-value theory. The final section, outcomes, deals with the use of feedback and reinforcement, and other intrinsic and extrinsic consequences of behavior with respect to motivation.

EXPECTANCY

The Concept of Expectancy

The belief that a person's attitudes toward success or failure have a causal influence on actual events has a long history. The Greek myth of Pygmalion, the motivational workshops of Dale Carnegie, George Bernard Shaw's *My Fair Lady*, and Weiner Earhardt's EST are all based, at least in part, on this belief. Formal psychological studies based on this belief have taken several forms, but can be subdivided into two categories: expectations about others and expectations about ourselves. The research on this topic is vast, so the remainder of this "concept" section will contain brief introductions to some of the major theoretical approaches. These will provide a sufficient basis for understanding the subsequent discussion of conditions and strategies.

Expectations of Others

One of the more widely known theories of expectancies concerns individual expectancies for the behavior of others. First defined as the self-fulfilling prophecy, Merton (1957) describes it as "...in the beginning, a false definition of the situation evoking a new behavior which makes the originally false conception come true" (p. 423).

Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968), who coined the term "Pygmalian Effect," demonstrated this in an elementary school classroom. Randomly selected children who were identified to the teacher as "intellectual bloomers" showed a four point gain in IQ over the control children in one year. Although the early work of Rosenthal and Jacobson was criticized on methodological grounds, subsequent research has supported the existence of a Pygmalian Effect (Strom, 1971; Jones, 1977).

A key factor in the self-fulfilling prophecy is the teacher's (or other professional's) belief that he or she can bring about the desired change. To tell a student, "You can do it if you try," is not an example of the self-fulfilling prophecy. To believe, "I know I can help this student despite the obstacles he presents," is an example. This was exactly the attitude of the fictional character of Professor Higgins in *My Fair Lady*, and of Anne Sullivan, the very real teacher of Helen Keller.

Expectations of Oneself

Turning to the more self-directed types of expectancies, there are several currently active concepts including locus of control (Rotter, 1966), personal causation (Bandura, 1977; deCharms, 1976; White, 1959), and learned helplessness (Seligman, 1975). Each of these concepts explains an aspect of

the effect of personal expectancies on one's own behavior.

The concept of locus of control (Lefcourt, 1976; Rotter, 1966; Phares, 1976) refers to a person's expectancy regarding the controlling influences on reinforcements. A person who tends to assume that good grades, friends, promotions, and other reinforcements are most likely to result from personal effort and initiative is an internally-oriented person. In contrast, an externally-oriented person tends to believe that irrespective of one's efforts, beneficial consequences are largely a matter of circumstances, either good luck or the favorable decision of a power-holding individual.

Weiner (1974) incorporated the concept of locus of control into the broader concept of attribution theory. He also broadened the concept from control over reinforcements to control over outcomes of behavior. His research suggests that attributions of successes or failures to relatively stable factors such as personal ability or task difficulty, in contrast to unstable factors such as effort and luck, are better predictors of performance than locus of control. Locus of control, which combines the internal attributions of ability and luck, and the external attributions of task difficulty and luck, is sometimes a better predictor of affect than performance (Keller, Goldman, & Sutterer, 1978; Weiner, 1979).

Another approach to the concept of personal expectancies is that of personal causation, or personal effectiveness. White (1959) introduced the concept of competence as an organism's capacity to interact effectively with its environment. A fuller development of this general idea is provided by Bandura (1977). Bandura's concept of self-efficacy refers to the personal conviction that one can execute the behavior required for successful performance. It does not refer to the relationship between performance and outcomes, which Bandura calls outcome expectations. These distinctions are virtually identical to those of Porter & Lawler (1968) who differentiate between the subjective expectancies that effort will lead to performance, and that performance will lead to reward. The same distinction is included in the theoretical bases of the present paper (see Figure 1).

Of more central interest to educators is deCharms' concept of personal causation (deCharms, 1968) which deCharms as the origin-pawn concept. Origins tend to be active authors of their own behavior, while pawns are more reactive and tend to let their goals and habits be dictated by others. However, deCharms has worked at a practical level to develop and validate programs for teachers and students to develop a higher degree of origin behavior (de Charms, 1976). Further reference to his work is included below in the discussion of strategies.

The final concept to be included in this section is learned helplessness (Seligman, 1975). Learned helplessness develops when a person wants to succeed, and when the person

cannot avoid the situation where success is expected but is in fact impossible. For example, a child in beginning algebra might be daydreaming, absent, or distracted by either his fear or amusement of the teacher during the time when some essential premises and operations are presented. Subsequently the child, who cannot avoid going to algebra every day and who would like to succeed, begins to fail. It is truly impossible for the child to be successful at this point without additional information which the child doesn't even realize is missing. Consequently, the child develops the deep seated conviction that, "I can't do math." The child perceives no relationship between his or her effort and what happens as a consequence. Once established, this condition is extremely difficult to reverse. However, the studies that have been completed in an educational context (e.g., Chapin & Dyck, 1976; Dweck, 1975; Murphy, 1979) suggest that the condition can be reversed, particularly when it is interpreted and treated in a context of attribution theory (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978; Dweck & Goetz, 1977).

Expectancy Conditions and

Strategies

The general motivational condition related to expectancy is that personal motivation will tend to increase with increases in personal expectancy for success. Furthermore, personal expectancy for success is influenced by past experience with success or failure at the given task, locus of control, and personal causation. Before proceeding, one qualification is in order. When a task becomes extremely easy, it is not unqualifidely true that personal motivation will increase. If tasks are very easy, hence an extremely high personal expectancy for success, a person may become bored or simply uninterested because the task represents no challenge. (Recall that persons high on need for achievement prefer tasks with a moderate level of difficulty.) In contrast, there are situations where people enjoy tasks that are easy and relaxing. The point to be made is that positive, as opposed to negative, expectancies for success are positively correlated with actual success, especially when the perceived control of success is internal rather than external.

Despite the rather large amount of research on expectancies, there has been rather little research on how to influence expectancies in an educational context. Most of the research on changing expectancies has been in a clinical psychology context (e.g., Rudestain, 1980) or commercial self-help books and workshops (e.g., Lakein, 1973; Ringer, 1977). The major study conducted in schools was that of deCharms (1976); and his concern, like that of the clinical and commercial contexts, was how to develop a greater sense of personal causation in children who tended to be very low, or external, in this regard. He was concerned with what might be called a trait change; that is, a change in the students'

generalized expectancies of personal effectiveness.

In contrast, as indicated earlier, the present chapter is concerned primarily with state changes: how to design instructional environments to stimulate students by responding to the motivational characteristics that may be expected to exist in a typical group. Students may be expected to be more interested in a class, and to perform better, if the class is designed in a way that stimulates their feelings of personal competence and control. The following list of strategies describes ways to help accomplish this goal. These strategies are not intended to solve the problems of either the extremely external, or highly obsessive student. They would need specialized help from a counselor, not an instructional scientist.

The following strategies encompass a number of instructional design techniques, including some approaches from the previously mentioned work of deCharms (1976). Whenever possible, research supporting a strategy will be mentioned, but in several instances the strategies, while based on sound arguments, need empirical investigation.

Strategy 1: Increase expectancy for success by increasing experience with success.

This idea has a relatively long history of support in both theory and research. Rotter (1954) expressed the relationship in terms of generalized and specific expectancies, and provided a mathematical representation in a subsequent article (Rotter, 1972). Without our getting into mathematics, Rotter suggests that expectancy for success in a given situation is a combination of one's generalized expectancy for success and one's history of success in similar situations. In unfamiliar situations, a measure of generalized expectancy of success (such as that of Fibel & Hale, 1978), not to be confused with locus of control which refers to the perceived internal versus external control of reinforcements, is the best predictor of performance. If a person has a generally low expectancy for success or a specific history of failure in a given area, then a series of meaningful successes in that area will improve the person's expectancy for success (Feather, 1965; Feather & Saville, 1967).

There is a qualification that needs to be mentioned in connection within this strategy. The goal of such a strategy is to increase positive expectancies so students will be more successful under normal classroom conditions. Consequently, the success experiences used to build positive expectancies must be similar to those in the transfer situation. Success on a series of trivially easy tasks will not help a student who is confronted with tasks perceived to be moderately or extremely difficult.

This strategy is similar to the principle of error-free responding (Markle, 1969) in programmed instruction. The strategy is based on a cognitive rather than behavioral assumption with respect to feedback. In this case it is assumed that feedback serves to verify the correctness of a response, but it is the cognition of success that increases the expectancy for success. This is different from the motivational influence of a reinforcement which serves to maintain a response as long as the reinforcer is an incentive for the learner. In the present case, the focus is on increasing positive expectancies. Reinforcers will be discussed in the last section of this paper.

Strategy 2: Increase expectancy for success by using instructional design strategies that indicate the requirements for success.

There are several instructional design strategies (or to be consistent with the present theoretical approach (see Figure 1), learning design strategies) that have had considerable research as to their effects on learning, but there are none with respect to motivation. Two of these strategies are advance organizers and objectives. It has already been mentioned how comparative organizers can help generate a sense of relevance. In addition, both comparative and expository organizers (Ausubel, 1968) may serve to increase a student's expectancy for success. By obtaining the superordinate relationships, or subsumptive structures, that facilitate the acquisition of unfamiliar material by overviewing its structure (expository organizers) or the integration of new but similar material (comparative organizers), the learner's motivation should increase due to increases in positive expectancies. Research is needed regarding these potential motivational effects.

Similarly, the presentation of instructional objectives to learners should increase the expectancy for success provided that there is consistency between the objectives and the evaluation of learning. A further assumption is that the stated objectives are the true objectives of the learning situation. All too often, relatively trivial aspects of a learning situation are stated in the objectives simply because the designers lacked the skill or imagination to describe the important goals in observable terms. Given these assumptions, well-stated objectives should have the dual motivational effect of reducing anxiety and increasing positive expectancies. Here again, research on the motivational properties of objectives is needed.

Strategy 3: Increase expectancy for success by using techniques that offer personal control over success.

This strategy helps combine the concept of locus of

control with expectancy for success. Strictly speaking, locus of control as developed by Rotter (1966) and other (e.g., Lefcourt, 1976; Phares, 1976) refers to the perceived internal versus external control over reinforcements. This implies something different from expectancy for success or failure, although the difference is not always clearly described. A person could have a positive expectancy for success at accomplishing a given task (e.g., "I will get that essay written by next Friday") and still have either an internal (e.g., "If I write it well, I'll get a good grade") or an external (e.g., "If the professor likes it I'll get a good grade") attitude toward reinforcement.

In essence, even though the two concepts are different, there is evidence that they are related. Internals tend to have a higher initial expectancy for success, especially with an unfamiliar task (Feather, 1968; Rotter, 1968; Ryckman, Gold, & Rodda, 1971). However, this difference tends to disappear with task experience.

The present strategy captures both concepts by suggesting that either personal control or predictable relationships (which is a form of control) over performance and reinforcement be established. An example of personal control would be individual contracting, assuming that the contract includes criteria for evaluation. An example of a predictable relationship would be mastery learning, again assuming that the mastery model is used properly with acceptable performance criteria specified.

Strategy 5: Increase expectancy for success by using attributional feedback and other devices that help students connect success to personal effort and ability.

This strategy is particularly important when a student does not perceive a connection between his or her effort and its consequences, as in learned helplessness. This strategy is also one of the more difficult to implement, because it requires special attention from the designer and teacher.

Much of the nondirective approach of Rogers (1969) and the personal causation approach of deCharms (1976) is concerned with helping students develop internal attribution for success and failure when such attributions are in fact appropriate. Both approaches emphasize the development of personal responsibility and self-directedness. Rogers works in a context of human potential development and deCharms in a context of achievement motivation, and both authors have a number of specific suggestions for curriculum design strategies. Those of deCharms (1976) are particularly helpful since concrete classroom activities are described. A similar approach to presenting Rogers work in terms of concrete procedures is found in Weil, Joyce, & Kluwin (1978).

A different and more direct approach to implementing this strategy requires the direct intervention of a teacher or tutor at an appropriate point. For example, a person who has developed a learned helplessness attitude toward a particular subject simply does not perceive any causal link between behavior and its consequences. This person will tend to give an external attribution for success or failure. In math, this person will work on problems if they are easy, but will quit when the problems become challenging. This person often does not see the connection between ability and persistence as the key to success. In this situation, the designer must develop a sequence of problems (or other assignments depending on the context) that are initially easy but become challenging. After each success, the teacher gives encouragement to keep trying, and after success at the more difficult problems, the teacher gives verbal, attributional feedback. The student is told something like, "See, you succeeded because you kept trying. You are able to do that." Ordinarily it would take many such experiences to overcome a deep-seated helpless attitude. This approach has been demonstrated by Dweck (1975) in a mathematics context, and with considerable revisions to fit the context, by Murphy (1978) in reading.

In summary, perceived expectancy of success is one of the two basic components of the basic expectancy-value theory of motivation. Jones (1977) has reviewed the research on expectancies, self-fulfilling prophecies, and the conditions related to the development of positive or negative expectancies. This research, incorporating both human and infrahuman subjects, supports the conclusion that positive expectancies lead to improved performance and success rates. A key factor in this principle is that the positive expectancies are not necessarily consistent with actual, or objective, predictions of success. Believing something can, apparently, help make it happen.

This principle, which is pushed to the unrealistic extreme in contexts such as "salesman seminars" or by the "success merchants" is not advocated to the exclusion of the other motivational principles. Excessive confidence in success can lead to a narrowness of focus and an insensitivity to interpersonal feedback. Both of these consequences can interfere with the other motivational components of curiosity and need satisfaction. However, it is seldom the case that students suffer from an excess of expectancy of success. Well-designed instruction should promote this perception.

OUTCOMES

The Concept of Outcomes

This category includes several specific factors that influence the satisfaction of goal accomplishment and the motivation to continue pursuing similar goals. It is assumed here, following the theory presented at the beginning of this paper (see Figure 1 for a representation) that both intrinsic and extrinsic outcomes follow a given performance. The extrinsic outcomes result from environmental controls and circumstances, and the intrinsic outcomes result from one's internal emotions and evaluations in response to the performance, the extrinsic consequences, and the relationship between them (Adams, 1965; Deci, 1975). The results of this cognitive evaluation feed back to motives and values, and thereby influence the motivation to continue to do the same kind of activity (see Figure 1).

For example, a student, Deborah, may feel elated immediately after giving a speech in front of a class. She is elated because she remembered her entire speech and delivered it without fainting. A few minutes later her extrinsic "reward" from the teacher is being told that she was tense, barely audible, and obviously unrehearsed. Unless Deborah is an unusually stalwart person, or driven by very powerful long range goals, her intrinsic satisfaction has just been converted to embarrassment and, depending on her temperament, either shame or anger. The motive, or value, she attaches to this activity has been depressed and will survive only if there are other, overriding values for success in this activity. Furthermore, her subjective expectancy for success, with respect to the relationship between performance and consequences, has been reduced.

From a behavioral point of view this example is a rather straightforward illustration of the interaction of internal and external consequences and evaluations of behavior. In a sense, it is simply an example of punishment, or a directly applied aversive consequence of behavior. However, in this case the relatively complex cognitive explanation might be preferable to a more parsimonious behavioral explanation. Recent research in intrinsic motivation versus extrinsic reinforcement suggests that there are a number of situations, similar to the preceding example, that are not explained satisfactorily by the more reductionistic behavioral theory (e.g., Bates, 1979; Condry, 1977; Deci & Porac, 1978). Space does not permit a thorough explication and review of the two positions, so the remainder of this section contains a brief overview. The next section, concerned with conditions and strategies, includes some of the principles that have been most heavily investigated, and seem to have the most practical applicability.

Operant conditioning theory assumes that behavior is controlled by its consequences. When a particular behavior is reinforced positively, it will increase in rate relative to a baseline, or non-reinforced, rate. Furthermore, if a variable ratio reinforcement schedule is used, the behavior will persist for a relatively long time after reinforcement stops. However, once reinforcement terminates, the behavior will extinguish, which means that the rate of response will return to the baseline or slightly above it. Countless laboratory experiments confirm this observation (cf., Travers, 1977).

In contrast to the heavily supported conditioning principles, there is a growing number of observed situations that are not effectively explained by conditioning theory. This is not surprising, as Kuhn (1970) has so aptly decried, since the more rigorously we develop and apply a theory and its associated principles, the more we begin to notice the anomalies. For example, several studies have found conditions under which the removal of extrinsic reinforcements resulted in a decrease in response rate to below the baseline for the given activities (for reviews see Bates, 1979; Condry, 1977; Deci, 1975). Typically these studies involve three phases. In Phase 1 subjects are observed working on fairly absorbing complex tasks such as solving puzzles, generating newspaper headlines, or creating artwork. An unobtrusive measure of time on task is obtained. In Phase 2 the subjects are given an extrinsic reinforcement such as praise or money for given units of performance. Then, in Phase 3, subjects are observed unobtrusively during a second period of "free-play" with no extrinsic reward. During this second free play period, the target behavior decreases significantly below the original baseline. Having controlled for fatigue and other sources of confounding, the researchers concluded that for some types of activity, extrinsic reinforcement can decrease intrinsic motivation.

This is not a new idea. Quite a number of researchers have commented on and studied the deleterious effects of extrinsic contingencies on intrinsic motivation and self-initiated, exploratory behavior (e.g., Festinger & Carlsmith, 1959; Harlow, 1953; Hunt, 1965; Koch, 1965). However, a recent approach (Deci, 1975), especially in conjunction with the work of Condry (1977), is particularly appropriate for the overall approach of the present theory. Deci (1975) presented three propositions in support of cognitive evaluation theory. It is worth examining these since they form the basis of several strategies to be presented, and they form a linkage between this and earlier sections of the chapter.

The first two of Deci's propositions describe conditions which reduce intrinsic motivation. The first states that intrinsic motivation decreases as the perceived locus of causality shifts from internal to external. The second proposition states that there will be a decrease in intrinsic

motivation if a person's feelings of competence and self-determination are reduced. The explanation for the relationship of external rewards to these two propositions lies in the third. It says that every reward, including feedback, has two elements, a controlling element and an informational element. If the controlling element is dominant, it will influence the perceived locus of causality. If the informational element is dominant, the influence will be a feeling of competence and self-determination. It is the controlling influence that is often responsible for the decrease in intrinsic motivation.

The research on intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation is still in somewhat of a formative state, and some of its findings are subject to criticism (Bates, 1979). Even so, there are several results that lead to prescriptions for strategies of instructional design and delivery. The following section contains several strategies concerned with the appropriate use of reinforcement for motivation, and maintenance of intrinsic motivation.

Outcomes Conditions and Strategies

The complexity of this section, caused in part by the number of sometimes conflicting propositions that must be accommodated, makes it difficult if not impossible to derive a single, guiding principle, except at a very abstract level. It is possible to state that to develop and maintain personal motivation for a given activity, use reinforcement, but do it in such a way that the controlling influences do not detract from the intrinsic satisfactions. This statement is intended to embrace standard reinforcement principles as modified by the research on intrinsic motivation.

The remainder of this section will be concerned primarily with strategies based on the intrinsic motivation research. The reason for this is practical, and not because of theory or personal biases of the author. Design principles based on reinforcement, or conditioning, theory have abounded in the literature of instructional technology for many years (Gagne, 1977, Markle, 1969, 1977). Therefore, apart from some recent and not widely disseminated work of Tosti (1978), that work will not be repeated here.

Strategy 1: To maintain intrinsic satisfaction with instruction, use task-endogenous rather than task-exogenous rewards.

Typically, one of the first questions asked in regard to intrinsic motivation is something like this, "If external rewards decrease intrinsic satisfaction, then how do you explain the effects of wages on job satisfaction?" The

research on intrinsic motivation does not suggest that external rewards always imply external control with a reduction in intrinsic motivation. As previously indicated, a distinction is made between "controlling influence" and "external reward." Both Condry (1977) and Bates (1979) point out that an endogenous reward tends not to be perceived as having a controlling influence. An endogenous reward is one which customarily or naturally follows from a task. For example, a scientist participating in a "think tank" expects to be paid for his or her labor. However, the remuneration does not control the manner in which the scientist behaves. The scientist is free to speculate, take risks, and make personal decisions about how to spend his or her time.

In contrast, in some university departments a university professor's annual salary increase is tied directly to the number and type of publications that he or she produces each year. This is an exogenous reward situation. Research is not usually conducted on the basis of how many publishable articles it yields each year. It is generally approached with the idea that time is secondary to the requirements for valid inquiry aimed at finding the true consequences of given assumptions. Therefore, it is somewhat artificial to attach financial rewards to specific, arbitrary indicators of the rate of research that one reports. In this case, the exogenous reward might be expected to decrease intrinsic interest in research even though the quantity of research might increase for as long as the reinforcement system was operating, but the quality of research might decrease.

This seems to be a frequent finding despite the traditional assumption in behavior modification that clients, or students, would move from extrinsic to intrinsic reinforcers as a desirable behavior became established. In token reinforcement systems, for example, desired behaviors, including both learning and classroom behavior, improve while the token system is in effect, but tend to extinguish rapidly when it is withdrawn (Kazdin, 1973; O'Leary and Drabman, 1971). Also, Levine & Fasnacht (1974) found that the use of tokens for rewards not intrinsic to the task led to decreases in self-initiated problem solving behavior and less innovative solutions.

Of particular interest to designers and teachers in this regard is the work of Kruglanski, Riter, Amitai, Shabtai, and Zaksh (1975) who report two studies using money-intrinsic and money-extrinsic tasks. They found that when monetary rewards (real or simulated) were normally associated with an activity such as coin tossing or a stock market game, subjects gave higher ratings of continued interest when the rewards were paid than not. Similarly, in money-extrinsic conditions such as athletic games and achievement activities such as a block-building game, subjects expressed greater continued interest when no monetary rewards were used.

The implication of this strategy is that extrinsic rewards should be used selectively and with consideration to the nature of the task to be reinforced. The remaining strategies in this section offer guidance as to the types and timing of various types of intrinsic and extrinsic reinforcers.

Strategy 2: To maintain intrinsic satisfaction with instruction, use unexpected, noncontingent rewards rather than anticipated, salient, task-contingent rewards (except with dull tasks).

A number of studies have shown that extrinsic rewards are not as likely to decrease intrinsic interest if they are unexpected rather than expected (Green & Lepper, 1974; Lepper & Green, 1975; Lepper, Green, & Nisbett, 1973), and in some cases, if they are noncontingent rather than being tied to a specific performance criterion (see Bates, 1979; and Condry, 1977 for reviews). Similarly, Ross (1975) found that highly salient rewards, such as having the anticipated reward on a table in front of the subjects while they worked on a task, tended to decrease intrinsic interest.

There are, as one might expect, complexities and inconsistencies in this active area of research that require qualification of these simply stated principles, even though there seems to be a fair degree of support for them. For example, Calder and Shaw (1975) found that rewards can increase interest in dull tasks. And, Kruglanski, Alon, and Lewis (1972) found that even unexpected rewards can decrease intrinsic motivation when the task is a type that is often associated with reward. Finally, there is a discrepancy between this strategy and the previous one which included the observation that rewards inherent to the task content can increase intrinsic motivation (Kruglanski et al., 1975).

Despite these problems, it seems reasonable to conclude that designers and teachers should be particularly cautious about using expected, contingent, extrinsic rewards for tasks that do not typically have an inherent extrinsic reward. If there is a desire to use extrinsic rewards under these conditions, it would perhaps be better to use them in an unexpected and noncontingent manner.

Strategy 3: To maintain intrinsic satisfaction with instruction, use verbal praise and informative feedback rather than threats, surveillance, or external performance evaluation.

The preceding strategies have been primarily concerned with the conditions of reinforcement. In contrast, this strategy is more concerned with the types of consequences that will enhance or suppress intrinsic motivation. This also happens to be one of the more heavily researched areas of

intrinsic motivation. Reviews of this research are provided by Bates (1979), Condry (1977), and Deci (1975). Again, as in the previous strategies, there tends to be a common theme despite the difficulties in interpreting and comparing the various studies. Intrinsic motivation tends to flourish to a far greater extent in a context of positive but noncontrolling consequences than when excessive evaluation and aversive forms of control are used.

For example, when working in a context that puts one before an audience frequently, as in the role of a teacher or professor, one can become as irritated with positive as with negative feedback. An educator must deal with many audiences including individual advisees, classes of students, principals or deans, consulting clients, and promotional review boards. The feedback from these various groups can sometimes serve to indicate that one's every move is being evaluated, and that can be irritating even when the results are positive. Similarly, the student's relationship to education, especially during the first twelve grade levels, is dominated by the evaluative role of the teacher. Indirectly, the instructional designer is part of this process since the predominant modes of instructional design include heavy doses of performance evaluation. Consequently, it is not difficult to see at least part of the reason for the difficulty in maintaining the intrinsic interest of children in the school process.

A challenge for designers and teachers is to find ways of utilizing these strategies to maintain intrinsic motivation while meeting the sometimes rigid and competitive performance criteria that society and state education departments place on the schools. The two remaining strategies offer somewhat more specific advice in regard to operationalizing two aspects of these strategies.

Strategy 4: To maintain quantity of performance, use motivating feedback following the response.

This traditional reinforcement principle, even with the modifications suggested in the preceding strategies due to intrinsic motivation research, is still a powerful principle with a great deal of relevance. We are much more likely to repeat behaviors that have pleasurable consequences than those that do not. Additional discussion of this strategy, which becomes more interesting when contrasted with the following strategy, is included in the Strategy 5 discussion.

Strategy 5: To improve the quality of performance, provide formative (corrective) feedback when it will be immediately useful, usually just before the next opportunity to practice.

Tosti (1978) uses the terms motivational and formative to

describe the traditional distinction between the two most frequently used types of feedback in learning and performance situations. The first, motivational, refers to positive reinforcement following a desired response. This could be praise for a student who finished an assignment or a salesman who sold a car, or it could be something tangible such as money or a grade. This type of feedback primarily affects the quantity of performance. It is the primary formulation of contingency management, and it signals that repetition of the same behavior is desirable.

The second type of feedback is formative; it is used to affect the quality of performance. In this sense, it signals a gap between the given versus a preferable performance, and it indicates the actions to take to close the gap. Consequently, formative feedback serves as a correctant, and it can produce rapid changes in behavior in contrast to the more tedious process of using shaping techniques with motivational feedback as a means of producing qualitative changes in behavior.

Typically these two types of feedback are used together, the first to encourage continued effort, and the second to encourage and assist improvements in quality. However, there are individual differences in style as observed by Tosti (1978) and as observed in subsequent research, differences in the effective use of the two types of feedback. When a student hands in a paper, some teachers will make a complementary comment such as, "I'm happy you finished. Your paper looks nice." Others would offer more corrective information such as, "You have missed some items. Here, let me show you your problem." Others, and this applies to supervisors in many contexts, not just teachers, mix the two types of feedback. This approach is easy to recognize because it always contains the word "but," or a surrogate. For example, "I'm so pleased to see that you finished, but you do have a problem here." Or, "You did an excellent job of formulating these objectives for the math curriculum, but I would like for you to change the format." In both cases, the corrective feedback tends to cancel the positive effect of the motivational feedback.

How do we resolve this problem? Tosti suggests that the timing of feedback is critical. Motivational feedback should be given immediately after a performance, and should refer to those aspects of the performance criteria that were acceptable. In contrast, formative feedback should relate to those aspects of performance that are less than standard, and should be delivered when it is immediately useful (i.e., just before the next performance). In a telephone sales organization, the managers would listen to randomly selected calls and give the operators feedback on their performance at the end of each day. This use of feedback, following the traditional behavioral modification pattern of immediate reinforcement, had little effect on the performance of the workers. When the corrective feedback was delayed until the beginning of the next day, performance improved dramatically.

Instructional designers and teachers would probably benefit from a similar application of this strategy. It is seldom the case that formative feedback is immediately useful just after a performance. An exception would be those situations where a series of rehearsals or supervised practice exercises precede a final performance as in drama, athletics, and programmed instruction. More often, especially in academic subject areas, an assignment is given with, perhaps, some general advice or instruction on how to do the assignment, but no individual feedback on a student's characteristic problems with respect to successful performance. How many students who have trouble articulating the main idea in a prose passage receive personal guidance just prior to applying that skill? The appropriate use of formative feedback as suggested in this strategy statement underscores the need for a cumulative file for each student which is used for feedback purposes at the appropriate time. This would, of course, require extra work for teachers in the short run, which could probably be facilitated with a computer management system, but if the performance improvements were substantial, there should be a long range savings in teacher effort. Additional insights into teachers' uses of feedback is included in Brophy & Good (1970) and Cooper (1977).

In summary the conclusions are far from being complete regarding intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic reward. The preceding strategies reflect some of the recent research findings, and must now be operationalized and tested in terms of prescriptive design strategies. There seems to be little doubt that the emotional, attitudinal, and tangible consequences of a behavior will influence one's motivation to continue at that activity. However, the exact characteristics of these influences on each other and on continuing motivation require much additional study. From an instructional design perspective it is important to include both the intrinsic and extrinsic consequences of our design strategies.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, the present model uses the four categories of curiosity, relevance, expectancy, and outcomes to summarize research on human motivation, and to identify several strategies for generating motivation. Furthermore, these categories are derived from a macro theory of the relationships of individual and environmental characteristics and effort, performance, and outcomes (see Figure 1).

There are a number of potential benefits of the present model for instructional science and instructional design, and there are some specific limitations. One of the benefits is that the model provides four reasonably specific categories* of variables that help synthesize many of the lines of research concerned with motivation. This synthesis facilitates the development of applied research projects because it helps identify several of the major sources of variance that operate simultaneously in a field setting. Research on instructional design has to have external validity if it is to be of any use to designers. This means that major sources of variance have to be understood, not just controlled, in order to develop prescriptive strategies with descriptions of the conditions under which they will and will not work. Principles that require unrealistic controls simply are not useful. Newton's physical laws were a boon to theory, but their practical utility was limited, since they were unqualifiedly true only in a frictionless environment. Schools are, metaphorically speaking, anything but frictionless.

The present model appears to have heuristic value in that it incorporates specific categories of variables in a theoretical context that facilitates the development of research that has direct implications for motivational design. Several dissertations have been completed, and others are in progress (Note 2) that were developed in the context of this model. Several of these studies are focusing on the development of prescriptive design strategies.

However, a limitation of the model, and of the state-of-the-art in research in this area is the lack of specific, prescriptive strategies. The amount of research on motivation is vast, and the conditions that influence motivation are difficult to specify in concrete terms. A strategy that works today might not tomorrow because it loses its novelty effect. Yet, it is shallow to assume that novelty has to always be present to stimulate and maintain motivation. The enduring characteristics of people and of instructional materials that contribute to sustained motivation are the ones that we want to capture. As we are able to do this in a systematic fashion, we will more frequently be able to make school appealing, even engrossing, as inspired teachers presently do.

Reference Notes

1. Keller, J.M., and Keller, B.H. Development of parallel self-report and teacher report measures of student motivation for specific school subjects. Syracuse University, Instructional Design, Development and Evaluation Program. Occasional Paper, 1981.
2. Keller, J.M. Motivational Design Research Group Annual Report. Syracuse University, Instructional Design, Development and Evaluation Program. Occasional Paper, 1981.

AD-A134 515

MOTIVATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN(U)
BATTELLE COLUMBUS LABS DURHAM NC J M KELLER ET AL.
24 SEP 82 DAAG29-81-D-0100


2/2

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 5/9

NL





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

REFERENCES

- Abramson, L.Y., Seligman, M.E.P., & Teasdale, J.D. Learned helplessness in humans: Critique and reformulation. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1978, 87, 49-74.
- Adams, J.S. Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.
- Alderman, D. L., & Mahler, W. A. The Evaluation of PLATO and TICCIT: Educational Analysis of the Community College Components. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1973.
- Alschuler, A.S. Developing Achievement Motivation in Adolescents: Education For Human Growth. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.
- Atkinson, J.W., & Raynor, J.O. (Eds.). Motivation and Achievement. Washington, D.C.: V.H. Winston & Sons, Inc., Publishers, 1974.
- Ausubel, D.P. Educational Psychology: A Cognitive View. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- Bandura, A. Self efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 1977, 84, 191-215.
- Bates, J.A. Extrinsic reward and intrinsic motivation: A review with implications for the classroom. Review of Educational Research, 1979, 49, 557-576.
- Berlyne, D.E. Motivational problems raised by exploratory and epistemic behavior. In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: A Study of a Science, Vol. 5. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Bloom, B.S. Human Characteristics and School Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- Brophy, J., & Good, T. Teacher's communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: Some behavioral data. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 365-374.
- Calder, B.J., & Straw, B.M. Self-perception of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 31, 599-605.
- Carroll, J.B. A model of school learning. Teachers College Record, 1963, 64, 723-733.
- Chapin, M., & Dyck, G. Persistence in children's reading behavior as a function of N length and attribution retraining. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1976, 85, 511-515.
- Condry, J. Enemies of exploration: Self-initiated versus other-initiated learning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 35, 459-477.
- Cooley, W.W., & Lohnes, P.R. Evaluation Research in Education. New York: Halsted Press, 1976.
- Cooper, H. M. Controlling personal rewards: Professional teachers' differential use of feedback and the effects of feedback on the students' motivation to perform. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1977, 69, 419-427.

- Cronbach, L.J., & Snow, R.E. Aptitudes and Instructional Methods. New York: Irvington, 1976.
- Cronbach, L.J., & Suppes, P. (Eds.). Research for Tomorrow's Schools: Disciplined Inquiry for Education. New York: Macmillan, 1969.
- deCharms, R. Personal Causation. New York: Academic Press, 1968.
- deCharms, R. Enhancing Motivation Change in the Classroom. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc., 1976.
- Deci, E.L. Intrinsic Motivation. New York: Plenum Press, 1975.
- Deci, E.L., & Porac, J. Cognitive evaluation theory and the study of human motivation. In M.R. Lepper, and D. Greene (Eds.). The Hidden Costs of Reward. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1978.
- Dweck, C.S. The role of expectations and attributions in the alleviation of learned helplessness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 647-695.
- Dweck, C.S., & Goetz, T.E. Attributions and learned helplessness. In J.H. Harvey, W. Ickes, and R.F. Kidds (Eds.), New Directions in Attribution Research (Vol. 2). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977, 1-37.
- Edwards, A.L. The Measurement of Personality Traits by Scales and Inventories. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.
- Einstein, A. Essays in Science. New York, 1934.
- Feather, N.T. The relationship of expectation of success to need achievement and test anxiety. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 118-126.
- Feather, N.T. Values in Education and Society. New York: The Free Press, 1975.
- Feather, N.T., & Saville, M.R. Effects of amount of prior success and failure on expectations of success and subsequent task performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 226-232.
- Fibell, B., & Hale, W.D. The generalized expectancy for success scale--A new measure. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 924-931.
- Flesch, R. A new readability yardstick. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1948, 32, 221-233.
- Foote, T. (Ed.), Help! Teacher can't teach. Time, June 16, 1980, pp. 54-63.
- Gagne, R.M. The Conditions of Learning, 3rd edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1977.
- Gordon, W.J. Synetics. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.
- Green, D., & Lepper, M.R. Effects of extrinsic rewards on childrens subsequent intrinsic interest. Child Development, 1974, 45, 1141-1145.
- Heider, F. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Hilgard, E. R., & Bower, G. H. Theories of Learning (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1975.
- Hiroto, D.S. & Seligman, M.E.P. Generality of learned helplessness in man. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 311-327.

- Hull, C.L. Principles of Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1943.
- Hunt, D.E., & Sullivan, E.V. Between Psychology and Education. Hinsdale, Ill.: Dryden, 1974.
- Johnston, J.M. (Ed.). Behavior Research and Technology in Higher Education. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1975.
- Jones, R.A. Self-Fulfilling Prophecies: Social Psychological, and Psychological Effects of Expectancies. New York: Halsted Press, 1977.
- Joyce, B., & Weil, M. Models of Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Kaplan, A. The Conduct of Inquiry. San Francisco: Chandler Publisher Company, 1964.
- Kazdin, A.E. Role of instructions and reinforcements in behavior changes in token reinforcement programs. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 64, 63-71.
- Keller, J.M. Motivation and instructional design: A theoretical perspective. Journal of Instructional Development, 1979, 2(4), 26-34.
- Keller, J.M. Motivational needs game. National Society for Performance and Instruction Journal, 1978, 17(6), 3-4, 21.
- Keller, J.M. Effects of instructions and reinforcement contingencies in the development of learned helplessness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1975.
- Keller, J.M., Goldman, J. A., & Sutterer J. R. Locus of control in relation to academic attitudes and performance in a personalized system of instruction course. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1978, 79, 414-421.
- Keller, J.M., Kelly, E.A., & Dodge, B. Motivation in School: A Practitioner's Guide to Concepts and Measures. Syracuse University: ERIC Clearinghouse for Information Resources, 1978.
- Kranzberg, M. The disunity of science-technology. American Scientist, 1968, 56, 21-34.
- Kruglanski, A.W., Alan, I., & Lewis, T. Retrospective misattribution and task enjoyment. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1972, 8, 493-501.
- Kruglanski, A.W., Ritter, A., Amitai, A., Margolin, B., Shabtai, L. & Zaksh, D. Can money enhance intrinsic motivation?: A test of the content-consequence hypothesis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 744-750.
- Kuhn, T.S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 2nd edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Lakein, A. How to Get Control of Your Time and Life. New York: The New American Library, Inc., 1973.
- Lefcourt, H.M. Locus of Control: Current Trends in Theory and Research. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1976.
- Lepper, M.R., & Greene, D. Turning play into work: Effects of adult surveillance and extrinsic rewards on children's intrinsic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 479-486.

- Lepper, M.R., Greene, D., & Nisbett, R.E. Undermining children's intrinsic interest with extrinsic rewards: A test of the overjustification hypothesis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 28, 129-137.
- Levine, F.M., & Fasnacht, G. Token rewards may lend to token learning. American Psychologist, 1974, 29, 816-820.
- Lewin, K. A Dynamic Theory of Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935.
- Maehr, M.L. Continuing motivation: An analysis of a seldom considered educational outcome. Review of Educational Research, 1976, 46, 443-462.
- Maier, S.F., & Seligman, M.E.P. Learned helplessness: Theory and evidence. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 1976, 105, 3-46.
- Markle, S.M. Good Frames and Bad: A Grammar of Frame Writing, 2nd edition. New York: Wiley, 1969.
- Markle, S.M. Teaching conceptual networks. Journal of Instructional Development, 1977, 1, 13-17.
- Maslow, A.H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.
- Maw, W.H., & Maw, E.W. Self appraisal of curiosity. Journal of Educational Research, 1968, 61, 462-466.
- Mayer, R.E. Thinking and Problem Solving: An Introduction to Human Cognition and Learning. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1977.
- McClelland, D.C., The Achieving Society. New York: Irvington Publishers, 1976.
- McClelland, D.C., Atkinson, J.W., Clark, R.W., & Lowell, E.L. The Achievement Motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.
- McClelland, D.C., & Burnham, D.H. Power is the great motivator. Harvard Business Review, 1976, 52(2), 100-110.
- McGhee, P.E. & Crandall, V.C. Beliefs in internal-external control of reinforcement and academic performance. Child Development, 1968, 39, 91-102.
- McConnell, J.V. Confessions of a textbook writer. American Psychologist, 1978, 33, 159-169.
- McConnell, J.V. Understanding Human Behavior (2nd. ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1977.
- Merrill, M.D. Learner control: Beyond aptitude-treatment interactions. AV Communications Review, 1975, 23, 217-225.
- Merrill, M. D., Schneider, E. W., & Fletcher, K. A. The Instructional Design Library: TICCAT. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, 1980.
- Merton, R.K. The self-fulfilling prophecy. In R.K. Merton (Ed.), Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press, 1968.
- Mischel, W. Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. Psychological Review, 1973, 80, 252-283.
- Moen, R., & Doyle, K.O., Jr. Measures of academic motivation: A conceptual review. Research in Higher Education, 1978, 8, 1-23.
- Murphy, F. Alleviation of learned helplessness in high school

- remedial readers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Syracuse University, 1978.
- Murray, H.A. Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- O'Leary, K.D., & Drabman, R. Token reinforcement program in the classroom: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 75, 379-398.
- Perlmutter, L.C., & Monty, R.A. The importance of perceived control: Fact or fantasy? American Scientist, 1977, 65, 759-765.
- Phares, E.J. Internal-external control and the reduction of reinforcement value after failure. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37, 386-390.
- Phares, E.J. Locus of Control in Personality, Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1976.
- Porter, L.W., & Lawler, E.E. Managerial Attitudes and Performance. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1968.
- Raynor, J.O. Relationships between achievement-related motives, future orientation, and academic performance. In J.W. Atkinson & J.O. Raynor (Eds.), Motivation and Achievement. Washington, D.C.: V.H. Winston & Sons, Inc., Publishers, 1974.
- Reigeluth, C.M. In search of a better way to organize instruction: the elaboration theory. Journal of Instructional Development, 1979, 2(3), 8-14.
- Reigeluth, C.M., & Merrill, M.D. Classes of instructional variables. Educational Technology, 1979, March, 5-24.
- Ringer, R.J. Looking Out for #1. New York: Fawcett Crest Books, 1977.
- Rogers, C.R. Client Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Rokeach, M. The Nature of Human Values. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Rogers, C.R. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.
- Ross, M. Salience of reward and intrinsic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 33, 245-254.
- Rotter, J.R. Social Learning Theory and Clinical Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954.
- Rotter, J.R. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (Whole No. 609).
- Rotter, J.B. An introduction to social learning theory. In J.B. Rotter, J.E. Chance, & E.J. Phares (Eds.), Applications of A Social Learning Theory of Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.
- Rudestam, K.E. Methods of Self-Change. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1980.
- Seligman, M.E. Helplessness. San Francisco: Freeman, 1975.
- Singer, D.G., Singer, J., and Zuckerman, D. M. Teaching Television. Dial Press, 1980.
- Skinner, B.F. The Technology of Teaching. New York:

- Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.
- Snow, R.E. Theory construction for research on teaching. In R.M.W. Travers (Ed.), Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1973.
- Steers, R.M., & Porter, L.W. Motivation and Work Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Strom, R.D. (Ed.) Teachers and The Learning Process. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- Suchman, J.R. A model for the analysis of inquiry. In Klausmeier, H.J. & Harris, C.W. (Eds.), Analysis of Concept Learning. New York: Academic Press, 1966.
- Thomas, A. Learned helplessness and expectancy factors: Implications for research in learning disabilities. Review of Educational Research, 1979, 49, 208-221.
- Tolman, E.C. Purposive Behavior in Animals and Men. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949.
- Tosti, D. T. Formative feedback. NSPI Journal, 1978, October, 19-21.
- Travers, R.M.W. Essentials of Learning, (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1977.
- Vidler, D.R. Curiosity. In S. Ball (Ed.), Motivation in Education. New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Walberg, H.J. Models for optimizing and individualizing learning. Interchange, 1971, 2, 15-27.
- Weil, M., Joyck B., & Kluwin, B. Personal Models of Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.
- Weiner, B. Theories of Motivation: From Mechanism to Cognition. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1972.
- Weiner, B. (Ed.) Achievement Motivation and Attribution Theory. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1974.
- Weiner, B. A theory of motivation for some classroom experiences. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 3-25.
- White, R.W. Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 297-323.
- Winter, D.F. What makes the candidates run. Psychology Today, July 1976, pp. 47-49; 92.
- Yerkes, R.M., & Dodson, J.D. The relation of stimulus to rapidity of habit formation. Journal of Comparative Neurological Psychology, 1908, 18, 459-482.
- Zuckerman, M. Dimensions of sensation seeking. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 36, 45-52.
- Zuckerman, M. The search for high sensation. Psychology Today, February 1978, pp. 38-46; 96-97.

END

FILMED

11-83

DTIC