DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 822   IR 000 994

AUTHOR   Merrill, M. David
TITLE   Learner Control: Beyond Aptitude Treatment
                Interactions. Draft Copy.
INSTITUTION   Stanford Univ., Calif. ERIC Clearinghouse on
                Information Resources.
SPONS AGENCY   National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington,
                D.C.
PUB DATE   20 Mar 74
CONTRACT   NIE-C-74-0027
NOTE   19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                Association for Educational Communications and
                Technology (Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 1974)

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS   Able Students; Academic Aptitude; Cognitive Ability;
                *Individual Differences; *Individualized Instruction;
                *Instructional Design; *Instructional Improvement;
                Instructional Innovation; Learning Theories;
                Literature Reviews; Low Ability Students; Media
                Selection; *Research Methodology; Student
                Characteristics; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS   *Aptitude Treatment Interaction; Cronbach (Lee J);
                Learner Control; Snow (Richard E)

ABSTRACT
                A careful reading of Cronbach and Snow's "Aptitudes
and Instructional Methods" reveals that an
aptitude-treatment-interaction (ATI) approach is not just a research
methodology but is, in fact, a theory oriented philosophy of proposed
revision in curriculum and instructional methodology. It is our
contention that as a theoretical argument the ATI approach extends
current practice in a desirable direction but that this approach,
like those it is intended to replace, seriously limits the
possibility of optimal adaptation to individual differences. This
paper attempts to identify the theoretical premises of the
Cronbach/Snow argument and to propose alternatives which are less
limiting. A new theoretical methodology, based on these alternative
premises, is described. It is suggested that the study of ATI's may
be unnecessary for the optimal adaptation of instruction to
individual differences. (Author)

Learner Control: Beyond Aptitude Treatment Interactions
(Draft Copy)
M. David Merrill

Brigham Young University

ATI Synopsis via Cronbach and Snow

Cronbach and Snow (1973) have prepared an extensive
book length review of the theoretical orientation, the
methodology and a summary of research related to an aptitude
treatment interaction approach to revision in curriculum
and instructional methods. In this paper an attempt has
been made to summarize their theoretical position and
to examine some of the premises which seem to provide
the basis for their argument. Following a synopsis of
their argument alternative premises have been proposed
which seem to be less limiting than those of Cronbach
and Snow. An alternative theoretical methodology is proposed
which suggests that the study of aptitude treatment interac-
tions while of interest to a descriptive science may be
unnecessary for the optimal adaptation of instruction
to individual differences.

The following quotations from Cronbach and Snow present
a very brief synopsis of their theoretical position. No
short summary can possibly do justice to a complex argument.
One always runs the danger of misrepresenting another's

1

position by selective ommission of crucial premises or qualifications. The author is desirous of representing the argument as carefully as possible. The serious reader is therefore admonished to carefully study Cronbach and Snow's original work before passing judgment on the alternatives proposed.

Cronbach and Snow suggest that for the most part the accepted theory of curriculum and instructional method in practice today is to provide an equal opportunity for all students. With this equal opportunity students will be able to gain as much as their abilities will allow. They suggest that the flaw in this argument is the assumption of one best method. The ATI argument proposed is opposed to an unidimensional conceptualization of education. An ATI approach is counter to the search for one best treatment.

"The old mandate was, 'the institution is given, try to pick persons who fit it! The needed mandate is, 'try to design enough treatments so that everyone will be able to succeed in one of them, and route the person into a treatment he fits.'" (Cronbach and Snow, 1973, p. I-18)

"We urge the social planner to concern himself not with running a fair competition [one where everyone has an equal opportunity in the same race] but with running a talent development operation that will bring everyone somewhere near his highest level of

contribution." (Cronbach and Snow, 1973, p. I-17)

"If one wants to foster development of a wide
range of persons, one must offer a wide range of
environments, suited to the optimum development of
each person." (Cronbach and Snow, 1969, p. 12)

Cronbach and Snow then argue that the two disciplines
of psychology--differential psychology and learning psychology
--should come together in an attempt to study aptitude treat-
ment interactions. The result of this study would be
a set of principles which would allow one to differentially
assign students to treatments in a way that would best
facilitate groups of students sharing similar aptitudes.

"Adaptation to the individual has been a slogan
widely held among educators. But such adaptation
has never been systematic because no one has known
the principles that govern the matching of learner
and instructional environment." (Cronbach and Snow,
1973, p. I-23)

"The ATI approach envisions modifying instruction
by periodic decisions...ordinarily at least a few
months apart...that assign the person to one or another
style of instruction." (Cronbach and Snow, 1973,
p. V-7)

Cronbach and Snow advocate a careful research methodology
for discovering those "principles" which relate aptitude
and treatment variables. Once these principles have been

discovered then the ATI approach to adapting the environment to the individual can be implemented.

ATI Premises and Some Alternatives

The position of this paper toward the ATI approach can be summarized as follows:

It is agreed that the search for a single best treatment is inadequate. It is agreed that instruction should be adapted to the individual. We do not, however, feel that an ATI approach will accomplish this goal. While it is agreed that ATI is a step in the right direction, it stops far short of desirable and possible procedures for adapting instruction to individual differences.

Let's examine Cronbach and Snow's implicit but not always explicitly stated assumptions. For each we would propose some alternatives.

"'Aptitude' is here defined as any character-
istic of the person that forecasts his probability
of success under a given treatment. We emphatically
do not confirm our interest in 'aptitude tests'...etc.,
etc.,...new kinds of aptitudes probably need to be
detected and measured." (Cronbach and Snow, 1973,
p. I-12) We agree! However, other statements of
these authors would lead one to believe that they
subscribe to the following assumption:

Cronbach and Snow Assumption No. 1: The aptitudes
thought to be of value in the study of ATI are those pervasive

characteristics of the individual which are relatively

stable over relatively long periods of time. This assumption

is reflected by the phrase, "...periodic decisions...ordinari-

ly at least a few months apart..." (Cronbach and Snow,

1973, p. V-7)

Alternative Assumption No. 1: While pervasive trait

aptitudes no doubt provide a limiting set of conditions

which restrict an individual's range of variance it is,

in our opinion, the multidimensional dynamic state aptitudes

which change from moment to moment that are more likely

to determine the treatment which is most appropriate for

a given individual at a given moment in time.

Cronbach and Snow Assumption No. 2: The treatments

thought to be of value in the study of ATI are those relative-

ly fixed procedures which are repeated for a group of

students and which retain a similar pattern from one occurrence

to the next.

Before suggesting an alternative it is necessary

to take one aside to define two terms which will enable

us to be more precise in stating an alternative assump-

tion. The word treatment is too vague for our purposes.

The following are suggested as substitutes.

A tactic is a given display or presentation to the

student of rather short duration. One can speak of differ-

ent kinds of tactics. A tactic is that which happens

next in a given instructional treatment. A given treatment

therefore consists of a sequence of tactics.

The word strategy is preferred to treatment. A specific strategy consists of a sequence of specific tactics. There are an infinite number of specific strategies since there are a large number of different tactics which can be combined in innumerable ways. A general strategy consists of a sequence of similar tactics. Each instance of a particular kind of general strategy would resemble other instances of this general strategy but would retain individuality and be distinguishable from other instances of the same general strategy.

Back to the argument.

Alternative Assumption No. 2: That tactic which may be of maximum value to a specific learner at one moment in time is likely not to be appropriate a moment later. That specific strategy which is optimal for a specific learner today is likely not to be the optimal specific strategy tomorrow or next week.

The experience of a human being is dynamic (continually changing). As a result the multidimensional dynamic state aptitudes which we feel most probably predict optimal learning with a given tactic are changing with every momentary experience of a given individual. The optimal next tactic for a given student at a given moment in time is determined by his position at that moment in this multi-dimensional dynamic state aptitude space. A given person

never has exactly the same configuration of these momentary aptitudes twice in his life. Consequently the search for the interaction of stable trait aptitudes and fixed treatments is never likely to be of instructional value. At the very moment one has identified such a relationship the aptitude configuration of the student has changed, never to be repeated. Hence the finding is descriptively interesting but prescriptively of little or no value.[2]

Cronbach and Snow Assumption No. 3: Throughout their paper Cronbach and Snow speak of adapting the environment or treatment to the individual. An implicit assumption which pervades their argument (and, by the way, the arguments of most persons who argue for individualization) is that the instructor or system will decide what treatment is best for the student--the environment should be adapted to the individual.

Alternative Assumption No. 3: The individual should be given some procedure which enables him to adapt the environment to himself. We feel that the individual should make decisions about what tactic he wants next rather than having this decision made for him.

Assume we could really know, based on generations of ATI research, exactly what should be presented to the student. We put him on our 1984 CAI system and every display is exactly what he needs for optimal learning. What would be the result? We are afraid that like a

spoiled child who is always given anything he wants, the student who always has the optimal tactic provided for him will be unable to cope with the real world which, in our experience, is not so accomodating. Such an adapting-to-the-student procedure will make the student system-dependent. Our goal ought rather to be to make the student system-independent. He ought to be able to learn better after experience on the system than he was before.

How can a student be taught system independence? First, he must be taught to manipulate the system to meet his needs. He must learn to make decisions which adapts the system or environment to himself. He must be given dominion over the system rather than to be placed in a situation where the system has dominion over him.

Learner Control Conclusions

So what? What is the conclusion from these alternative premises?

In our opinion, what is needed is a dynamic general strategy which enables the learner to select at any moment in time that particular tactic which is optimal for his unique configuration of aptitudes at that moment in time. Furthermore, he must be able to select a new tactic on a moment's notice. He must not be required to anticipate his aptitude configuration or the tactic needed more than one step ahead. He must be able to make the change with a minimum of effort. (If all his time or even a significant

part is used up in the mechanics of tactic selection,
his learning continuity will be grossly impaired.) He
must know how to select a variety of tactics. He must
have a wide variety of tactics available to him but not
so many that he is overwhelmed by the number of choices.
He must be provided a procedure for adapting slowly to
this dynamic instructional environment since his previous
experience has all been with fixed treatments which have
been administered to him and over which he has little
or no control.

Cronbach and Snow say: "The needed mandate is 'try
to design enough treatments so that everyone will be able
to succeed in one of them, and route the person into a
treatment he fits.'" (Cronbach and Snow, 1973, p. I-18)

A less limiting mandate is: Let each student select
that tactic which is most appropriate for his unique state
aptitude configurations during a given interval of time.

Cronbach and Snow say: "If one wants to foster develop-
ment of a wide range of persons, one must offer a wide
range of environments, suited to the optimum development
of each person." (Cronbach and Snow, 1969, p. 12).

A less limiting position says: If ʌe wants to foster
development of an infinite range of per ʌns, one must
offer an infinite range of environments, each uniquely
suited to the development of a specific person. This
unique environment should not be selected for and administered

to a given learner but should be consciously selected
by and modified by that individual.

Requirements for Learner Control

Question? How? What are the necessary steps required
to provide a dynamic learner control general strategy.

Answer! Two steps seem necessary. 1. The identifica-
tion of an integrated set of tactical variables and associated
parameters which when combined constitute the variety
of strategies possible. 2. The development of delivery
systems which enables the easy, deliberate and differential
manipulation of each of these tactics and/or the associated
parameters by the student.

This paper is not an appropriate vehicle for describing
in detail a taxonomic system of tactical variables. Merrill
and Boutwell (1973) provided the first attempt at such
a taxonomy for cognitive variables thought to affect cognitive
learning outcomes. Merrill and Wood (1974) suggested
refinements for the previous system and described flow
chart conventions for unambiguously describing existing
specific strategies in terms of these variables. While
neither of these attempts are as comprehensive as might
be desirable they do enable the identification of a limited
set of learner tactics which can be placed under learner
control.

Under funding from NSF and in cooperation with MITRE
Corporation, investigators at Brigham Young University

have designed a learner controlled Computer Assisted Instruction system (TICCIT--Two-way Interactive Computer Controlled Information Television). This system was an attempt to implement some of the tactical variables identified by Merrill and Boutwell (1973) by means of a learner control language. This language enables the student to select the next tactic he desires by merely touching a button on a specially designed keyboard. The premises and assumptions underlying the design of this system are described by Merrill (1973). Further description of this system can be found in MITRE Corp. (1974), Bunderson (1973a, 1973b), and O'Neal (1973).

Learner control delivery systems are not limited merely to CAI systems. Gibbons (1974) has described an attempt to provide "unprogrammed" learner control in a self-study workbook-based statistic course. Field testing of this course indicates that students are able to break out of a linear mode and to select that strategy which they feel will best satisfy their momentary aptitude state.

Another major attempt to provide learner control is the work of Gordon Pask (1971) in England. Pask has determined through this work that students tend to have preferences for general strategies that are quite different. Two major classes of such strategies have been identified as wholist and serialist. To a large extent this categorization of learners is determined by a student's self selected

progress through a knowledge network rather than a student's
selection of particular tactics for learning a given concept
or rule within the net. Within this system Pask has also
provided the student considerable flexibility in selecting
his own tactics. For the most part, however, the tactics
made available to the student within Pask's system are somewhat
uniquely tied to the subject matter being presented rather
than being general tactics which can be applied to a
wide variety of subject matters.

Learner Control Research Questions

A learner control approach to individualization
of instruction suggests considerable variation from the
research methodology suggested by Cronbach and Snow.
It is suggested that the determination of aptitudes may
not be necessary to this work. Rather the following
types of engineering research questions are of interest.

1. Learner control language. Can a learner control
language be devised and delivered to a student in such
a way that students who are allowed to control their
own strategies by selecting moment to moment tactics
will perform better on appropriate criterion measures
(including efficiency and effectiveness) than students
who are given any type of fixed strategy?

2. Transfer of learner control. Can a learner control
language be devised that has sufficient generality that
the student's use of this language will transfer to other

learning situations besides the delivery system on which
the language was orginally taught? In other words can
a universal, delivery system-independent, tactical language
be devised?

3. Acquisition of learner control. It is a fact
that in most current learning systems the student does
not have tactical control or, in most cases, any form of
content control. Can a training system be devised that
will allow a student to gradually acquire more and more
tactical control? Correlative questions are as follows:
Given control of a single tactic, what tactic has the
greatest payoff in terms of learning gains? What tactic
added to the first provides control of the greatest portion
of the remaining variance, and so forth for additional
tactics? How many tactics can a learner control within
a given learning situation before the number of controls
available has a disruptive effect on his learning? Does
this number vary with children of different ages? Can
a student be taught to use a variety of strategies as
may be appropriate to various kinds of learning situations?
Is the use of such a variety of strategies correlated
with more efficient learning in these situations?

4. Learner control and ATI. In conclusion, we come
full cycle and pose questions which we initially rejected.
Is it possible that there are trait aptitudes which enable
one student to benefit from one type of learner control

while another student might benefit from a different type
of learner control. Pask (1971) seems to have already
demonstrated (within the domain of content control) that
some students do better with a wholest approach while
others perform more adequately when using a serialist
approach. Under his system a single learner control language
allows both approaches thereby making the assignment of
students to treatments on the basis of this wholist-serialist
trait unnecessary. Is it conceivable that such universally
applied learner control is not equally beneficial to all
students?

References

Bunderson, C. Victor. Team production of learner-controlled
courseware: A progress report. ICUE technical report
No. 1, BYU, 1973d.

Bunderson, C. Victor. The TICCIT project: Design strategy
for educational technologies symposium held Stoney Brook,
New York. "Production in higher education," N.I.E.,
September 1973b, also ICUE technical report No. 4.

Cronbach, Lee J. and Snow, Richard E. Aptitudes and
Instructional Methods, Preliminary edition, Stanford
University, 1973.

Cronbach, Lee J. and Snow, Richard E. Individual differences
in learning ability as a function of instruction
variables. Final Report, Stanford University, 1969.

Gibbons, Andrew S. An attempt at unprogramming instruction:
A preliminary report, IRD&E Working Paper No. 46,
Provo, Utah, April 1974.

Merrill, M. David and Boutwell, Richard C. Instructional
development: Methodology and research--In Kerlinger,
Fred (Ed.), Review of Research in Education, vol. 1,
Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock (AERA), 1973.

Merrill, M. David and Wood, Norman. Instructional strategies:
Display and interdisplay variables. IRD Working Paper
No. 48., 1974. Invitational address to AERA special

interest group for research in mathematics education. Presentation was titled: "Is there emperical evidence for a theory based approach to mathematics instruction?"

Merrill, M. David. Premises, propositions, and research underlying the design of a learner controlled computer assisted instruction system: A summary for the TICCIT system. IRD&E working paper No. 44, Provo, Utah, BYU Press, 1973.

O'Neal, Fred. Learner control of instruction: Requirements and potentials. ICUE technical report No. 2, BYU, 1973.

An overview of the TICCIT program. Washington, MITRE Corp. Jan. 1974.

Pask, Gordon. A cybernetic experimental method and its underlying philosophy. International Journal Man-Machine Studies, 1971, 3, 279-337.

Simon, Herbert A. The Sciences of the Artificial, Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1969.

FOOTNOTES

[1]The preparation of this paper was requested and support-
ed in part by the ERIC Clearing House on Information Resources
at the Stanford Center for Research and Development in
Teaching. Excerpts were presented at a symposium during
the 1974 AECT Convention in Atlantic City.

The ideas represented are the result of lengthy inter-
actions with the author's colleagues during the past two
years and special acknowledgement must go to them. C.
Victor Bunderson's work on learner control and aptitude
treatment interaction at the University of Texas CAI labora-
tory first oriented our thinking in this direction. The
leap beyond fixed treatments must be credited to Harvey
Black who insisted on the concept of "local control."
Gerald W. Faust was a major contributor in all of the design
meetings where the details of the TICCIT CAI system were
hammered out. All of our associates on the project have
greatly contributed to the ideas presented. This paper,
however, represents the author's synthesis of these discussions
and the reader should not hold my colleagues responsible
for faulty premises or logic which may be discovered in
the arguments presented.

[2]H. A. Simon (1969) has made an extremely useful distinc-
tion between artificial and natural science. Natural science

is descriptive while artificial science is often prescriptive. Natural science deals with events occurring in the real world while artificial science deals with man-made artifacts. Instructional science is in our opinion an artificial science rather than a natural science. Based on the arguments presented the study of ATI's are of value and are in the domain of the natural science of psychology but are unlikely to be of primary value in the artificial science of instruction.