ABSTRACT

        A survey was conducted of more than 300 instructional
developers, asking which books they would recommend for a variety of
different uses. To assist them, a listing of 139 instructional
development books taken from a recent journal article was included
with the survey. Participants, who represented a diverse but
highly-experienced group, were asked to recommend three books for
each of four categories: personal use, textbook, reference for
practitioners, and for reading by nondevelopers. A list of most
recommended books was developed, and demographic variables were used
in the analysis of respondent recommendations. Results, though
inconclusive, indicate that significant differences exist in book
recommendations according to such factors as sex, age, and other
demographic variables and suggest areas for further analysis and
research. This report includes tables displaying data on respondents'
job responsibilities, years of experience, and places of employment;
the 39 most-recommended books; additional book recommendations; and
topics for new books suggested by respondents. Forty references are
listed. (LMM)

BASIC REFERENCES ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting,
Association for Educational Communications and Technology,
New Orleans, Louisiana,
January 21, 1983

Roberts A. Braden
Learning Resources Center
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

and

Steven G. Sachs
Extended Learning Institute
Northern Virginia Community College
Annandale, Virginia 22152

An abridged version of this paper has been accepted for publication
in Educational Technology under the title
"The Most Recommended Books on Instructional Development"

ABSTRACT

'This paper reports on a survey of more than 300 instructional develop-
ers who were asked which books they would recommend for a variety of
different uses. To assist them, a listing   139   Books taken from
a recent journal article was included with   survey. The respondents
represented a diverse but highly experienced group. Participants were
asked to recommend three books for each of four categories: personal
use, textbook, reference for practitioners, and for reading by non-
developers. A list of most recommended books was developed, and demo-
graphic variables were used in the analysis of respondent recommendations.

In the past few years it has been popular to develop bibliographies of

books on instructional development. However, for the most part, these bibli-

ographies have been the result of one individual or perhaps a small group de-

ciding arbitrarily what should or should not be included on a list. Little

attempt has been made to verify the utility of these choices for users in the

field.

The purpose of this study was to conduct a natior   vey of instruc-

tional developers, asking for recommendations about the books of the field.

The results were expected to reflect any consensus opinions held by the users

regarding the utility of the identified literature. The very nature of the

survey was expected to result in the omission of a variety of specialized

resources that might be useful in certain settings. Even so, the desired

results of the study were not limited to the development of a new, perhaps

shorter bibliography. Instead, it was thought that much could be learned by

examining the pattern of responses to questions about ID books. The authors

began with high hope that the results might help to identify which ID approaches

are most useful, who the conceptual leaders of the field are, and what networks

among authors exist.

The field of ID is characte z. by wide diversity. ...e of   is the

result of the settings in which ID is practiced. Some of it is the result of

differences among graduate ID programs. Some of it is the result of differences

among philosophical approaches to education and training. While books are only

a part of the literature on ID, they should be representative of most or all of the theoretical and conceptual ideas upon which the field is founded. This study was designed to be a first step in identifying some of the common themes and common pivergence that typify ID toda such, this study anticipates the need for future analysis of the periodic literature of the field.

THE METHOD

Selecting the Sample. No one is really sure how many instructional developers there are. In fact, there is not even an agreed-upon method for distinguishing between professional instructional developers (whatever "professional" means) and others in the education and training field who have adopted the ID title. Our goal was to identify survey participants who would be knowledgeable about ID literature. We also sought respondents whose claim to the instructional developer title was based upon some actual experience doing ID either full-time or part-time. T accomplish this, a sample of 306 was selected from past or present members of the Division for Instructional Development of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology. To provide a high probability that the individuals were primarily involved in some aspect of ID, address indicators such as job titles and unit names were used in selecting the sample.

Analysis of Respondents. A total of 126 responses (41.2%) were returned. Ten responses had to be discarded because they did not provide enough usable data. Of the remaining 116 survey forms, 74% were from men, 26% from women. Because the initial impetus for this study came from a perceived need to obtain user verification of a list of ID books, particular attention was given to analysis of the respondent population. Thoug not necessarily scientifically represen-tative of all instructional developers, the respondents represented a diverse, highly experienced group, as illustrated in Tables 1-3.

4

Table 1

Respondents' Job Responsibilities

(listed in declining order of frequency)

Job Responsibility	Percentage
Part-time Developer	53%
ID Instructor of Graduate Students	46%
ID Project Evaluator	38%
ID Program Administrator	34%
ID Support Service	33%
Full-time Developer	14%
ID Instructor: Industry or Government	10%
ID Instructor of Undergraduate Students	9%

Table 2

Years of Respondent Experience

	Years				
	0	1-3	4-6	7-9	10+
Direct ID Experience (practitioner) N = 110*					
Full-time (74)	33%	16%	19%	13%	19%
Part-time (63)	43%	20%	12%	8%	17%
Training Developers or Teaching ID N = 116					
Full-time (45)	61%	7%	11%	5%	15%
Part-time (41)	65%	16%	6%	4%	9%
ID Related Experience	16%	6%	14%	12%	51%

*All 116 respondents ve intormati. which indicated past or present ID experience--full-time, part-time, or both. However, 6 persons did not respond directly to years of experience, and their replies were not used in these computations.

Table 3

Respondents' Places of Employment

Place of Employment	Percentage
Public College	66%
Private College	11%
Consulting firm	9%
Self-employed	8%
Industry	8%
Community or Junior College	8%
All other categories	11%

(Total exceeds 100% due to multiple responses.)

A total of 964 years of full-time or part-time ID experience was re-
ported by 110 individuals. Similarly, 93 people reported a total of 1127
years of ID-related experience. The predominance of college staff and
faculty (85%) is mirrored in the finding that the vast majority of those
responding (82%) ' ' doctoral degrees. (The low response by r----   -t-
side of academia was a disappointment.) The majority (71%.
swering the survey had taken Educational Technology or ID coursework as a
major, with courses taken at 56 colleges and universities from around the
country. In spite of this heavy concentration of college faculty, experi-
enced professionals, and Ed Tech/ID majors, one-third reported having ex-
amined or read only a little of the literature li----d in the reference

, and only 10% reported having examined or read almost all of it.

To verify the geographic dispersion of subjects, the envelopes in which
the questionnaires were returned were checked for postmarks. Of 108 readable
postmarks from 37 states and the District of Columbia, the most were from
Florida (9), Illinois (9), Texas (9), r-   'ennsylv a (7).

The Survey Instrument. Each of the 306 members of the sample was sent a

questionnaire of 2 pages, legal size, with 17 questions (See Appendix). Half

of the questionnaires were printed on green paper, half on yellow. All of

the sample received the 139 item book list (Braden, 1982) which had originally

been printed in Educational Technology. The half of the sample (152 persons)

who received green questionnaires were also given a second list which con-

tained names of 61 other books. Both book lists are included in the appendix.

Procedures. From each returned questionnaire 74 items of information were

coded onto an optical scan sheet. The coded opscan sheets were then read into

a computer data base and an initial tabulation was run to determine which

demographic questions had elicited response patterns suitable for cross-break

analysis of respondent book recommendations. The 16 most frequently recom-

mended books were also identified and were used thereafter in the statistical

analysis.

RESULTS

Supplement Book List. Whether a supplementary book list was included with

the questionnaire and basic book list made no difference in response rate (64

for both lists vs. 62 for basic list only). However, eight of the ten responses

that were unusable because insufficient data was furnished came from subjects

who received only the basic book list.

Book Recommendations. Each participant in the survey was asked to recommend

three books from the Braden article for each of four categories: personal use,

textbook, reference for practicing developers, and reading for a client not

knowledgeable about ID. One or more votes were cast for 94 of the books on

the list of 139. Main results of the selection aspect of the survey are shown

in Table 4.

Table 4

The Most Recommended Books

Author & Short Title	Own	Text	Reference	Client	Overall
AECT. Educational Technology: Glossary.	–	–	10	–	–
Bloom. A Taxonomy of Educational Objectives.	8	–	5	–	10
Briggs. Instructional Design.	4	3	7	6	3
Briggs & Wager. Handbook of Procedures.	–	5	6	9	7
Davies. Competency Based Learning.	–	–	–	10	–
Davis, Alexander, & Yelon. Learning System Design.	7	6	–	5	8
Diamond. Instructional Development for Individualized Learning.	–	10	–	8	–
Dick & Carey. The Systematic Design of Instruction.	9	2	–	4	6
Fleming & Levie. Instructional Message Design.	3	7	2	–	4
Gagne. The Conditions of Learning.	2	4	3	7	2
Gagne & Briggs. Principles of Instructional Design.	1	1	1	3	1
Heinich. Technology and the Management of Instruction.	10				
Hil... ...ories of Learning.	–	–	9	–	–
Ken... Instructional Design.	–	9	–	2	9
Mager. Preparing Instructional Objectives.	5	8	8	1	5
Travers. Second Handbook of Research on Teaching.	6	–	4	–	–

Other books recommended by 10% or more of the respondents:

AECT Task Force on Definitions and Terminology. The Definition of Educational Technology; Baker & Schutz, eds. Instructional Product Development; Banathy, Instructional Systems; Bass, Lumsden, & Dills. eds. Instructional Development: The State of the Art; Bloom, Madaus, & Hastings, Evaluation to Improve Learning; Gagne, Essentials of Learning for Instruction; Merrill, ed. Instructional Design: Readings; Merrill & Tennyson, Teaching...cept An Instruc...onal Design Guide; Postlethwait & Associates ...oring ...ching Alternatives; Salomon, Interaction of Media, Cognition, and Learning; Snelbecker, Learning Theory, Instructional Theory and Psychoeducational Design; Wittich & Schuller, Instructional Technology: Its Nature and Use (Sixth Edition).

There is much duplication in selection from category to category. The top ten choices in all four categories are covered by only 16 books. An additional 13 books were recommended for one or more categories by 10% or more of the respondents. Of these 29 highly selected books, four were in the top ten for all categories: Principles of Instructional Design by Gagné & Briggs, The Conditions of Learning by Gagné, Instructional Design edited by Briggs, and Handbook of Procedures for the Design of Instruction by Briggs & Wager. The dominant influence of Gagné & Briggs is hard to ignore, with their book Principles of Instructional Design recommended as a textbook by over 40% of all respondents. This was the highest agreement on any recommendation in the survey.

In addition to the list of 139 books included in the survey, respondents were given an opportunity to list other books that would be appropriate for a basic ID reference shelf. A 9 other books were named. Table 5 lists the most frequently reco. ded.

Table 5

Additional Bo t Recommendations

Gerlach & Ely. Teaching and Media.

Gilbert. Human Competence.

Hartley. Designing Instructional Text.

Ininich, Molenda, & Russell. Instructional Media & The New Technologies of Instruction.

Jonassen. The Technology of Text.

Kemp. Planning & Producing Audio-Visual Materials.

Mager. Goal Analysis.

Markle. Designs for Instructional Designers.

Romiszowski. Designing Instructional Systems.

Wileman. Exercises in Visual Thinking.

Book Deletions. Another aspect of the study was to identify books that were no longer appropriate for a basic ID reference shelf. Reasons for such a deletion might involve age, topic, cost, readability; etc. Of the 139 books on the survey list, 81 received at least one nomination for deletion. A few of the negative expressions were strongly stated. However, no clear cut case emerged for deleting any book from the list, though seven did receive more recommendations for deletion than for inclusion as one of the top three in a category. An additional 26 books received neither recommendations as a top book nor recommendations for deletion.

Topics for New Books. In addition to making judgements about specific books in the ID field, the respondents were asked to indicate topics about which they would like to see new books published. The results are shown in Table 6 and suggest that the individuals who responded to this survey have a greater interest in the application of learning theory and other research findings than in procedures and strategies for doing ID. Keep in mind, however, that college faculty made up the majority of participants in the survey. Research and theory are topics which one would expect to be of greater interest to academics than to instructional developers.

Table 6

Topics for New Books

Topic	Rank	Responses
Applying Learning Theory to ID	1	54%
Research Related to ID	2	45%
Designing Instructional Strategies	3	31%
Practical ID Tips	4	29%
ID for Business and Industry	5	28%
Front-end Analysis	6	27%
Formative Evaluation	7	25%
Designing Instructional Material	8	21%
Teaching Instructional Evaluation	9	17%
ID (General)	10	14%

Observations. The survey generated an extensive data bank of significant

and non-significant facts which offer innumerable tidbits of information that

will be useful in further studies of the literature and its relationship to

the field of instructional development. For example:

- Men were significantly more apt to select Principles of Instructional

  Design (Gagné & Briggs) for personal use and as a reference than women

  (43% vs. 17% and 22% vs. 10%).

- Women were almost twice as likely as men to recommend The Conditions

  of Learning (Gagné) as a text (24% vs. 13%). Men, however, recommended

  it twice as often as women to give to clients (13% vs. 7%) and three

  times as often as a reference (23% vs. 7%).

- Men were significantly more apt than women to select Instructional

  Design (Briggs) as a text (22% vs. 3%).

- Respondents who majored in Ed Tech or ID were more than twice as

  likely as all others to select Instructional Message Design (Fleming

  & Levie) as a reference (22% vs. 9%).

- Only 8% of college level developers selected Preparing Instructional

  Objectives (Mager) as a book to own for personal use as compared with

  31% of all others. Those under 40 years old recommended it for clients

  twice as often as those over 40 (31% vs. 15%).

DISCUSSION

The initial analysis of the data from this survey can hardly explain why

significant differences exist for such factors as sex, age, and other variables.

It does suggest areas for further analysis and future research. Not surprising-

ly, additional analysis will be needed to synthesize what the recommended books

say about the actual practice of ID and to identify the invisible networks that

provide the theoretical and conceptual framework upon which the practice of ID

is based. The rather limited agreement on the top books should not be taken to imply that the field should be based on such a limited foundation.

A number of indications from this study suggest that most developers have a relatively narrow perspective and limited experience with the variety of literature available. The majority of the 16 books most recommended are more than seven years old. While a wide range of responses was expected and, in fact, did occur with 193 different books receiving at least one recommendation, it seems surprising that so few received recommendations from several persons. (Only 63 books were recommended by four or more people).

While the results of this survey are hardly conclusive, they do raise some disturbing questions about instructional development and how far the field has come as a profession. Has the field become so specialized that each developer truly has unique literature needs? Is there a failure to base the practice of ID on a solid theoretical foundation as chronicled in the books of the field? Is ID an art developed almost entirely through personal experience? It seems unlikely that these questions have affirmative answers, but that is one way of interpreting these findings. Other reactions would be to conclude that it is too early to judge the literature of the ID field or that any agreement about the literature (and there was some) is an important step for an evolving profession. Certainly, the 39 most recommended books as revealed by this survey are all excellent (see references). Taken as a whole they represent a fundamental and growing core of basic literature for instructional development.

12

6

References

AECT Task Force on Definitions and Terminology. <u>The Definition of Educational Technology</u>. Washington, D.C.: Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1977.

AECT Task Force on Definitions and Terminology. <u>Educational Technology: A Glossary of Terms</u>. Washington, D.C.: Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1979.

Baker, Robert L., and Schutz, Richard E., eds. <u>Instructional Product Development</u>. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1971.

Banathy, Bela H. <u>Instructional Systems</u>. Palo Alto, CA: Fearon Publishers, 1968.

Bass, Ronald K., Lumsden, D. Barry, and Dills, Charles R., eds. <u>Instructional Development: The State of the Art</u>. Columbus, OH: Collegiate Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Bloom, Benjamin S., Madaus, George F., and Hastings, J. Thomas. <u>Evaluation to Improve Learning</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1981.

Bloom, Benjamin S. et al., eds. <u>A Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain</u>. New York: Longman, Inc., 1956.

Braden, Roberts A. One Hundred Book Titles: A Twelve-Foot Shelf of Basic References for Instructional Design and Development. <u>Educational Technology</u>, 1981, 21(9), 41-45.

Briggs, Leslie J., ed. <u>Instructional Design: Principles and Applications</u>. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, 1977.

Briggs, Leslie J., and Wager, Walter W. <u>Handbook of Procedures for the Design of Instruction</u> (Second Edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, 1981.

Bushers, L. R. K. Corey. <u>_____ Evaluation, Development, and Design</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Davies, Robert H., Alexander, Lawrence T., and Yelon, Stephen L. <u>Learning Systems Design: An Approach to the Improvement of Instruction</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

Diamond, Robert M. et al. <u>Instructional Development for Individualized Learning in Higher Education</u>. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, 1975.

Dick, Walter, and Carey, Lou. <u>The Systematic Design of Instruction</u>. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1978.

Fleming, Malcolm L., and Levie, W. Howard. <u>Instructional Message Design</u>. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, 1978.

Gagné, Robert M.   Essentials of Learning for Instruction.   Hinsdale, IL: The
    Dryden Press, 1974.

Gagné, Robert M.   The Conditions of Learning (Third Edition).   New York: Holt,
    Rinehart, and Winston, 1977.

Gagné, Robert M., and Briggs, Leslie J.   Principles of Instructional Design.
    New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1974.

Gerlach, V. S., and Ely, D. P.   Teaching and Media: A Systematic Approach.
    Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1971.

Gilbert, T. F.   Human Competence: Engineering Worthy Performance. New York:
    McGraw Hill, 1978.

Hartley, J.   Designing Instructional Text.   London.   Kogan Page, 1978.

Heinich, Robert   Technology and the Management of Instruction: Monograph 4.
    Washington, D. C.:   Association for Educational Communications and Technology,
    1970.

Heinich, Robert, Molenda, M. and Russell, J. D.   Instructional Media and the
    New Technologies of Instruction.   New York: Wiley & Sons, 1982.

Hilgard, Ernest R., and Bower, Gordon H.   Theories of Learning (Fourth Edition).
    Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

Jonassen, David H.   The Technology of Text: Principles for Structuring, Designing,
    and Displaying Text.   Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications,
    1982.

Kemp, Jerrold E.   Planning and Producing Audio Visual Materials.   New York:
    Thomas Y. Crowell, 1975.

Kemp, Jerrold E.   Instructional Design: A Plan for Unit and Course Development
    (Second Edition).   Belmont, CA: Fearon Publishers, 1977.

Mager, R. F.   Goal Analysis   Belmont, CA.   Fearon Pitman, 1972

Mager, R. F.   Preparing Instructional Objectives (Second Edition).   Palo Alto, CA:
    Fearon Publishers, 1975.

Markle, S.   Designs for Instructional Designers.   Champaign, IL: Stipes, 1978.

Merrill, M. David, ed.   Instructional Design: Readings.   Englewood Cliffs, NJ:
    Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.

Merrill, M. David, and Tennyson, Robert D.   Teaching Concepts: An Instructional
    Design Guide.   Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, 1977.

14

Postlethwait, Samuel N., and Associates. Exploring Teaching Alternatives.
    Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1977.

Romiszowski, A. J. Designing Instructional Systems. London: Kogan Page, 1981.

Salomon, Gavriel. Interaction of Media, Cognition, and Learning. San Francisco:
    Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1979.

Schramm, Wilbur. Big Media, Little Media: Tools and Technologies for Instruction.
    Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1977.

Snelbecker, Glenn E. Learning Theory, Instructional Theory, and Psychoeducational
    Design. New York. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

Travers, Robert M. W., ed. Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand
    McNally College Publishing Company, 1974.

Wileman, R. E. Exercises in Visual Thinking. New York. Hastings House, 1980

Wittich, Walter A., and Schuller, Charles F. Instructional Technology: Its
    Nature and Use (Sixth Edition) New York. Harper and Row, 1979.