

**THE DYNAMICS OF THEORY AND PRACTICE
IN INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEMS DESIGN**

**A thesis by
MARY RUTH DE VILLIERS**

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Philosophiae Doctor

**in the Department of Teaching and Training Studies
of the Faculty of Education
University of Pretoria**

**Supervisor: Prof. Dr J.C. Cronje
February 2002**

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the dynamics of theory and practice in the design of instructional systems, learning events and learning environments, with a view to synthesizing an integrated metamodel as a framework to facilitate effective learning in systems which use computer technology as a tutor, tool, or environment. This framework can be used as a design aid by instructional designers and instructor-designers, or as a tool to examine existing learning events from the viewpoint of learning and instructional-design theory. The research contributes to inquiry into learning theory by an in-depth study of the elements of the framework itself, investigating how they function in different contexts and contents.

Following an extensive literature survey, the researcher synthesizes a concise integrated framework of learning theories and instructional design practice from the cognitive family. This framework, the Hexa-C Metamodel (HCMm), is generated by a process of criterion-based textual filtration through effectiveness criteria, and encompasses the theoretical concepts of *constructivism*, *cognitive learning* and *knowledge/skills components*, as well as the practical characteristics of *creativity*, *customization* and *collaborative learning*. Using mainly qualitative ethnographic methods within the contexts of action research and development research, case studies are undertaken, applying the elements of the HCMm as an inquiry toolset to investigate three diverse learning events to determine what they reveal about the practice of effective and motivational learning. The learning events - a computer-based practice environment, an Internet-based course, and a fieldwork project – were selected due to the researcher’s close involvement with each intervention. Information from the evaluations of the learning events is then used to further examine in-depth the theories and characteristics which comprise the tool, as well as their interrelationships and ways of implementing them in domains that differ in context and content - distinguishing particularly between well-structured and ill-structured domains.

Key words:

Instructional systems design and development; Learning and instructional theory; Evaluation; Inquiry tool; Computer-integrated learning; Cognitive learning; Collaborative learning; Components of knowledge; Constructivism; Creativity; Customization; Domains of learning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank:

My supervisor, *Prof Johannes Cronjé* - for sound, insightful and supportive, as well as consistently enthusiastic and encouraging leadership.

The institutions and academic departments which gave permission for evaluation of the artifacts, course material and learning events investigated in the case studies:

1. Department of Computer Science, University of South Africa - for permission to evaluate the interactive practice environment *FRAMES*.
2. Department of Teaching and Training Studies, University of Pretoria - for permission to evaluate *RBO880*, the Internet-based course on Computer-Assisted Communication and Management.
3. School of Tourism Management, University of Pretoria - for permission to evaluate the *Mkambati Project* of the Ecotourism course.

The academics and students who participated in the three evaluations - for their willing co-operation and contributions.

My young-adult children - for valuable practical assistance. In an unusual variation on the parent-offspring relationship, we mutually support one another in our post-graduate studies. Thank you to:

Adrian - for the CAD charts

Dorothy - for editorial assistance

Gabrielle - for doing the bibliography, and to *JP* for Figure 4.1

Jonathan - for the diagrams.

My husband *André* - for assistance, both technical and domestic, in the final stages.

I really do appreciate it!

Ruth de Villiers

September 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One	<i>Introduction</i>	1
1.1	Real-world problem statement	2
1.2	Research questions and associated subquestions	2
1.3	Value of research	4
1.4	Research goal and criteria	5
	1.4.1 Research goals within educational technology	5
	1.4.2 Research goals of this thesis	5
	1.4.3 Field of investigation	6
	1.4.4 Selection criteria	7
	1.4.5 Motivation for the selection criteria	8
1.5	Research methods	9
	1.5.1 Research methods for educational technology	9
	1.5.2 Research methods used in this thesis	9
1.6	Limitations and delimitations of the study	10
	1.6.1 View of instructional systems design and instructional systems	10
	1.6.2 Domain of the study and its literature	11
	1.6.3 Research perspectives of the study	11
	1.6.4 Technology in this study	11
1.7	Research design	12
	1.7.1 Research design in this thesis	12
	1.7.2 Development research	13
	1.7.3 Development research in this study	14
	1.7.4 Action research	15
	1.7.5 Action research in this study	16
1.8	Structure and chapters of this thesis	17
	1.8.1 Structure and interrelationships	17
	1.8.2 Development of the reasoning	19
	1.8.3 Content of the chapters	20

Chapter Two *Theory*

Learning and instructional theory	22
2.1 Introduction	22
2.2 Behaviourism	23
2.2.1 Background and ethos of behaviourist instructional theory	23
2.2.2 Key characteristics of behaviourism	24
2.2.3 Behaviourist instruction: associated concepts	25
2.2.3.1 Gagné's categories of learning outcomes	25
2.2.3.2 Gagné's conditions of learning	26
2.2.4 Behaviourist learning theory: related perspectives	27
2.2.4.1 Objectivism	27
2.2.4.2 Instructionism	28
2.2.4.3 Reductionism	28
2.2.5 Comments on behaviourist instruction	29
2.3 Cognitivism	30
2.3.1 Background and ethos of cognitive learning theories	30
2.3.1.1 Ventures into artificial intelligence	30
2.3.1.2 Adaptive control of thought: Anderson's ACT model	31
2.3.2 Characteristics of the cognitive learning perspective	31
2.3.2.1 Key features of cognitive learning	31
2.3.2.2 Bloom's taxonomy	32
2.3.2.3 Gagné-Merrill enterprise schemas	33
2.3.3 Theories of cognitive instruction	34
2.3.3.1 Human problem solving: Newell and Simon theory	34
2.3.3.2 Learning as human information processing	35
2.3.3.3 Component display theory (CDT)	36
2.3.3.4 The second generation paradigm (ID ₂)	37
2.3.3.5 Instructional transaction theory (ITT):	38
2.3.3.6 Automaticity	38
2.3.4 Cognitive learning theory: related perspectives	39
2.3.4.1 Complexity theory: integrating the affective with the cognitive	39
2.3.4.2 Transfer	41

2.3.4.3	Metacognition	41
2.3.4.4	Cognitive flexibility theory	42
2.3.4.5	Objectivism	42
2.3.5	Discussion on cognitivism and its development	43
2.4	Constructivism	44
2.4.1	Background and ethos of constructivist learning theories	45
2.4.2	Key characteristics of the constructivist learning perspective	46
2.4.2.1	General features and characteristics	46
2.4.2.2	Constructivist evaluation	49
2.4.3	Views and controversies about constructivist learning	51
2.4.4	Radical/extreme constructivism	54
2.4.5	Constructivist learning theory: related perspectives	55
2.4.5.1	Situated cognition and anchored instruction	55
2.4.5.2	Cognitive apprenticeship and cognitive flexibility theory	56
2.4.5.3	Constructivist learning environments and open-ended learning environments	56
2.4.5.4	Project-based learning and problem-based learning (PBL)	58
2.4.5.5	Interpretivism	60
2.4.5.6	Positivism	60
2.4.5.7	Chaos theory	60
2.4.6	Discussion of constructivist learning	61
2.5	Cross-paradigm characteristics	63
2.5.1	Collaborative learning and co-operative learning	63
2.5.1.1	The difference between collaborative and co-operative learning	63
2.5.1.2	Key elements of co-operative learning	64
2.5.2	Learner-centricity and learner-control	65
2.5.3	Creativity and motivation	66
2.5.3.1	Creative instruction	66
2.5.3.2	Motivation	68
2.6	The learning-focused paradigm of instructional theory	70
2.6.1	Towards a new paradigm of instructional theory	70
2.6.2	Relationship between instructional theory and instructional strategies	71
2.6.3	Learning-focused instructional theory	71

2.6.4	Involvement of user-designers	72
2.6.5	How the new paradigm of instructional theory differs	73
2.7	A theoretical subdivision according to educational psychologists	74
2.7.1	The behaviourist/empiricist view	75
2.7.2	The cognitive/rationalist view	76
2.7.3	The situative/pragmatist-sociohistoric view	77
2.8	The three paradigms - isolationist or integrative?	78
2.9	Conclusion	81

Chapter Three *Practice*

Learning and instructional systems design in practice	83	
3.1	Introduction and discussion of terminology	83
3.1.1	Instruction and learning: theory to practice	84
3.1.2	Terminology	85
3.2	Behaviourist instructional systems	88
3.2.1	Introduction to behavioural instructional systems development	88
3.2.2	Characteristics of behaviourist instruction	89
3.2.2.1	Fleming and Levie's behaviourist principles	89
3.2.2.2	Hannafin and Peck's behaviourist principles	90
3.2.2.3	Gropper's behaviourist skills	91
3.2.3	Behavioural instructional systems development models	91
3.2.3.1	Gagné's events of instruction	91
3.2.3.2	The Dick and Carey model	92
3.2.3.3	Briggs and Wager model	94
3.2.3.4	The Braden model	94
3.2.4	Discussion of behaviourist instructional design	95
3.3	Cognitive instructional systems	97
3.3.1	Introduction to cognitive instruction and systems development	97
3.3.2	Characteristics of cognitive instructional design	97
3.3.2.1	Objectives and task analysis	98
3.3.2.2	Entry characteristics	98
3.3.2.3	Instructional strategies	98

3.3.3	Cognitive ISD models	100
3.3.3.1	Component display theory (CDT)	100
3.3.3.2	Another perspective on components	102
3.3.3.3	Enterprise schemas	102
3.3.3.4	Second generation instructional design (ID ₂)	103
3.3.3.5	Instructional transaction theory (ITT)	104
3.3.3.6	Alternative views to linear ID - 'design alternatives'	105
3.3.4	Cognitive-related aspects: practical applications in ISD	107
3.3.4.1	Implementation of metacognitive strategies	107
3.3.4.2	Instructionism and grounded design	108
3.3.4.3	Five star instructional design rating	109
3.4	Constructivist instructional systems	110
3.4.1	Introduction to constructivist learning and constructivist design	110
3.4.1.1	Differences between assumptions of traditional ID and constructivism	111
3.4.1.2	Towards constructivist instructional design	112
3.4.2	Characteristics and principles of design for constructivist learning	113
3.4.2.1	From objectivist strategies to constructivist methods	114
3.4.2.2	Constructivist values	115
3.4.2.3	Constructivist constructs	117
3.4.2.4	Constructivist instructional principles	119
3.4.2.5	Constructivist design principles	119
3.4.2.6	BIG and WIG constructivism	121
3.4.2.7	Constructivist assessment	121
3.4.3	Frameworks for constructivist learning and constructivist instructional design models	122
3.4.3.1	The recursive, reflective design and development model (R2D2)	122
3.4.3.2	The layers of negotiation model for designing constructivist learning materials	124
3.4.3.3	Constructivism and grounded design	127
3.4.3.4	The revised R2D2 model	128
3.4.3.5	Activity theory as a framework for designing constructivist learning environments	131
3.4.4	Design of learning in perspectives related to constructivism	135
3.4.4.1	Situated cognition, anchored instruction, and cognitive apprenticeship	135
3.4.4.2	Constructivist learning environments (CLEs)	136
3.4.4.3	Open-ended learning environments (OELEs)	138

3.4.4.4	Problem-based learning (PBL)	141
3.4.4.5	Implications of chaos theory for instructional design	142
3.5	Cross-paradigms issues	145
3.5.1	Collaborative learning and co-operative learning	145
3.5.2	Learner-centricity, customization, and learner-control	146
3.5.3	Creativity and motivation in instructional methods and resources	147
3.5.4	Five facets of a learning environment	149
3.5.5	Technology	149
3.6	The learning-focused paradigm of instructional-design theory	152
3.6.1	Towards a new paradigm	152
3.6.2	Reigeluth's classification according to instructional goal	153
3.6.3	Implications of the learning-focused paradigm	154
3.6.4	The debate on the learning-focused paradigm	156
3.7	Duchastel's prolegomena to instructional-design theory: a challenge for a full theory of instructional design	157
3.7.1	Many current theories - resulting confusion	157
3.7.2	Issues involved in building a full theory	158
3.7.3	How instruction can influence learning	160
3.7.4	Towards a theory of instructional design	162
3.8	Instructional design approaches - eclectic and pure ...	163
3.8.1	Should aspects of different paradigms be combined in ISD?	163
3.8.2	Research methods to examine different paradigms	165
3.8.3	The practitioner in action	165
3.9	Conclusion	166

Chapter Four *Synthesis*

	Towards a metamodel	168
4.1	Introduction	168
4.2	Comparative analysis of the three major paradigms	169
4.2.1	Comparison and contrast: a summary	169
4.2.2	The different approaches - conflict, convergence or co-existence?	174
4.3	Selection criteria	175

4.4	Selection process - culminating in the Hexa-C Metamodel	177
4.4.1	How the selection criteria were used to filter textual data	177
4.4.2	Results of the textual filtration process	178
4.4.3	Consolidated results of the textual filtration process	190
4.4.4	Discussion of results of textual filtration	192
4.4.4.1	Learning theories and characteristics of instructional design/practice	192
4.4.4.2	Further aspects of learning, including context and technology	193
4.4.4.3	Aspects of learning theory from the behavioural family	194
4.5	Elements of the Hexa-C Metamodel	195
4.5.1	The six elements: singly and compositely	195
4.5.2	Elements examined against the effectiveness criteria	196
4.6	The Hexa-C Metamodel compared to Duchastel's challenge for a single theory of ID and Reigeluth's new paradigm of ID	198
4.7	Conclusion	201

Chapter Five *Evaluation*

	What the HCMm toolset reveals about three learning events	202
5.1	Introduction	202
5.1.1	The three learning events	202
5.1.2	Research methods for evaluating the learning events	204
5.1.3	Structure of learning event evaluations	205
	Section 5A - Case Study One: <i>FRAMES</i>	207
5A.1	Introduction to FRAMES	207
5A.1.1	Immediate domain and purpose	207
5A.1.2	Greater environment and learners	208
5A.1.3	Roles: the FRAMES designer, lecturer, and researcher	208
5A.1.4	Material and approach of the FRAMES practice environment	209
5A.1.5	Research design of the FRAMES case study	213
5A.2	Investigating FRAMES - using the Hexa-C Metamodel	214
5A.2.1	Components	215
5A.2.1.1	Initial discussion	215
5A.2.1.2	Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	217

5A.2.1.3	Findings from survey of the learners	217
5A.2.1.4	Concluding discussion	219
5A.2.2	Cognitive learning theory	220
5A.2.2.1	Initial discussion	220
5A.2.2.2	Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	222
5A.2.2.3	Findings from survey of the learners	223
5A.2.2.4	Concluding discussion	224
5A.2.3	Constructivism	225
5A.2.3.1	Initial discussion	226
5A.2.3.2	Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	227
5A.2.3.3	Findings from survey of the learners	228
5A.2.3.4	Concluding discussion	229
5A.2.4	Collaborative learning	230
5A.2.4.1	Initial discussion	230
5A.2.4.2	Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	231
5A.2.4.3	Findings from survey of the learners	231
5A.2.4.4	Concluding discussion	231
5A.2.5	Customization and learner-centricity	232
5A.2.5.1	Initial discussion	232
5A.2.5.2	Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	233
5A.2.5.3	Findings from survey of the learners	233
5A.2.5.4	Concluding discussion	235
5A.2.6	Creativity	236
5A.2.6.1	Initial discussion	236
5A.2.6.2	Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	237
5A.2.6.3	Findings from survey of the learners	238
5A.2.6.4	Concluding discussion	239
5A.3	General	240
5A.3.1	Facets of the FRAMES learning environment	240
5A.3.2	Technology in FRAMES	240
5A.4	Conclusion to the FRAMES evaluation	241

Section 5B - Case Study Two: <i>RBO880</i>	243
5B.1 Introduction to RBO880	243
5B.1.1 Immediate domain and purpose	243
5B.1.2 Greater environment and learners	244
5B.1.3 Roles: the RBO880 developer, instructor, and the researcher	245
5B.1.4 Approach, the classroom, and tasks in RBO's electronic world	245
5B.1.5 Research design of the RBO case study	251
5B.2 Investigating RBO880 using the Hexa-C Metamodel	252
5B.2.1 Cognitive learning theory	252
5B.2.1.1 Initial discussion	252
5B.2.1.2 Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	255
5B.2.1.3 Findings from survey of the learners	255
5B.2.1.4 Concluding discussion	258
5B.2.2 Constructivism	259
5B.2.2.1 Initial discussion	259
5B.2.2.2 Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	264
5B.2.2.3 Findings from survey of the learners	264
5B.2.2.4 Concluding discussion	266
5B.2.3 Components	267
5B.2.3.1 Initial discussion	267
5B.2.3.2 Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	267
5B.2.3.3 Findings from survey of the learners	268
5B.2.3.4 Concluding discussion	268
5B.2.4 Collaborative learning in RBO	268
5B.2.4.1 Initial discussion	268
5B.2.4.2 Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	272
5B.2.4.3 Findings from survey of the learners	273
5B.2.4.4 Concluding discussion	275
5B.2.5 Customization	276
5B.2.5.1 Initial discussion	276
5B.2.5.2 Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	277
5B.2.5.3 Findings from survey of the learners	277
5B.2.5.4 Concluding discussion	280
5B.2.6 Creativity	281
5B.2.6.1 Initial discussion	281

5B2.6.2	Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	283
5B2.6.3	Findings from survey of the learners	283
5B.2.6.4	Concluding discussion	286
5B.3	General	287
5B.3.1	Facets of the RBO learning environment	287
5B.3.2	Technology in RBO	288
5B.4	Conclusion	288
 Section 5C - Case Study Three: <i>Mkambati 2000</i>		290
5C.1	Introduction to Mkambati 2000	290
5C.1.1	Immediate domain and purpose	290
5C.1.2	Operational environment and learners	291
5C.1.3	Roles: the project designer, facilitator, and the researcher	292
5C.1.4	Scope and events of Mkambati 2000	292
5C.1.5	Research design of the Mkambati case study	298
5C.2	Investigating Mkambati 2000 - using the Hexa-C Metamodel	299
5C.2.1	Creativity	299
5C.2.1.1	Initial discussion	299
5C.2.1.2	Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	300
5C.2.1.3	Findings from survey of the learners	300
5C.2.1.4	Concluding discussion	303
5C.2.2	Collaborative learning	304
5C.2.2.1	Initial discussion	304
5C.2.2.2	Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	305
5C.2.2.3	Findings from survey of the learners	305
5C.2.2.4	Concluding discussion	307
5C.2.3	Customization	308
5C.2.3.1	Initial discussion	308
5C.2.3.2	Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	310
5C.2.3.3	Findings from survey of the learners	310
5C.2.3.4	Concluding discussion	312

5C.2.4	Components	312
5C.2.4.1	Initial discussion	313
5C.2.4.2	Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	313
5C.2.4.3	Findings from survey of the learners	313
5C.2.4.4	Concluding discussion	313
5C.2.5	Cognitive learning theory	314
5C.2.5.1	Initial discussion	314
5C.2.5.2	Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	315
5C.2.5.3	Findings from survey of the learners	317
5C.2.5.4	Concluding discussion	319
5C.2.6	Constructivism	321
5C.2.6.1	Initial discussion	321
5C.2.6.2	Viewpoint of the instructor-designer	325
5C.2.6.3	Findings from survey of the learners	326
5C.2.6.4	Concluding discussion	328
5C.3	General	329
5C.3.1	Facets of the Mkambati 2000 learning environment	329
5C.3.2	Technology in Mkambati 2000	329
5C.4	Conclusion to evaluation of the Mkambati Project	330
5.2	Conclusion to the chapter	333
Chapter Six <i>Reflection</i>		
What the case studies reveal about the HCMm toolset		
6.1	Introduction	334
6.2	The three learning events	335
6.2.1	Contexts of the learning events	336
6.2.2	Use of technology in the learning events	337
6.2.3	Learner-responses related to elements of the metamodel	339
6.3	The Hexa-C elements, i.e. investigating the investigation tools	341
6.3.1	Constructivism	342
6.3.2	Cognitive learning	349

6.3.3	Creativity and motivation	354
6.3.4	Collaborative learning in the three learning events	359
6.3.5	Components	364
6.3.6	Customization of learning, learner-centricity, and learner-control	366
6.4	Inter-relationships and integration within the Hexa –C Metamodel	369
6.5	Conclusion	373

Chapter Seven *Conclusion* 374

7.1	What has been achieved?	374
7.2	Research questions and answers	375
7.2.1	Response to Research Question One	375
7.2.2	Response to Research Question Two	375
7.2.3	Response to Research Question Three	377
7.3	Final review of the Hexa-C Metamodel	378
7.3.1	Strengths of the HCMm	378
7.3.1.1	As an evaluation aid	378
7.3.1.2	As a design aid	378
7.3.2	Weaknesses of the HCMm	379
7.3.2.1	As an evaluation aid	379
7.3.2.2	As a design aid	379
7.4	Relevance to South Africa	380
7.5	Directions for further research	382
7.6	Conclusion	383

Bibliography 384

Appendices 395

4.6.5	Summary and scores from Criterion 5: Incorporates some form of external assessment	187
4.6.6	Summary and scores from Criterion 6: Integrates affective and cognitive aspects	188
4.6.7	Summary and scores from Criterion 7: Communicates domain complexity	189
4.6.8	Summary and scores from Criterion 8: Platform-independent	189
4.6.9	Summary and scores from applying Criterion 9: Helps learners apply knowledge and skills in practice	190
4.7.1	Consolidated occurrences of learning theories and characteristics	191
4.7.2	Consolidated references to other issues	191
4.7.3	Consolidated occurrences of concepts from the behavioural family	194
4.8	The six elements of the Hexa-C metamodel against the nine selection criteria	197
4.9	Comparison and contrast : Hexa-C Metamodel, Reigeluth's new paradigm, and Duchastel's prolegomena	199
5.1	Introduction to the three case studies	203
5.A.1	Profiles of learners surveyed	214
5.A.2	Relationship between FRAMES and CDT	215
5.A.3	Learner-responses to structured questions relating to components	218
5.A.4	Learner-responses to structured questions relating to cognitive learning	223
5.A.5	Constructivist aspects of FRAMES	226
5.A.6	Learner-responses to structured questions relating to constructivism	228
5.A.7	Co-operative learning in FRAMES	230
5.A.8	Customized learning in FRAMES	232
5.A.9	Learner-responses to structured questions relating to customized learning	233
5.A.10	Use of the three modes	234
5.A.11	Learner-responses to structured questions relating to creativity	238
5.A.12	Facets comprising the FRAMES practice environment	240
5B:1	Profiles of the learner population surveyed	251
5B.2	Internet familiarity prior to RBO	256
5B.3	Internet familiarity after RBO	256
5B.4	Aspects of overload/anxiety	257
5B.5	Constructivist aspects in RBO	264
5B.6	Being on the receiving end of constructivism	265
5B.7	How did you find the interaction with classmates?	273
5B.8	Did you use any other means of communication?	274

5B.9	Realization of personal learning preferences in RBO	277
5B.10	RBO and learning preferences	278
5B.11	Would learners like marks on an ongoing basis?	279
5B.12	Was RBO useful in your personal or professional life?	279
5B.13	Innovative aspects of RBO	284
5B.14	Aspects of this approach that I have used / would use in my own teaching	285
5B.15	Facets comprising the RBO virtual classroom	287
5C.1	Profiles of the learner population surveyed	298
5C.2	What motivated you in this experience?	301
5C.3	What did you find innovative in this approach?	301
5C.4	Emotions at the nature reserve during the project	302
5C.5	Motivation at write-up time	303
5C.6	Views on collaborative learning	306
5C.7	Views on learning preferences and personalization of the project to own style, interests, and expertise	310
5C.8	Software packages used in generating collaborative projects	311
5C.9	How I bridged learning gaps	318
5C.10	Elaborations on overload/anxiety	319
5C.11	Learner comments on aspects of constructivist learning	326
5C.12	Correspondence between constructivist features and learner-responses	327
5C.13	Shortcomings identified and suggested remedies	327
5C.14	Facets comprising the Mkambati 2000 fieldwork project	329
6.1	Contexts, conditions and circumstances of the three learning events	336
6.2	Computer usage in the three learning events - categorized according to full and empty instructional technologies	337
6.3.1	Information revealed about constructivism in this study	343
6.3.2	Ways of implementing constructivism	347
6.3.3	Features of instruction in well-structured procedural domains	348
6.4.1	Information revealed about cognitive learning	350
6.4.2	Ways of implementing cognitive learning	353
6.5.1	Information revealed about creativity and motivation	355
6.5.2	Ways of implementing creativity	358
6.6.1	Information revealed about collaborative and co-operative work	360
6.6.2	Ways of implementing collaborative learning	363

6.6.3	Problems incurred in collaborative learning	363
6.7.1	Information revealed about components within instruction and learning	364
6.7.2	Ways of implementing learning of basic components	365
6.8.1	Information revealed about customization of learning	367
6.8.2	Ways of customizing learning	368
6.9.1	Positive relationships between elements of the Hexa-C Metamodel framework	371
6.9.2	Negative relationships between elements of the Hexa-C Metamodel framework	372
7.1	Review of the Research Questions	375

LIST OF FIGURES

1.1	The development approach to research	13
1.2	Structure of the thesis	18
1.3	Chain of reasoning	19
2.1	Stimulus-response-reinforcement	24
2.2	A human information processing system	35
2.3	Interactive learning model	40
2.4	The objectivist-constructivist continuum	79
2.5	The objectivist-constructivist plane	80
3.1	The Dick and Carey instructional design model	93
3.2	Merrill's performance-content grid for CDT	101
3.3	Jonassen's web of constructivism	118
3.4	The R2D2 instructional design model	123
3.5	The Cennamo, Abell and Chung 'Layers of negotiation' constructivist design model	126
3.6	The revised R2D2 model	129
3.7	Activity system	131
3.8	Model for designing constructivist learning environments	137
3.9	Development cycle of a science-based technology	151
4.1	The framework of the Hexa-C Metamodel	196
5.1	Evaluation perspectives : How each element is used to investigate each event from three perspectives	205
	Text Box 5A: Subject matter and modus operandi of FRAMES and the FRAMES learner evaluations	209
5A.1	A FRAMES introductory screen	212
5A.2	A composite component for analysis of the 'Kind' of relation	212
5A.3	Performance-content matrix for the components of FRAMES	217
5A.4	A FRAMES operational screen	221
5A.5	A FRAMES operational screen	222
5A.6	Operational screen showing example synthesis	227
5A.7	The graphic aid components	237

Text Box 5B: The virtual world of an RBO learner	246
5B.1 Website of the RBO electronic classroom	248
5B.2 Desks of four of the learners of 2000	249
5B.3 Mini-desks of the two former learners	250
5B.4 The RBO timetable for 2000	250
5B.5 Outcomes and requirements of two RBO activities	260
5C.1 The Ecotourism tetrahedron	292
Text Box 5C: The Mkambati 2000 Project	293
5C.2 Map of Mkambati Nature Reserve	296
5C.3 Setting the scene	297
5C.4 Customizing the project to learners' interests	309
5C.5 Integration and issues	316
5C.6 The mission of Mkambati 2000 – in learners' terms	331
6.1 Computer Usage in the three learning events	338
6.2.1 Categorization of FRAMES open-ended responses	339
6.2.2 Categorization of RBO open-ended responses	340
6.2.3 Categorization of MKAMBATI open-ended responses	340
7.1 How the HCMm contributes towards the critical outcomes of OBE	381

APPENDICES

Appendix A1	395
Appendix A2	402
Appendix B	404
Appendix C	414

Terminology

This is not a comprehensive glossary of terms. Rather, it is an overview of some generally-accepted, traditional meanings of certain terms in the domain of instruction and instructional design. These terms set the background for this study and form the context out of which the newer approaches such as constructivist learning environments, problem-based learning, etc. evolved.

- ***What is an instructional theory?*** (Reigeluth, 1996c, 1999)

Instructional-design theory:

- is design-oriented - focusing on how to attain goals for learning or development, rather than description-oriented - focusing on the effects of given events.

Instructional-design theory identifies:

- Methods of instruction (ways to support and facilitate human learning and development);
- Situations in which those methods should and should not be used. A major aspect of any situation is the desired instructional outcome (not the same as a learning goal) which sets out the levels of effectiveness, efficiency, and appeal required from the instruction.

The methods of instruction are:

- Componential, in that they comprise different components or features;
- Probabilistic, not deterministic, meaning that they increase the chances, but do not ensure, attainment of the goals.

- ***How does instructional-design theory differ from learning theory?*** (Reigeluth, 1996c, 1999)

Learning theories are descriptive, in that they describe how learning occurs but do not identify or prescribe methods for promoting learning. By contrast, instructional-design theories are applied in practice; they are theories that identify methods for use in particular situations. In short, an instructional-design theory comprises *methods* and *situations*, and relates to events external to learners rather than describing what takes place within learners when learning occurs.

- ***How does instructional-design theory differ from instructional systems development (ISD) processes?***

Instructional-design theory is concerned with the characteristics of the instruction and its methods, not with the processes an instructional designer or teacher would use to plan the instruction. According to Reigeluth (1999), terms which characterize this distinction are:

- Instructional theory, instructional model, instructional strategies - to represent instructional-design theory;
- Instructional development model, instructional systems development (ISD) process -to represent the actual process and procedures of designing instruction. These processes are, however, closely related to underlying theories.

- ***What is instructional design? What are instructional design theory/models, and what does the instructional design process comprise?***

Instructional design (ID) is the link between descriptive learning theory and prescriptive educational practice (Reigeluth, 1997). ID thus comprises prescriptive instructional-design theories and models which set out methods for developing instruction, along with the conditions under which each should be used to produce a desired learning outcome. Instructional designers should be versed both in descriptive learning theories and prescriptive design theories, so that theory and practice can be integrated.

Reigeluth (1983) in his classic, *Instructional-design theories and models, Volume I* describes *instructional design*:

- As a professional activity, whereby decisions are taken as to what methods of instruction are best for bringing about desired changes in student knowledge and skills in a specific content area, and
- As a discipline concerned with producing knowledge about optimal instructional methods, strategies, and combinations of methods (i.e. whole models).

Reigeluth (1999) proposes that *instructional design theory* describes the characteristics of the instruction, i.e. what methods should be used. Analogous concepts are instructional theory, instructional model, and instructional strategies. *The instructional design process* is what a teacher or designer does to plan and prepare for the instruction, also called an instructional development model or instructional systems development (ISD). However, ID theories and ID processes are closely related.

According to Merrill *et al* (1996c), *instruction is a science* and *instructional design is a technology* founded on this science.

- Instructional science is concerned with discovering the natural principles involved in instructional strategies. Sciences are verified by discovery, so instruction, like other sciences, is verified by discovery.
- Instructional design is a man-made technology using those principles to invent procedures and tools that will promote learning. Like other technologies, ID is extended by invention. Design research involves deriving procedures and processes that incorporate the theory learned from instructional science. So *instructional design* is a technology for the development of learning experiences and environments which promote the acquisition of specific knowledge and skill by students. It incorporates known and verified learning strategies into these instructional experiences and environments, so as to make the acquisition of knowledge and skill more efficient, effective, and appealing.
- *Instructional systems development* (ISD) is a set of procedures for systematically designing and developing instructional materials.

Winn (1990) defines *instructional design* as a set of decision-making procedures by means of which the most effective instructional strategies are developed or chosen.

Willis (1995) uses the following simple and paradigm-independent definitions:

Instructional design refers to the process of designing instructional materials; and

An instructional design model refers to a theory or model that can guide the process of instructional design.

▪ ***What is entailed by instruction?***

Instruction involves directing students to appropriate learning activities, guiding them to appropriate knowledge, helping them rehearse, encode, and process information; monitoring student performance; providing feedback to their learning activities and practice (Merrill *et al*, 1996c).

Dick (1991) defines *instruction* as an organized set of methods, materials, and assessments designed to promote competence in defined outcomes.

Both of the above are definitions of what is known as 'direct instruction'.

Models of instruction

Reigeluth (1989) identifies three basic forms for instructional theories and associated models of instruction:

1. *Intact models*, where a different kind of instruction is prescribed for each of a variety of conditions, for example, Merrill's CDT - section 3.3.3.1;
2. *Variations on a model* where there is one general model and variations of it are prescribed for different conditions; and
3. The 'smorgasbord' paradigm, which has *no formal model* of instruction, but prescribes various methods on a mix-and-match basis according to the conditions.