

Chapter I

Commodity, Firmness, and Delight: *Four Modes of Instructional Design Practice*

Brad Hokanson

University of Minnesota, USA

Charles Miller

University of Minnesota, USA

Simon Hooper

Penn State University, USA

This chapter is interactive, with surveys and reflective examinations of the reader's own work in instructional design. It examines instructional design using four professional models: manufacturer, engineer, architect and artist to help develop a broader understanding of the process of design. The values of the instructional design are also challenged, with the chapter examining the balance between utility and aesthetics, function and form. It concludes with a call for the instructional designer to work more as an artist, and offers tactics to encourage that change.

INTRODUCTION

How do *you* solve an instructional design problem? Do you attempt to craft a solution based on the unique demands of each problem and the application of well researched instructional strategies? Or do you build upon an existing model, one that has worked many times before, selecting from solutions developed for a range of previous projects?

Your work is directly connected to your conceptualization of your role within the field of instructional design. And that conception includes assumptions and biases about processes, theories, and products. In the course of this chapter we will ask you to re-conceptualize your professional practice as an instructional designer and to recognize the roles of instructional manufacturer, instructional engineer, instructional architect, and instructional artist. We will describe how the working ethos of each shapes their practice.

What then, would happen if you were an *instructional artist*? As an instructional artist, you might be encouraged to create fundamentally different designs and work in a completely different manner. You might begin from an idea, engaging and desirable, but unconnected with learning, only later to apply it to instruction. It might work; it might not; but the application would be entirely different. We can see that the perspective through which we view ourselves biases how we understand and address problems.

Your Balance in Design

The following survey is intended to stimulate personal reflection and discussion of the ideas included in this chapter. Participating in the survey will help you to engage with the article, to stimulate understanding of the concepts presented, and to reflect on your personal practice as an instructional designer. The survey was built from the characteristics which will be explored in this chapter, and will focus on the Vitruvian

Table 1. Survey

Q1	Are you a teacher or an artist?	Teacher <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> Artist
Q2	Which is more important: a functionally useful product or a stable product?	Functionally useful <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> Stable
Q3	Should media be used as tools or content providers?	Content providers <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> Tools
Q4	Which is more important: pedagogical soundness or innovation?	Pedagogically sound <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> Innovative
Q5	Which is more important: software usability or utility?	Usability <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> Utility
Q6	Which is more important: software stability or visual richness?	Stability <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> Visual richness
Q7	Should designs be easy to use or motivating to the learner?	Easy to use <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> Motivating
Q8	Which is more important: functional capability or learner motivation?	Functional capability <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> Motivation
Q9	Should people or design experiences be more central in ID?	People <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> Design Experiences
Q10	Which is more important: pedagogical soundness or efficiency?	Pedagogical soundness <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> Efficiency
Q11	Should products or experiences be more central in ID?	ID Products <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> ID Experiences

Continued on following page

15 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/chapter/commodity-firmness-delight/22085

Related Content

Incorporating Affective Computing Into an Interactive System With MakeyMakey: An Emotional Human-Computer Interaction Design

Liu Hsin Lan, Lin Hao-Chiang Koong, Liang Yu-Chen, Zeng Yu-cheng, Zhan Kai-cheng and Liu Hsin-Yueh (2022). *International Journal of Online Pedagogy and Course Design* (pp. 1-15).

www.irma-international.org/article/incorporating-affective-computing-into-an-interactive-system-with-makeymakey/282723

A Blended Approach to Canadian First Nations Education: The SCcyber E-Learning Community

Norman Vaughan, Neepin Auger, Martin Sacher and Mavis Sacher (2018). *Student Engagement and Participation: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 1308-1329).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/a-blended-approach-to-canadian-first-nations-education/183568

The Politics of E-Learning: A Game Theory Analysis

Celia Romm-Livermore, Mahesh S. Raisinghani and Pierluigi Rippa (2016). *International Journal of Online Pedagogy and Course Design* (pp. 1-14).

www.irma-international.org/article/the-politics-of-e-learning/147742

NGCMS: Exploring and Supporting Effective Faculty Use

Youmei Liu (2005). *Course Management Systems for Learning: Beyond Accidental Pedagogy* (pp. 131-146).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/ngcms-exploring-supporting-effective-faculty/7179

Evolving On-Line Pedagogy: Developing Research-Based Multimedia Learning Tools for the High School and Undergraduate Biology "Classroom"

Jacqueline S. McLaughlin and Darin S. Munsell (2012). *International Journal of Online Pedagogy and Course Design* (pp. 1-20).

www.irma-international.org/article/evolving-line-pedagogy/61397