

Chapter 5.21

Programmed Instruction, Programmed Branching, and Learning Outcomes

Robert S. Owen

Texas A&M University-Texarkana, USA

Bosede Aworuwa

Texas A&M University-Texarkana, USA

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the principles of two qualitatively different and somewhat competing instructional designs from the 1950s and '60s, *linear programmed instruction* and *programmed branching*. Our hope is that an understanding of these ideas could have a positive influence on current and future instructional designers who might adapt these techniques to new technologies and want to use these techniques effectively. Although these older ideas do still see occasional study and debate (e.g., Dihoff, Brosvic & Epstein, 2003, 2004), many current instructional designers are probably unaware of the learning principles associated with these (cf., Fernald & Jordan, 1991; Kritch & Bostow, 1998).

BACKGROUND

An important difference between these instructional designs is associated with the use of feedback to the learner. Although we could provide a student with a score after completing an online multiple-choice quiz, applications that provide more *immediate feedback* about correctness upon completion of each individual question might be better. Alternatively, we could provide *adaptive feedback* in which the application provides elaboration based upon qualities of a particular answer choice.

Below is a discussion of two qualitatively different instructional designs, one providing immediate feedback regarding the correctness of a student's answer, the other providing adaptive feedback based on the qualities of the student's answer. Suitability of one design or the other is a

function of the type of learner and of the learning outcomes that are desired.

MAIN THRUST OF THE CHAPTER

Although the idea of non-human feedback would seem to imply a mechanical or electronic device, other methods could be used. Epstein and his colleagues, for example, have used a multiple-choice form with an opaque, waxy coating that covers the answer spaces in a series of studies (e.g., Epstein, Brosvic, Costner, Dihoff & Lazarus, 2003); when the learner scratches the opaque coating to select an answer choice, the presence of a star (or not) immediately reveals the correctness of an answer. Examples of the designs discussed below are based on paper books, but they are easily adaptable to technologies that use hyperlinks, drop-down menus, form buttons, and such.

Linear Programmed Instruction

The programmed psychology textbook of Holland and Skinner (1961) asked the student a question on one page (the quote below starts on page 2) and then asked the student to turn the page to find the answer and a new question:

“A doctor taps your knee (patellar tendon) with a rubber hammer to test your _____.”

The student thinks (or writes) the answer and turns the page to find the correct answer (“reflexes”) and is then asked another question.

Questions or statements are arranged in sequentially ordered *frames* such as the single frame above. A frame is completed when the student provides a response to a stimulus and receives feedback. Skinner contended that this method caused learning through *operant conditioning*, provided through positive *reinforcement* for stimuli that are designed to elicit a correct answer (c.f., Cook, 1961; Skinner, 1954, 1958).

Skinner (and others who use his methods) referred to his method as *programmed instruction*, which incorporates at least the following principles (cf., Fernald & Jordan, 1991; Hedlund, 1967; Holland & Skinner, 1958, 1961; Whitlock, 1967):

- Clear learning objectives.
- Small steps; frames of information repeat the cycle of stimulus-response-reinforcement.
- Logical ordered sequence of frames.
- Active responding by a student who works at his/her own pace.
- Immediate feedback to the response in each frame with positive reinforcement for correct answers.

A technique in programmed instruction is to help the student a great deal at first, and then gradually reduce the cues in latter frames; this is called *fading* (Fernald & Jordan, 1991; Reiff, 1980). If correct responding suggests that a student is learning at a quick rate, *gating* can be used to skip over frames that repeat prior information (Vargus & Vargus, 1991). The programmer is expected to use information about student performance to make revisions; if the student is not succeeding, then it is due to a fault of the program, not to an inability of the student (Holland & Skinner, 1961; Vargus & Vargus, 1991).

Programmed Branching

Crowder (e.g., 1959, 1963) and others (e.g., Pressey, 1963) were critical of Skinner’s approach, arguing that students not only learn from knowing a correct answer, but also learn by making mistakes. Crowder distinguished between his *automatic tutoring device* and the Skinner-type *teaching machine*, proposing that the automatic tutoring device is more flexible in allowing the student to receive an explanation when an error is made. Crowder (1959, pp. 110-111) provides an

4 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/programmed-instruction-programmed-branching-learning/27571

Related Content

Cultural Conceptions of Flipped Learning: Examining Asian Perspectives in the 21st Century

Shannon Skelcher (2017). *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education* (pp. 17-27).

www.irma-international.org/article/cultural-conceptions-of-flipped-learning/187017

Identifying Student Satisfaction in the Flipped English Class Enhanced With Clickers

Zhonggen Yu (2019). *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education* (pp. 25-40).

www.irma-international.org/article/identifying-student-satisfaction-in-the-flipped-english-class-enhanced-with-clickers/239834

User-Centered Design Principles for Online Learning Communities: A Sociotechnical Approach for the Design of a Distributed Community of Practice

Ben K. Daniel, David O'Brien and Asit Sarkar (2008). *Online and Distance Learning: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 1186-1198).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/user-centered-design-principles-online/27459

Influences on Student Performance in a University Networks and Telecommunications Course

Robert G. Brookshire, Tena B. Crews and Herbert F. Brown (2011). *Online Courses and ICT in Education: Emerging Practices and Applications* (pp. 300-310).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/influences-student-performance-university-networks/50192

Preservice Teachers Creating Electronic Portfolios

Katherine C. Wieseman (2005). *Encyclopedia of Distance Learning* (pp. 1508-1515).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/preservice-teachers-creating-electronic-portfolios/12306