

DTIC FILE COPY

①

Changing Aptitude Achievement and Relationships in Instruction: A Comment

Sigmund Tobias

City College, CUNY

for

Contracting Officer's Representative
Michael Drilling

AD-A226 879

Basic Research
Michael Kaplan, Director

August 1990

DTIC
ELECTE
SEP 28 1990
S B D
Co



United States Army
Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

90 09 27 005

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

**A Field Operating Agency Under the Jurisdiction
of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel**

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

JON W. BLADES
COL, IN
Commanding

Research accomplished under contract
for the Department of the Army

City College, CUNY

Technical review by

George Lawton

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: This report has been cleared for release to the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) to comply with regulatory requirements. It has been given no primary distribution other than to DTIC and will be available only through DTIC or the National Technical Information Service (NTIS).

FINAL DISPOSITION: This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The views, opinions, and findings in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS --	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY --			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE --			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) ARI Research Note 90-92	
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) --			7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army Research Institute	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION City College, CUNY	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) --		7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) City College, CUNY 138th Convent Avenue New York, NY 10031		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER MDA903-82-C-0353		
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) PERI-BR		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 61102B	PROJECT NO. 74F	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. N/A
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Changing Aptitude Achievement Relationships in Instruction: A Comment				
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Tobias, Sigmund				
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Interim	13b. TIME COVERED FROM 82/09 TO 86/09	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1990, August	15. PAGE COUNT 11	
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Contracting Officer's Representative, Michael Drillings				
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	Instruction , Achievement ,	
			Cognition , Individual differences	
			Treatment ,	
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Findings of variable relationships between cognitive aptitudes and instructional outcomes were seen as a challenge to the aptitude treatment interaction paradigm. This paper points out that correlations between preceding and succeeding modules were generally as high as those between module outcomes and the 24 cognitive aptitudes. These data lend further support to the variability of the achievement treatment interaction formulation. Keywords:				
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Michael Drillings			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (202) 274-8722	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL PERI-BR

Changing Aptitude--Achievement Relationships in Instruction:

A Comment

Sigmund Tobias

City College, CUNY

Pat-Anthony Federico

Naval Personnel Research and Development Center

A recent study by Federico (1983) demonstrated that there was considerable variability in the relationships between different aptitudes and instructional outcomes. Federico suggested that such a lack of consistency raised questions regarding the usefulness of aptitude treatment interaction (ATI) research for instructional design. The purpose of this comment is to suggest some alternate interpretations of Federico's data indicating that the implications of these results for ATI research are more encouraging than was first apparent.

Federico administered 24 individual difference measures to 166 Navy trainees who completed a hierarchically organized, mastery based, computer managed instruction course consisting of 11 modules. The course required a mean of 101.7 hours of student time. The test scores were submitted to factor analysis and varimax rotation yielding seven orthogonal factors. Factor scores were then computed and correlated with subject's achievement on the modules. The pattern of correlations between factors and achievement on the modules shifted substantially,

from one module to another. Furthermore, the multiple correlation between scores on all factors and achievement was relatively modest, ranging from a high of .47 to a low of .23. These results were substantially similar to those reported by Burns (1980) using a brief instructional sequence dealing with an imaginary science.

Both Burns and Federico pointed out that their results were troublesome for the ATI paradigm which, of course, assumes that there is no one optimal instructional method for all individuals. Instead, it is hypothesized (Cronbach and Snow, 1977) that one method may be superior for students at one end of an individual difference continuum, whereas another may be optimal for students at a different point on the continuum. Variability in aptitude-outcome correlations, of course, indicates that the psychological processes required for mastery shift from one module to the next. The difficulties of such variability for ATI research were described by Tobias (1976) as follows.

"If the psychological processes demanded shift from what they were at task outset, the instructional strategies designed to teach that task similarly have to shift. In terms of ATI, then, method X, which is supposed to depend on ability x, and method Y which depends on ability y may both shift with respect to the abilities involved since these may have changed from those demanded earlier by the task. . . . Does it then make sense to develop several instructional methods when the degree to which they require different abilities is likely to change once the student has found his way into the task?" (p. 65).



on For	
RA&I	☒
3	☐
nced	☐
ation	
ution/	
bility Codes	
ail and/or	
Special	

Dist

A-1

In Federico's study the correlations between achievement of adjacent modules were also reproduced (Table 1, p. 160-161) These ranged from a low of .19 to a high of .48. In general, these zero order correlations between posttest scores on adjacent modules were approximately as high as the multiple correlations between the factor scores and achievement on the module. Table 1, adapted from Tables and 4 in Federico's paper reproduces the essential data.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Table 1 indicates that a single prior achievement measure, the posttest on the preceding module, predicted instructional outcome approximately as well as 24 individual difference measures used by Federico. Such results were anticipated (Tobias, 1976) is recommending that adapting instruction to individual differences in prior achievement, may lead to more stable results than the use of aptitudes. We are not suggesting that the posttest contains different information than that represented by the seven crystalized and fluid aptitude factors in Federico's data. Instead, the likelihood that the factor information may well be summarized in the posttest score makes the latter more convenient and stable for use in adaptive instruction. These results and those reported by Burns (1980) provide striking support for the viability of the achievement treatment formulation, compared to an aptitude-treatment approach.

Tobias (1976) predicted an inverse relationship between prior

Table 1. Multiple Correlations Between Factor Scores and Module Achievement Test Results,
and Correlations of Preceding with Succeeding Module Results.

Corre- lations	Module Scores										
	Mod 1	Mod 2	Mod 3	Mod 4	Mod 5	Mod 6	Mod 7	Mod 8	Mod 9	Mod 10	Mod 11
R	.34**	.45**	.23	.31**	.36**	.35**	.34**	.37**	.34**	.43**	.47**
r	-----	.41	.19	.19	.31	.48	.36	.24	.50	.35	.38

achievement and amount of instructional support required. "Instructional support was defined as the assistance given the learner by way of organizing the instructional content, maintaining student attention, eliciting responses, providing feedback on the responses and so on" (Tobias, 1982, p.5). It was suggested that students high in prior achievement may be assigned to a "lean" instructional strategy, whereas those low in prior achievement might require an augmented strategy providing various forms of assistance. The achievement-treatment formulation was revised (Tobias, 1982) to suggest that only those forms of instructional support which improved students macroprocessing, or the frequency and intensity of cognitive processing of instructional input, would improve achievement. If instructional support reduced student macroprocessing, no achievement increments would be expected.

It should be noted that the correlations between preceeding and succeeding modules in Federico's data do not have a motonic relationship. In a hierarchically organized course one would assume that adjacent modules should correlate most substantially, while the correlations of modules further removed from one another should decrease. This was not the case with the modules used in Federico's study. These results may suggest that these modules were not as hierarchically organized as had been assumed, and that, even though the course dealt with electricity, content differences from one module to the next were more substantial than first believed. These content differences may also help to explain the relatively modest correlation among different modules.

If the achievement treatment hypothesis were to be applied to adapt instruction to student differences, it might be advisable to

include some pretest items on succeeding modules in the outcome measures of prior learning. Such tests would be more useful in predicting which instructional method would lead to optimal achievement on succeeding modules, since posttests measure only what the student has mastered previously. Including some items drawn from the next module on posttests would improve the relationship with outcomes since content not included in the preceding module could then be sampled. Such a practice would, probably, substantially increase the correlations between prior outcomes and succeeding achievement making the achievement treatment formulation even more useful in practical situations.

The results reported both by Federico (1983) and by Burns (1980) provide clearcut support for the achievement treatment hypothesis. The stability of prior achievement-outcome correlations, compared to the relationships with aptitudes, attest to the usefulness of the achievement treatment formulation heuristically as well as making this approach useful for instructional design.

Footnote

1) Completion of this manuscript was facilitated by a grant to the first author from the Basic Research Program of the Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

References

- Burns, R. B. Relation of aptitudes to learning at different points in time during instruction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1980, 72, 785-795.
- Cronbach, L.J., & Snow, R.E. Aptitudes and instructional methods. New York: Irvington Press, 1977.
- Federico, P. A. Changes in the cognitive components of achievement as students proceed through computer-managed instruction. Journal of Computer-Assisted Instruction, 1983, 9, 156-168.
- Tobias, S. Achievement treatment interactions. Review of Educational Research, 1976, 46, 61-74.
- Tobias, S. When do instructional methods make a difference? Educational Researcher, 1982, 11, 4-9.