


Chapter 10

The Future Role of Robert M. Gagné In Instructional Design

Rita C. Richey

Wayne State University

Instructional Technology is a field that has grown from two separate knowledge bases and two related areas of practical concern. Its original roots were in the study and construction of visual aids as teaching devices. This line of thinking is consistent with the current fascination with computers and their role in the delivery of instruction. The field's second major line of intellectual heritage emanated from instructional psychology, and provides the bases for many principles of instructional design theory and practice. Gagné has been a central figure in this infusion of psychology into the field, and indeed in the "creation" of the domain of instructional design. Today, the bulk of the research and theory in Instructional Technology is concentrated in the design domain (Seels & Richey, 1994).



Instructional design can be seen in terms of either macro-design procedures which provide overall direction to a design project (typically using instructional systems design principles) or micro-design that involves the design of lessons and instructional strategies which constitute those lessons. Gagné's contributions have been primarily in the development of micro-design principles and procedures. However, his work at the American Institutes for Research in Pittsburgh and at Florida State University tended to involve collaboration with experts in the systematic design of instruction, as well as in the psychology of learning (Briggs, Campeau, Gagné, & May, 1967; Gagné, Briggs, & Wager, 1992; Gagné & Dick, 1983).

Gagné's orientation to design, as summarized in Chapter 6, now serves as the crux of many other design models, such as in Instructional Transaction Theory (Merrill, 1999), Elaboration Theory (Reigeluth & Stein, 1983; Reigeluth, 1999), or the ARCS Model of Motivation Design (Keller, 1987). In each of these models, learning is fundamentally viewed as an internal process that is:

- Dependent upon past learning
- Stimulated and controlled by external events
- Expedited by instruction which varies depending upon the nature of the desired outcome, and
- Precipitated by the use of sequenced instructional strategies that provide motivation, direction, guided practice, feedback, and reinforcement.

These ideas emanate substantially from the work of Robert Gagné.

The principles promoted by Gagné provide not only a theoretical orientation to an instructional design project, but also have prompted a number of design conventions and techniques. For example, designers construct learning hierarchies as a technique by which they can determine the full sequence of content related to a given instructional objective, and the techniques have also been extended to designing and sequencing instructional programs. Designers use the events of instruction as a framework for lesson design, or the Gagné taxonomy of learning tasks to classify the objective of a particular lesson.

In the years since Gagné first began his research, instructional design was “born” as a field and began maturing as a profession, as well as an area of study. In many environments, it is considered a discipline unto itself (Richey, 1986). This development has also been accompanied by an expansion in the various environments in which designers work. Practitioners work in the military, corporate training arenas, the health care industry, the K–12 schools, and higher education. Gagné’s ideas are now embedded in each of these worlds of work. In addition, his design principles have been integrated into delivery systems of all types. They are relevant to designers who are producing both stand-up training and computer-based instruction. They are relevant to designers of simulation games and cooperative learning environments.

The key question in this chapter, however, is “To what extent will Gagné’s theories *continue* to influence the field as design research expands and as design practice changes in response to new demands and pressures?” While Gagné’s dominance has been assumed in the past, this question is not unrealistic in the current climate of growing alternative perspectives of both research and design processes. Today’s intellectual climate is subject to many pressures from new theoretical orientations, as well as from on-the-job demands for additional efficiency and effectiveness. These changing pressures and ideological influences may also control the impact of the Gagné design orientation.

Nonetheless, Gagné's influence has been so pervasive (as demonstrated in Chapters 6-9), that it is easy to find traces of Gagné theory even in the most divergent design orientations. The aim of this chapter is not so much to further identify Gagné's imprint on our field in *emerging* design theory and practice, but rather to analyze these trends in an effort to predict the stability and continuing relevance of his theory.

The Continuing Domination of Gagné Doctrines in Design Theory

Previously unvoiced challenges to traditional principles of instructional design theory are now surfacing in the field. To a great extent, these challenges stem from criticism of instructional design's heavy reliance upon general systems theory and conventional learning theory. New learning and instructional theory, especially those positions concerning the role of the learning task, the impact of the learner and learner control, and increased concern with the need for transfer of training, is closely related to Gagné's work. These innovations are presented within the context of constructivism, situated learning, and an even more pronounced emphasis on organizational performance improvement principles. As a whole, they raise the possibility of fairly profound changes in design practice.

The Emerging Tension Between Learner-Centered and Content-Oriented Instruction

Trends in Learner-Centered Instruction

Both the nature of the learning task and the nature of the learner guide instructional design procedures. With respect to the learning task, Gagné's work leads to an analysis of the content so that one can not only determine the sequence of a lesson, but also diagnose the prerequisite skills of the learner. Instructional strategies are also contingent upon the learning task, since they vary depending upon the type of task being addressed. For example, problem-solving tasks are taught differently from concept formation tasks. While learner characteristics are clearly important, traditionally, instructional design procedures have been controlled more by the *material* to be taught than by the *persons* receiving the instruction. This position is totally compatible with the objectives-oriented stance of instructional systems design models. However, to many it is also an outdated vestige of behavioral learning theory.

Currently, there are trends toward a change in this stance with much of the new theoretical thinking focusing more centrally on the learner, with content taking a somewhat secondary role (Richey, 1993). This is most evident in constructivist theory that posits that meaning and reality are functions of individual interpretation (Jonassen,

1991; Lebow, 1993), and learning itself is a process...

... in which the learner is building an internal representation of knowledge.

... This representation is constantly open to change, its structure and linkages forming the foundation to which other knowledge structures are appended.

Learning is an active process in which meaning is developed on the basis of experience (Bednar, Cunningham, Duffy, & Perry, 1992, p. 21).

Central to constructivism in its most extreme form is the rejection of the notion of an objective reality and the role of external events (i.e., external conditions of learning) as ways of promoting a common reality for a group of people (Duffy & Cunningham, 1996). In other words, the emphasis on an individual's internal processing of information is completely dominant. The learner and learning processes control, and even shape, the learning task.

In spite of the growing popularity of constructivist principles, many designers are uncomfortable with extreme constructivist positions. Dick's (1992) comments in this regard are noteworthy. He observes that educational interventions that are truly constructivist must necessarily provide the learner with almost total control of the instructional process, *including* the selection of objectives and learning activities. This is less because of an adherence to laissez-faire philosophy than it is to a belief that pre-designed instruction is meaningless since two individuals will seldom have the same interpretation or understanding of a particular event. This position minimizes the role of structured instructional activities, in favor of a more tutorial model of instructional facilitation. Merrill (1992) also argues against extreme constructivism by pointing out that while learners develop their own internal mental models in most instructional situations, they nonetheless do respond to and interact with abstractions and mental models of others. There is a functional, objective core of knowledge that can easily co-exist with individual interpretations and opinions of the knowledge.

Questions regarding the dominance of content are not confined, however, to constructivists. Many involved in design and development of instruction using the new and emerging technologies have also come to question traditional practice. Hannafin (1992) argues that traditional instructional design theory and models are most effective with "highly prescribed, objective outcomes and the organization of to-be-learned lesson content, not the largely unique and individual organization of *knowledge*" (p. 50). Instruction controlled by these pre-defined objectives then tends to be seen as only the transmission of knowledge, rather than the facilitation of learning. Kember and Murphy (1990) voice concerns that the product of such instruction is only surface, rather than deep learning. It is learning that is less likely to be transferred and used by the learner in

new situations.

It is predictable that constructivists and technology developers would find common ground in these arguments. The new technologies can facilitate levels of learner control previously unattainable. The technologies can give learners instant access to information, and the ability to link information. The technologies allow totally adaptable, interactive, and less structured designs and learning environments than were typical using traditional design orientations (Hannafin, 1992). Here the content becomes *part* of the learning environment, but the learner is more dominant.

Learner-Centered Design and Gagné

The learner-centered advocates, even those who espouse a more extreme position, do not have theoretical bases that are totally incompatible with Gagné's theory. He stresses the importance of prior knowledge and experience, self-regulated learning strategies, and learner motivation. However, there is a different perspective in the Gagné orientation. While Gagné uses learner characteristics as one basis of strategy selection, the pertinent learner considerations tend to relate to the cognitive processing of information—the nature and capacity of the learner's memory storage and processing skills, qualities that affect sensory perception, and attitudes that directly impinge on learning. These factors shape one's ability and motivation to achieve a given type of learning outcome. They define the learners' cognitive capabilities, prerequisite content knowledge, and interest in a particular topic, and become central to the design of those external conditions that promote learning. Learner characteristics, however, are critical to Gagné's theory primarily in the extent to which they are related to *pre-defined* learning objectives.

Learner involvement (as opposed to learner control) is also a critical aspect of Gagné's work, but learners' participation in the instructional process entails more than simply being engaged in a series of activities, the external performance aspect of instruction. Participation and activity also refer to internal involvement in the perception, storage, and retrieval of information. This is the core of Gagné's cognitive orientation, and the Events of Instruction are designed to promote internal, as well as external activities.

Current advocates of learner-centered instruction present arguments that are multi-faceted, including debates on at least two aspects of the problem:

- Who controls the instructional process, and what is the nature of such control?
and
- Which learner characteristics influence the selection and design of instructional strategies and how they should be addressed?

With respect to the first question, Gagné seems to suggest that the designer (or the instructor) has fundamental control of *instructional* processes that are external events, even though individuals always control their own learning processes, which are internal events. Superior design of instruction can facilitate learning efficiency, instructional effectiveness, transfer of training, and interest. In these respects then, the designer also exercises a certain amount of control by structuring the external conditions according to research-based principles in a manner that will facilitate internal learning and information processing. Learners and designer/instructors then share control of the teaching/learning process.

Although seldom framed in these terms, the issues surrounding control of instruction seem to have much to do with the type and extent of individualization that is desirable in a teaching/learning environment. Instructional technologists, in spite of the many interpretations of the term have always valued individualized instruction. Fundamentally, individualized instruction involves varying the teaching/learning procedures for each student. These variations occur by making different instructional decisions for different students. These decisions include:

- What and how much should one learn?
- When and where should one learn?
- What resources should one use to learn?
- How does one know when learning has occurred or when it has not?

The extent of individualization depends upon the number of decisions made for individuals as opposed for the class as a whole, and the extent to which learners assume control of the decisions regarding their own instruction. For example, an individualized setting may only involve self-pacing of instruction by the students with the content, materials, and testing procedures prescribed by the instructor. On the other hand, a program may be totally individualized with learners making all of their own decisions, and instructors serving as facilitators. Technologically-based delivery systems clearly expedite learner control. For example, most hypertext environments at the least allow students to control content selection, sequencing, and pacing.

Constructivists and many of those involved in using the new technologies to their fullest advantage, tend to advocate more total individualization. Such instruction is not necessarily incompatible with Gagné's principles of learning. Moreover, the compatibility is not dependent upon whether there is a structured or flexible approach to the management of its delivery. Learners can assume a major part of the control of the instruction, and the process can still be perfectly consistent with Gagné's theory. The

critical factor seems to be whether the design of this instruction has been grounded in an analysis of the subject matter and the learner prerequisites, not on whether students are involved in collaborative, active learning of highly relevant content.

In some respects, the second aspect of the learner-centered issue is more interesting—the most critical learner characteristics. Instructional design rooted in a content emphasis, as opposed to a learner emphasis, tends to highlight learner traits that are related in some way to the subject matter of the lesson, including:

- Prerequisite skills
- Background experiences which enhance prerequisites and/or interest in the topic of the lesson, or
- The learner's proficiency in those cognitive strategies required to master the content.

Designers are now considering other learner characteristics as well. For example, Richey (1992) has shown the direct impact on learning of other learner characteristics that are not content-related. With respect to adult learning in employee training environments, pertinent factors include learner attitudes toward the instructional delivery system and the organization delivering the training, the previous training experiences of learners, and their work experience. These learner attitudes and background experiences seem to predict not only the extent to which objectives are achieved during training, but also the extent of transfer. Other characteristics currently being studied include feminist thinking (Gilligan, 1982; Canada & Brusca, 1991) and other aspects of a person's cultural background.

It is possible for one to argue that these characteristics shape the cognitive strategies that a learner uses to address a particular piece of instructional content and, as such, are still within the Gagné tradition. Nonetheless, they do represent a line of thinking which, even though logically connected to Gagné's previous work, is suggesting new design procedures and emphases. It is one, however, which is consistent with Gagné's past thinking.

The Emerging Role of Context in Instructional Design

Theory Trends in Context-Centered Instruction

Another area of current theoretical expansion concerns the impact of context upon the teaching and learning process. Of interest, is not only the immediate teaching context, but also the pre-instructional (or orienting) context and the post-instructional (or transfer) contexts in which learners live and work (Richey, 1993; Richey & Tessmer, 1995;

Tessmer & Richey, 1997).

This trend of looking to contextual variables as predictors of learning effectiveness has emerged with the concurrent influence of performance technology, the quality movement, situated learning, systemic design, and once again, constructivism. The commonality among these divergent theories and movements is an interest in “meaningful” instruction, meaningful to the learner and meaningful to the society that expects to be improved as a result of an educated populace. In the past, such “meaning” has had important implications for the transfer of training from educational environments to real-life behavior. Today, it also has implications for organizational development and quality improvement.

Most instructional design procedures and principles are typically seen as being applicable to all settings. In spite of this, new instructional systems design procedural models are frequently developed in an effort to respond to the seemingly unique aspects of a given situation. This emphasis on situation-specific procedures is complemented by the ever increasing demands that education and training programs serve as quality improvement vehicles and solve specific organizational problems. Contextualization also reflects efforts to create motivating, relevant instruction. While this latter goal is not new, the pressures for intrinsically relevant instruction are increasing with the new emphases on adult education and training and the expectations of children and adolescents reared on action-oriented television. Finally, these events coincide with situated learning and constructivist emphases on “anchoring” instructional activities into meaningful contexts as a means for promoting long-term retention, understanding, and transfer of training. The issue is then an outgrowth of societal changes, as well as new theoretical biases.

The emphasis on context and environment is not unrelated to the learner-centered design thrust, since context is typically a matter of perceptions made by learners in light of their background experiences. Moreover, context emphases also tend to expand the number of factors addressed by designers, sometimes at the expense of instructional content considerations.

Contextualization is typically achieved not only through the topics of instruction, but also through the selection of examples and the nature of the practice exercises. Topics can be those that are currently issues in a particular setting. Examples can be drawn from the social or work culture of the students. Practice can be provided using what Brown, Collins, and Duguid (1989) would call authentic activities. Authenticism involves “ordinary practices of the culture” (p. 34), as opposed to hybrid activities that are more reflective of the education and training culture rather than the “real world.” Decontextualized environments, therefore, are not only created through the use of verbal

abstractions, but also through the use of examples and practice activities that are not reflective of the daily situations encountered by the learners. One can also create context-rich instruction by using problems, examples, and practice activities involving multiple contexts. In this way, instruction seems realistic, even though it is not “anchored” in a given context. This is not the typical approach, however, in many of the newer approaches to context in instruction.

Current emphases on context have the potential of changing design procedures by not only expanding the needs assessment, evaluation, and systems maintenance phases, but also by altering the nature of the instructional strategies themselves. The ultimate goal is instruction that is less abstract, more applied, and more responsive to external realities than had previously been the case.

Context-Centered Design and Gagné

Streibel (1991) summarizes the fundamental difference, in his opinion, between Gagné’s theory of instruction and that of situated learning with respect to contextual issues. He sees environmental factors in the Gagné tradition as playing the role of triggering stimuli in a teaching/learning situation, rather than serving as causes of behavior. While this characterization may be debatable, the point is well made that context is not as central in the Gagné theory as it is in many current orientations, and the question at hand involves the extent of this deviation. This issue can be analyzed in terms of the implications of context for transfer of training as well as long-term retention—elements that are not unrelated and need to be considered together.

Transfer of training, from Gagné’s perspective, is a function of the extent to which a learner has:

- The required prerequisite knowledge and skills
- The ability to recall prior learning, and
- Developed those cognitive strategies appropriate for the task.

The first is a function of content and background, rather than contextual elements of the instruction. The latter two elements, however, are impacted by context. The ability to recall needed prior learning is a function, in part, of whether the material to be recalled was originally presented within a meaningful contextual framework. If so, it is far easier to recall. Moreover, the contextual anchoring of past instruction in a variety of novel problem-solving tasks not only enhances meaning, but also develops cognitive strategies used in problem solving and transfer of training. Gagne, therefore, tends to advocate context-rich instruction by systematically using alternative contexts for practice,

rather than emphasizing the dimensions of only one environment.

What is more likely to strengthen transfer, generalization, or context-embedded instruction? Clark and Voogel (1985) conclude, “the extent of transfer is determined, in part, by the amount of decontextualization achieved during instruction” (p. 119) but that the issue is also dependent upon the nature of the learning task and the type of transfer anticipated. Procedural knowledge is more conducive to near transfer (i.e. transfer of skills to situations that are similar to those in which the instruction occurred), while concepts and principles are more appropriate for far, or more generalized, transfer situations. Moreover, Clark and Voogel (1985) assert that the two types of transfer are not compatible; one is typically emphasized at the expense of the other, even though all transfer is highly dependent upon learner abilities. In this vein, Gagné would likely assert that even though putting instruction into a meaningful context is important, instruction that is dominated by examples from real-life situations is not necessarily in the best position to promote the process of *far* transfer. This point, which has been introduced by Fields in Chapter 7, is one important part of the discussion of differences between Gagné and the advocates of highly context-centered instruction.

Perkins and Salomon (1989) in essence have discussed the same issue, but in terms of the dichotomy between the roles of general strategic knowledge (i.e. decontextualized) and specialized domain knowledge (i.e. contextualized) as predictors of effective problem solving. They conclude that transfer is a highly specific phenomenon and while all specific applications need to consider contextual factors, there is a need to have an “intimate intermingling of generality and context-specificity in instruction” (p. 24). This seems not so very different from Gagné’s position of embedding context within the instructional strategies, even though the ultimate goal is to facilitate far transfer.

There is a second aspect of Gagné’s work and orientation that needs to be considered when discussing the role of context in promoting both transfer of training and long-term retention—namely, the role of the enterprise schema (see Chapter 5). An enterprise is a complex *purposive* performance involving multiple, related instructional goals. It is a higher level goal than is frequently used in many education and training programs. An enterprise is represented in one’s memory by a schema that relates these larger goals (typically presented as a realistic application task) to their prerequisite skills and knowledge. The schema is a mental model that serves as the basis for retention and retrieval, as well as transfer.

The emphasis on integrated instructional goals corresponds with an emphasis on purposive, relevant instruction. While such instruction is designed with transfer in mind, it may not be authentic in the same sense promoted by advocates of situated cognition

that seems to view learning as more of an enculturation process. The notions of integrated goals and enterprise schema tend to relate more to *generalized* transfer and a de-emphasis of declarative and procedural learning as an end unto itself. While Gagné would undoubtedly use contextualized examples and practice activities, it is unlikely that he would advocate always rooting instruction in a *single*, even though relevant, context. The most useful enterprise schema is somewhat generic—applicable to a variety of specific enterprises in which one might become engaged. Of course, much instruction, especially that of a training nature, is oriented only toward specific performance-oriented objectives that are more conducive to near transfer, and these situations often demand strategies which utilize a given context.

In summary, Gagné's orientation to context is not totally incompatible with current thinking insofar as it stems from a cognitive orientation. Gagné continues to strive for instruction that primarily addresses higher levels of learning and aspires to far reaching transfer as opposed to specific applications of content. Effective instruction is relevant to learners' needs as well as being appropriate to their skill levels, and shows application in a variety of contexts rather than being "anchored" in only one environment. While procedural knowledge relates to more specific uses, the goal, nonetheless, is to use such knowledge in combination with other skills and knowledge for creative problem solving. Ultimately, Gagné's design theory is generic in nature. It is theory that is applicable to all contexts, all types of content, and all types of learners.

The Stability of the Gagné Orientation to Theory

A clear trend in design theory over the past fifty years has been its continual expansion. There is more research. There is more theory construction. Just as Gagné responded to the issues that were critical during his most productive years, today's scholars are responding to a new set of concerns. While it is evident that the new theorizing is sometimes charting new waters, for the most part new theory is not antithetical to the old and, it continues to build upon Gagné's foundational work. It is likely that Gagné's primary positions will remain current to the extent that:

- Cognitive learning principles continue to be accepted
- Design continues to be viewed as a generic activity, and
- Instructional content and strategies continue to be pre-specified and analyzed.

There are now alternatives to each of these perspectives that present radically new design orientations. Their acceptance as more mainstream theory could modify Gagné's impact on future theory development.

The Continuing Domination of Gagné Doctrines in Design Practice

As with theory, the world of design practice is also undergoing changes that were previously unanticipated. These changes are, on the whole, reactions to demands for increased design efficiency. Such concerns are especially reflected in current efforts to enhance the traditional instructional systems design models and to reduce design cycle time.

In the preface to the first edition of *The Conditions of Learning* (1965) Gagné indicated that the impetus for this book was to explain “what is known about the process of learning that can be put to use in designing better education” (p. v). This reflects the fundamentally practical nature of instructional design. From one edition to the next, *The Conditions of Learning* became increasingly more practice oriented, and the final edition included four chapters describing specific design and analysis procedures and techniques. His last examination of the conditions of learning was a full exploration of their applicability to modern training environments (Gagné & Medsker, 1996). The question now is basically the same as was posed with respect to his theoretical contributions. Will Gagné’s design and development techniques continue to provide direction for the typical practitioner?

In the past, much of Gagné’s direction for practice has related to techniques for varying designs in terms of the type of learning task, for using learning hierarchies as a pre-design content analysis tool, and for using the events of instruction as a guide for the design of lessons and the selection of instructional strategies. Clearly these tactics are bi-products of Gagné design theory. While their continued use by the typical practitioner is dependent upon the stability of this underlying theory, such use is also greatly affected by the realities of the everyday world of work.

The Continuing Dominance of Conditions and Outcomes-Based Design

Gagné’s contributions to instructional design relate to the premise that learning is brought about by arranging different instructional conditions for different types of learning tasks. Gagné has identified five different domains of learning outcomes, and has suggested varying conditions that are likely to lead to a learner achieving each of these types of goals. (These have been discussed in Chapter 3.) This approach is foundational to most instructional design models and is, by and large, still dominant among current designers who have been formally trained in the field.

While there are currently more advocates of alternative design positions than has previously been the case, this principle seems to be essentially unchallenged by

practicing designers. It is not that other instructional foundations have not been suggested, such as the developmental level of the learner, or the use of reinforcement. While Gagné's conditions of learning recognize the role of such elements, the basic principle remains—instruction should vary depending upon what is to be learned.

Constructivists who do not accept this assumption voice the only major dissention to this position

Indeed, from a constructivist viewpoint it is not possible to isolate units of information or make a priori assumptions of how the information will be used. Facts are not simply facts to be remembered in isolation (Bednar et al., 1992, p. 23).

Gagné (as have most instructional designers) has often noted the futility of teaching isolated facts, even though he would nonetheless argue that such content could be classified. It is far more common today for the Gagné position to be supported with respect to this issue, and there is no indication that his basic premise will not remain essentially in tact. Other elements of design practice according to Gagné, however, are to some extent more debatable, even though they too are prevalent among practitioners.

The Continuing Dominance of Pre-Design Analysis

Gagné's emphasis on pre-design content analysis coincides with the tenets of general systems theory. The use of the learning hierarchy tool facilitates such analysis as well as the identification of necessary learner prerequisites. Today there are two seemingly opposing trends. The first is to expand the analysis stage to accommodate a wider range of design variables in an effort to promote transfer of training (Richey, 1995). The second is a recognition that many expert designers use other methods that do not depend upon such analysis (Tripp, 1994). Both trends are occurring in the midst of extreme pressure, especially in the world of business, to reduce the design cycle time.

Before predicting the continuing influence of Gagné with respect to pre-design analysis, it is important to try to do justice to his position. With respect to the use of analysis and the construction of learning hierarchies, Gagné has cautioned against rigid use of the technique. For example, he recognizes that a learning hierarchy is not necessarily the sequence by which an *individual* learner will acquire a particular capability, rather it is the most probable route to transfer of training for most people. He also cautions against emphasizing verbal knowledge in a hierarchy at the expense of the underlying intellectual skills. (See Gagné's full explanations of these points in his 1968 article "Learning Hierarchies" in Chapter 2.)

The Future Role of Robert M. Gagné in Instructional Design; Rita C. Richey

These arguments (made more than 30 years ago) may anticipate, at least in part, current analysis trends. The expansion of the analysis phase today represents not only the increased attention being given to learner characteristics and context, but also a new adherence to designing instruction focused upon larger content units. This latter move is, of course, consistent with Gagné and Merrill's advocacy of integrated goals as well as Gagné's initial position favoring hierarchies that focus on larger intellectual skills rather than discrete pieces of knowledge. The increased use of analysis is a direct extension of Gagné thinking, even though there may be some debate as to the legitimate focus of such analytic activity.

On the other hand, the findings of recent designer decision-making research draw a picture of expert designers working in a far less structured manner, responding spontaneously to situations which "trigger opportunistic excursions that yield unexpected insights into the problem" (Tripp, 1994, p. 117). However, Tripp also cites other research that shows designers using a *combination* of systematic analysis and opportunistic tactics. While Gagné has not specifically addressed this topic, it seems likely that he would support the latter approach.

Most designers today are under great pressure to produce a product in a shorter period of time than one would think realistic. While they know those procedures that are "textbook perfect," they face daily demands to take shortcuts. The first steps to be slashed typically relate to evaluation and a detailed analysis of both content and needs. However, many designers are seeking ways to adhere to the time-proven methods and still be realistic in a business sense. Rather than sacrificing pre-design analysis standards, one salvation may be the use of computer-based design tools. Those tools that relate to content analysis, however, are based for the most part on Gagné techniques. Gustafson and Reeves (1990), Merrill, Li, and Jones (1990) completed early work in this area. Spector, in Chapter 8, describes other related work.

Another current effort to increase the efficiency, as well as the effectiveness, of the typical design task involves the use of rapid prototyping. Tripp and Bichelmeyer (1990) describe this methodology as one in which "after a succinct statement of needs and objectives, research and development are conducted as parallel processes that create prototypes, which are then tested and which may or may not evolve into a final product" (p. 35). As with the use of computer-based design, rapid prototyping builds upon traditional design practice although the stages are not linear in nature (Jones, Li, & Merrill, 1992). Content analysis in the Gagné tradition, however, is central to the early rapid prototyping stages in a similar fashion to its use in conventional systematic design. Nelson, in Chapter 9, has introduced both of these applications of technology to Gagné's work. He demonstrates the ability of traditional practice tools, many of which were

introduced by Gagné, to transcend the changes being interjected in the new design work environments.

The Continuing Dominance of the Events of Instruction

Another important tool for designers has been the use of Gagné's Events of Instruction. The Events serve as a conceptual model for the design of lessons, the selection of instructional strategies, and the sequencing of instruction. In essence the Events summarize much of the key research related to instruction, including factors such as motivation, perception, feedback, reinforcement, individual differences, retention, and transfer. They provide a framework for creating those external conditions that promote learning.

Inherent in the Events is the notion of designer control of instructional options. While this is at odds with some constructivist theory, it is nonetheless consistent with the vast majority of the design practice in education and training environments today. The Events have been used regardless of the delivery medium, encompassing everything from stand-up training to computer-based instruction. For many expert designers the Events are now an internalized model that guides their work on a seemingly intuitive level. This is reflective of Duffy and Jonassen's (1991) assertion that "while instructional designers typically may not have the time or support to explicitly apply a theory of learning during a design or development task, the theory is nonetheless an integral part of the instruction that is produced" (p. 7).

While some may disagree on the particular strategy that is best for a given situation, there is little disagreement with the Events of Instruction themselves because they summarize key *stages* in the instructional process which have been repeatedly validated in the research literature. For example, conscious learning in a formal instructional environment requires attending to the topic and guidance, as well as reinforcement. While there are various strategies for accomplishing these tasks, one must be selected. As such, the general framework provided by the Events remains constant.

To a great extent the Events framework is likely to remain useful even in situations which have student-controlled sequencing of learning activities, as is more frequently the case in computer-based instruction. This is because the instructional events still need to be programmed and available for learner use. While it is likely that multiple strategies and activities will be incorporated into a particular piece of instruction, each of the various functions of instruction (as suggested by the Events model) must still be accommodated. Such structure is as appropriate for designing individualized environments, as it has proven to be for the design of teacher-directed instruction.

The Stability of Gagné's Orientation to Practice

Gagné has consistently argued that instructional design practice should be based upon what we know about human learning. This position is seemingly axiomatic. Since it is unclear to most that the field currently has a completely accurate view of all human learning, it is possible that the stability of Gagné's orientation to design practice is assured because of our tendency to combine ideas from a variety of plausible explanations of the learning process.

However, practice techniques, even when based upon complex theory, often tend to be streamlined and simplified. Perhaps this accounts for the fact that there has been less debate related to design practice than theory, and for many of Gagné's practice techniques to remain current even in the midst of great theoretical debate. Bednar, et al. (1992) are not satisfied with the field's tendency to create a patchwork collection of tools and techniques that have been abstracted from different (and often conflicting) theories being used in a given design project. They argue that this eclectic approach does *not* produce the most effective instruction.

In any case, Gagné's basic orientation has become ensconced in design tradition, even *with* the emergence of new theory. Most trained instructional designers select their design focus depending upon the nature of the learning task, and are likely to continue this practice. Most will continue to conduct some sort of pre-design content analysis as a precursor to sequencing and identification of prerequisite skills—even if they do not overtly use the learning hierarchy tool. Most will continue to select instructional strategies based upon a general Events of Instruction framework—even if it is internalized and not consciously used. To some extent this begs the question of whether expert designers who demonstrate alternative design decision-making patterns are really deviating from the Gagné tradition or are still using the same principles.

If major deviations from the Gagné orientation do occur, it is typically because time limitations are posing barriers to their use. Such pressures are leading to a reexamination of design practice. However, most expert designers are increasing design efficiency using the same basic orientation, rather than making a sharp break with past tradition. Dick (1993) calls this process the *enhancement* of the instructional systems design process. Even time saving design models such as Tessmer and Wedman's (1990) Layers of Necessity approach, which suggests a way to streamline the process given the demands of a given situation, does not radically change the fundamental orientation to design. Therefore, the basic Gagné approach will continue to provide direction to the field, even with changes and advancements in design tools and techniques.

Conclusion

Robert Gagné has substantially shaped a new field of instructional design during his career as a psychologist. He made enormous contributions and had an enormous impact as both a researcher and a practitioner. While design has been called a “linking science,” Gagné himself has also served a linking role throughout his career. He has linked the heyday of behavioral psychology with the dominance of cognitive psychology. He has linked the field’s emphasis on designing educational programs for children with an emphasis on designing training programs for adults in the military and in business settings. He has linked basic learning research to applied educational research. He has linked theory to practice.

In his more than 50 years of active work, Gagné explored the complex processes of learning and instruction, and explained them to generations of designers in a simple, understandable way. In the process he has demonstrated his true genius. Gagné’s work was spurred on by important social events that highlighted its importance and need for the general public rather than only a small intellectual community. There was an urgent need for efficient, effective training early in World War II. The Sputnik crisis in the 1950s highlighted the need for American schools to reinforce mathematics and science education. American corporations looked to education and training as an avenue to retool their workforces and to meet foreign competition. His research and the successful application of this research in a variety of settings provided evidence of its relevance and practicality. In addition, its legitimacy was rooted in scientific authority and superior academic credentials.

Gagné’s ideas were part of other prominent intellectual movements over the years, including behavioral and cognitive psychology, general systems theory, and the early explorations into the nature of instructional theory. He was a contemporary of other giants of the world of education scholarship, including persons such as Benjamin Bloom, Jerome Bruner, John Carroll, Robert Glaser, and Ralph Tyler. In retrospect, there was a social and intellectual climate in the United States that was conducive to the proliferation and acceptance of Gagné’s work.

Today, the field of instructional design has grown. It has many areas of specialization, many delivery options, and many alternative theoretical perspectives that command considerable support. Furthermore, there are far more people involved in the field. This growth in itself is testament to Gagné’s work. However, this more complex environment may greatly reduce the possibilities of one person alone exercising the same over-arching dominance of a Robert Gagné.

Yet Gagné’s influence is surely attributed to more than “being in the right place at the

right time.” Ultimately, his influence is a product of the power of his ideas. His influence is a product of those seemingly simple principles, which most of us are still re-examining. We continue to find that Gagné’s principles provide new meaning and new direction. Perhaps his influence will be even more important though, as designers evaluate his contributions and build upon them, devising new approaches and theory to solve new problems. Is that not the power of an intellectual legacy?

References

- Bednar, A. K., Cunningham, D., Duffy, T. M., & Perry, J. D. (1992). Theory into practice: How do we link? In T. M. Duffy & D. H. Jonassen (Eds.), *Constructivism and the technology of instruction: A conversation* (pp. 91–98). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Briggs, L. J., Campeau, P. L., Gagné, R. M., & May, M. A. (1967). *Instructional media: A procedure for the design of multi-media instruction, a critical review of research, and suggestions for future research*. Pittsburgh: American Institutes for Research. (ED 024 278)
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18 (1), 32–42. (EJ 386 603)
- Canada, K., & Brusca, F. (1991). The technological gender gap: Evidence and recommendations for educators and computer-based instruction designers. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 39 (2), 43–51.
- Clark, R. E., & Voogel, A. (1985). Transfer of training principles for instructional design. *Educational Communications and Technology Journal*, 33 (2), 113–125. (EJ 322 489)
- Dick, W. (1992). An instructional designer’s view of constructivism. In T. M. Duffy & D. H. Jonassen (Eds.), *Constructivism and the technology of instruction: A conversation* (pp. 17–34). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Dick, W. (1993). Enhanced ISD: A response to changing environments for learning and performance. *Educational Technology*, 33 (2), 12–16.
- Duffy, T. M., & Cunningham, D. J. (1996). Constructivism: Implications for the design and delivery of instruction. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology* (pp. 170–198). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.
- Duffy, T. M., & Jonassen, D. H. (1991). Constructivism: New implications for instructional technology? *Educational Technology*, 31 (5), 7–12.
- Gagné, R. M. (1965). *The conditions of learning*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Gagné, R. M. (1968). Learning hierarchies. *Educational Psychologist*, 6, 1–9.
- Gagné, R. M., & Dick, W. (1983). Instructional psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 34, 261–295.
- Gagné, R. M., & Medsker, K. L. (1996). *The conditions of learning: Training applications*. Fort

The Future Role of Robert M. Gagné in Instructional Design; Rita C. Richey

Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Gagné, R. M., Briggs, L. J., & Wager, W. W. (1992). *Principles of instructional design* (4th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gustafson, K. L. & Reeves, T. C. (1990). IDioM: A platform for a course development expert system. *Educational Technology*, 30 (3), 19–25. (EJ 407 306)

Hannafin, M. J. (1992). Emerging technologies, ISD, and learning environments: Critical perspectives. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 40 (1), 49–63. (EJ 446 171)

Jonassen, D. H. (1991). Objectivism versus constructivism: Do we need a new philosophical paradigm? *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 39 (3), 5–14. (EJ 436 301)

Jones, M. K., Li, Z., & Merrill, M. D. (1992). Rapid prototyping in automated instructional design. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 40 (4), 95–100. (EJ 462 865)

Keller, J. M. (1987). The systematic process of motivational design. *Performance and Instruction*, 26 (10), 1–8. (EJ 363 840)

Kember, D., & Murphy, D. (1990). Alternative new directions for instructional design. *Educational Technology*, 30 (8), 42–47. (EJ 413 718)

Lebow, D. (1993). Constructivist values for instructional systems design: Five principles toward a new mindset. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 41 (3), 4–16. ((EJ 471 175)

Merrill, M. D. (1992). Constructivism and instructional design. In T. M. Duffy & D. H. Jonassen (Eds.), *Constructivism and the technology of instruction: A conversation* (pp. 99–114). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Merrill, M. D. (1999). Instructional transaction theory (ITT): Instructional design based on knowledge objects. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional-design theories and models, Volume II: A new paradigm of instructional theory* (pp. 397–424). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Merrill, M. D., Li, Z., & Jones, M. K. (1990). Second generation instructional design (ID2). *Educational Technology*, 30 (2), 7–14. (EJ 407 275)

Merrill, M. D., Li, Z.; & Jones, M. K. (1991). Instructional transaction theory: An introduction. *Educational Technology*, 31 (6), 7–12.

Perkins, D. N., & Salomon, G. (1989). Are cognitive skills context-bound? *Educational Researcher*, 18 (1), 16–25. (EJ 386 601)

Reigeluth, C. M. (1999). The elaboration theory: Guidance for scope and sequence decisions. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional-design theories and models, Volume II: A new paradigm of instructional theory* (pp. 425–453). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

The Future Role of Robert M. Gagné in Instructional Design; Rita C. Richey

- Reigeluth, C. M., & Stein, F. S. (1983). The elaboration theory of instruction. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional design theories and models* (pp. 338–381). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Richey, R. C. (1986). *The theoretical and conceptual bases of instructional design*. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Richey, R. C. (1992). *Designing instruction for the adult learner: Systemic training theory and practice*. London: Kogan Page, Ltd. (ED 367 306)
- Richey, R. C. (1993). Instructional design theory and a changing field. *Educational Technology*, 33 (2), 16–21.
- Richey, R. C. (1995). Trends in instructional design: Emerging theory-based models. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 8 (3), 97–111.
- Richey, R. C., & Tessmer, M. (1995). Enhancing instructional systems design through contextual analysis. In B. Seels (Ed.), *Instructional design fundamentals: A reconsideration* (pp. 187–197). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Seels, B. B., & Richey, R. C. (1994). *Instructional technology: The definition and domains of the field*. Washington, DC: Association for Educational Communications and Technology.
- Striebel, M. J. (1991). Instructional plans and situated learning: The challenge of Suchman's theory of situated action for instructional designers and instructional systems. In G. J. Anglin (Ed.), *Instructional technology: Past, present, and future* (pp. 117–132). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Tessmer, M., & Richey, R. C. (1997). The role of context in learning and instructional design. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 45 (2), 85–115. (EJ 546 269)
- Tessmer, M., & Wedman, J. F. (1990). A layers-of-necessity instructional development model. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 38 (2), 77–85.
- Tripp, S. D. (1994). How should instructional designers be educated? *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 7 (3), 116–126. (EJ 488 352)
- Tripp, S., & Bichelmeyer, B. (1990). Rapid prototyping: An alternative instructional design strategy. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 38 (1), 31–44. (EJ 412 118)