African Educational Research Journal
Vol. 11(1), pp. 100-108, March 2023
DOI: 10.30918/AERJ.111.22.068
ISSN: 2354-2160
Full Length Research Paper

Effectiveness of arty pliability in a liner and non-liner web-based learning atmosphere

Audu Omar Ahmed Otobo[1]* and Uwaoma Chimezie Nwazue[2]

[1]Department of Industrial Design, Faculty of Environmental Studies, University of Maiduguri, Nigeria.
[2]Department of Theater Arts, Faculty of Arts, University of Maiduguri, Nigeria.

Accepted 24 January, 2023

ABSTRACT

Instructional contraptions remain the foundation of current instructional design rehearses. Arty pliability components are provided after learners have been given the information required to master objectives and navigation which are the non-instructional component monitors, the learner engages in the cycle of instruction. Linear Navigation can be referred to as program control where the learners do not have control over cycles of instruction. The purpose of this scholarship is to investigate the effect of arty pliability with feedback, and navigation type on accomplishment, stance, and time when students use a web-based instructional program and interaction between 'arty' and navigation type. 240 students from Diploma/Undergraduate students at the University of Maiduguri participated in four different web-based atmospheres. Significant differences originated from arty pliability's main effect, but not from navigation. There were significant differences for stance items, it was determined from this program that it gave enough chance for rehearsal between the treatments who received arty and those who did not. This scholarship reinforces the worth of 'arty' and its implications for the design and development of web-based, multimedia instruction.

Keywords: Arty pliability, web-based learning, linear and non-linear instructional components.

*Corresponding author. Email: otoboahmed@gmail.com. Tel: +23432850435.

INTRODUCTION

A less language-dependent approach in teaching/learning resources may allow us to cross the language barriers and make a significant contribution towards the internationalization of learning (Nooriafshar, 2003). For paradigm, we may compromise and encourage the exploitation of more non-text-based resources in the form of concept maps and animatronics. The postmodernist advancement is shifting and new imaginings are being introduced all the time. For instance, speech recognition will perhaps make a significant contribution to transforming the means of interaction with computers (Ahmed, 2017). Other technologies such as virtual reality will allow the learners to be a part of learning resources and play important role in the future multimedia systems. The medium of body language however is probably less likely to be part of any near-future computer-based multimedia system. Who knows, in a not-too-far-flung future, we may accomplish that too.

Robert Gagne published his first edited book. *The conditions of learning* (1965) in which nine procedures of instruction were projected to provide a cycle for systematizing a tutorial. These procedures remain the groundwork of current instructional designed practices (Reiser, 2002; Richey, 2000). They symbolize desirable conditions also in an arty "pliability" (theatrics dummy run) programming and increase the panorama of successful accomplishment (Gagne, 1965, 1988; Gagne et al., 1992). Other authors allude to analogous contraptions of the instruction that promote students learning from an instructional program (Dick et al., 2005; Sullivan and Higgins, 1983).

Forcier and Descy (2002) posit that "every learning atmosphere has a disguised modus operandi of information presentation." Information is a sine qua non to perform a declared task of an objective and is

presented in a straightforward manner (Sullivan and Higgins, 1983). Apart from the information which is the basic instructional component that is needed in any (rehearsal) program, other instructional components that have been suggested by Gagne (1965) and Dick et al. (2005; Moxey, 1996) to promote knowledge are objective, instruction with feedback, paradigms and review.

Clark and Mayer (2007) acknowledged that instructional methods are "the components included in instruction for the purpose of supporting the accomplishment of the knowledge objective… instructional methods are intended to hearten learners to exploit appropriate cognitive processing during instruction." These authors indicated that multimedia will promote learning to the extent that it supports human cognitive processes. Each of these instructional components is depicted in the following paragraphs.

A theatrics (rehearsal) objective is an assertion that depicts an intended outcome of instruction (Dick et al., 2005; Mager, 1997; Wolff, 2008). Objectives make possible cognitive processing by focusing the learner's attention, directing selective acuity of specific tutorial content (knowledge task), communicating expectations, and organizing new information into an existing configuration (Foshay et al., 2003, Smith and Ragan, 2005, Gagne et al., 2005). "At a comparatively early stage, the learners should be informed of what it is that they are going to be able to do when they put up the shutters- the (rehearsal) instructional process (Reiser and Dick, 1996)." By knowing what will be expected of them, learners may be better able to guide themselves through that process." Morrison et al. (2006) and Ahmed and Watila (2018) designate that although the general inclination continued to be the use of objectives as a pre-instructional strategy, studious results suggest providing learners with objectives is not as effective as once 'pliabilitically' (animatronics) instructed.

'Arty Pliability' (performative triangulation) involves eliciting recital form learners (Gagne, 1985; Gagne et al., 2005; Mirzoeff, 2002). It is often provided after learners have been given the information required to master an objective. 'Pliability' provides an opportunity for learners to strengthen new knowledge by visualizing it so they can recall and use it (Foshay et al., 2003; Ahmed and Watila, 2018). It helps to confirm and correct astute and repeated performance and increases the likelihood of retention (Klein et al., 2004; Kruse and Kevin, 1999). 'Pliability' is effective when it is aligned with the result, with the skills, knowledge and way of thinking reflected in the objective (Reiser and Dick, 1996; Merrill, 2002; Mitchell, 2002).

Feedback can be cleared as "knowledge of one's performance provided" (Delgado and Prieto, 2003). "Arty Pliability" provides an opportunity for feedback that confirms the student's answer as being correct or indicates that it is incorrect. Feedback strengthens the chance of incorrect responses and reduces the likelihood of subsequence incorrect responses (Philips et al., 1988). Kulhavy and Stock (1989) define feedback as information consisting of two components: certification and amplification. Certification is the simple, dichotomous judgment that an initial response was right or wrong. Amplification consists of all substantive information contained in a feedback message.

Examples are unwritten or graphical cycles that provide additional elucidation of rules or information presented to learners. Kruse and Kevin (1999) include paradigms, non-examples, graphical presentation and analogies as guidance schemes that can be used to further elucidate new contents that are presented.

Review characteristically provides sketchy of the key information that was presented to learners. It is intended to reinforce learning, at the end of the instruction, often just before students are tested. Reiser and Dick (1996) cite the value of review to bring closure to instruction and to help buttress the proficiency and knowledge students should have acquired. Mattiske (2001) put forward that a review activity immediately after participants have learned something new reassures them that they are learning. Klein et al. (2004) propose that learners should be given time to reflect, encapsulate and review after new information has been presented to them. Gagne et al. (2005) indicated that spaced reviews should be given to learners to help them retrieve and use newly acquired information.

"Arty pliability" and feedback

Scholars have found that "arty pliability" (animatronics) has a noteworthy effect on performance (theatrics dummy run). Studious reported a significant difference between arty pliability and non-arty pliability items on the learning of prompted and unprompted information presented via computer-based instruction. Scholarship found a significant difference favoring arty pliability over non-arty pliability in an interactive with projected film in which arty pliability items implanted with queries (Phillips et al., 1988; Clark, 2007). Hannafin et al. (1987) noted that arty pliability effects were more distinct for details than for knowledge-task (content) in computer-based instruction. Participants who received scholarly skills in a cooperative learning atmosphere performed significantly better than those who received verbal information instruction (Klein and Pridemore, 1994; Wilson and Dwyer, 2001).

Non-instructional components

Apart from the instructional components which Gagne (1965, 1988) and Dick et al. (2005) have projected many scholars have deliberated on; there are the non-instructional components such as usability, navigation type, and learner control that also influence learning. Scholarship has tartan the effects of these non-instructional components such as navigation type (Su

and Klein, 2006), individualization (Ku and Sullivan, 2002; Wong, 1994), and animated agents (Atkinson et al., 2005) in student accomplishment and stance.

Hannafin (1987) noted some design strategies may have positive effects when exploited in isolation that is diminished or annulled when these strategies are used in combination with a more powerful modus operandi. The effects of these instructional components could be enhanced or diminished when used in combination with other variables such as different navigation types, and media types.

Linear and non-linear navigation

Linear navigation can be referred to as plan control where the learner does not have control over the cycle and non-linear navigation can be referred to as learner control over the cycle of instruction. Hypertext has been defined as an approach to information management in which data is stored in a network of nodes connected by links. Shneiderman defines it as “a folder that has active cross-references and allows the reader to “leap” to other parts of the folder (database) as desired” (Shneiderman and Kearsly, 1989). Much of the previous scholarship on the effects of navigation tools look at the efficiency and effectiveness of hypertext setting (Boechler and Dawson, 2002; Dee-Lucas and Larkin, 1995; Dias and Sousa, 1997; McDonald and Stevenson, 1998) Efficiency measures are based on speed and the number of steps taken to complete an information exploration. Effectiveness measures focus on the user’s search accuracy and the user's understanding of the configuration of the article (Boechler and Dawson, 2002). Different types of navigation configurations are available-hypertext links with graphics, and keyword indexes (Hammond and Allinson, 1989). Other parts of the folder’s studies were also conducted to test for the most effective navigation types such as content lists and content maps (Su and Klein, 2006).

Scores of instructional programs designed to test in computer-based instruction were built with HyperCard and Tool book originally and now it is built with Author ware, Dreamweaver and Flash. In general, these programs have been linear in format (Freitag and Sullivan, 1995; Schnackenberg et al., 1998; Martin et al., 2007). These programs do not consent learners to navigate to any screen of their choice except in a linear format. But with the coming on of the web and the hypermedia configuration, programs are now built with the feature such that the users can map out the part they like within these computer-based programs.

Learner control by and large augments effectiveness, efficiency, and prompts learners. There are no shortcomings against exploiting learner control as long as the control choice does not confound the learners. There are only urgings for and against the degree of learner control. Depover and Quintin (1992) cite that the degree of learner control depends on variables that influence the degree of learner control are prior knowledge, student strategy and knacks, learning progress, complexity of material and awareness of the subject (Depover and Quintin, 1992; Hannafin, 1984; Milheim and Martin, 1991; Steinberg, 1989).

In computer-based instruction, the learner has control over choice and cycles of instruction, control strategy and control over (content) applicability task. There has been scholarship on learner control relating to the choice of strategies such as the level of difficulty of paradigms and arty pliability items (Merrill, 1980; Kopcha, 2005). Chung and Reigeluth (1992) analyses learners’ control into control over applicability tasks, cycle, speed of learning, display or strategy, the internal process, and the advisory strategy. In this current study, the students had control over the cycle of instruction of their choice in the web-based hypertext setting. A navigation option was provided as a menu bar at the top of the screen.

Purpose of the study

In the preceding studies conducted by erudite (Martin et al., 2007; Martin and Klein, 2008), the learners did not have control over the cycle of instruction in the program and had only linear navigation (program control). For this reason, in order to answer the queries on the effects of the instructional components of “arty pliability” with feedback when learners had control (non-linear navigation) and learners had control (linear navigation), this study was proposed. The IPSO (Instructional Processing Storage Operation) instructional program with the same instructional content (knowledge task) but with changes to the navigation links was exploited in this study

The exploit of this study was to investigate if a) the presence or absence of arty pliability in a web-based tutorial had a significant effect on student accomplishment, stance and time; b) if the navigation types which provided control over the cycle of the instructional components (Linear, Non-linear) had a significant effect on student accomplishment, stance and time; and c) if there was any interaction between arty pliability and navigation type. The components investigated in the study, arty pliability with feedback, and linear and non-linear navigation type were combined into four different accounts of web-based programs in a manner that permitted investigation of the effectiveness of the program when arty pliability was presented and absence for both linear and non-linear navigation types.

The research queries for this study are listed below:

1. What is the effect of arty pliability with feedback on accomplishment, stance, and time when students exploit a web-based learning atmosphere?
2. What is the effect of navigation type (linear and non-linear navigation) on accomplishment, stance, and time

when students exploit a web-based learning atmosphere?
3. Does arty pliability and navigation type (linear and non-linear navigation) interact to influence accomplishment, stance and time?

The erudition anticipated that the combination of arty pliability and linear navigation would have higher student accomplishment while arty pliability with non-linear navigation would have a higher student stance.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants were 240 diploma/undergraduate students enrolled in a computer literacy course at the University of Maiduguri. 60 students participated in each treatment. The students enrolled in this course had varied background knowledge of computers and were from different faculties, and departments including education, mass communication, and others. Students participated in the study as part of the reorientation course requirement and the score in the posttest was part of their course grade.

Avoiding the variation in the treatment within the tutorial (arty pliability, non-arty pliability, linear navigation, and non-linear navigation), the students were allotted to treatments by the program, not by individual. The tutorials were randomly allotted to one of the four treatments based on the pretest average scores. It was a quasi-experimental study due to the nature of allotment to treatments.

Materials

Four different accounts of a web-based tutorial (IPSO) on theatrics dummy run of a computer were developed using Dreamweaver. IPSO makes clear the most important operations of the computer which are Input, Processing, Storage and Output. An introduction section was included before the most important operations were explained in detail. This section introduced pliability, and its means and classified based on its size, power and generation. It also explained the IPSO cycle. The four sections described the concepts of the Input, Processing, and Storage and Output operations in a computer and explained the function of the different components associated with that operation. The web-based tutorial was pilot tested with six students before it was used in the study.

The four different accounts of instructional program were as follows:

a) Program with ‘Arty pliability’ (performative triangulation) using Linear Navigation (program control).
b) Program with Arty pliability and using Non-Linear Navigation (Learner Control over the cycle).
c) Program without Arty pliability and using Linear Navigation (Program Control)
d) Program without Arty pliability and using Non-Linear Navigation (Learner Control over the cycle)

In linear navigation, the users go through the components in the linear (performative-triangulation) path; (‘visuality’ ‘acoustic’ and ‘textuality’) folio after folio and this process can also be referred to as program control. Showing sequences of the linear or configuration navigation modus operandi that was used in the instructional material

And in Non-Linear navigation, users can navigate from one folio to another in any demanding order, both forward and backward and to any display within the instructional program. This navigation type is also called learner control over the cycle. The instructional program in this study was built with Dreamer weaver and the navigation type was hypertext.

Arty pliability displays

The first two programs had arty pliability (performative triangulation) on the display screens in the program and it provided the students with the chance to stage-manage the content (application tasks) they were learning. There were a total of five computer screens for graphic pliability or components, each of which was implanted with five four-choice multiple-choice queries.

Procedures

Eighteen segments of the students (n-240) join up in the computer graphics literacy course were blocked by tutoring and randomly assigned to the four treatment groups. The pretest, which took just about 15 minutes to complete, was administered a week prior to the study. The tutoring was blocked into four groups based on their mean post-test scores, and a tutorial within each block was allotted to each of the four treatments.

The web-based IPSO was used by the participants for tutorials during the six weeks of the semester. Participants met in the normal computer lab for tutoring and were directed by the tutor to the address for the instructional program. Each group of students was routed directly to its treatment version of the program. Students worked through the program at their own pace, averaging approximately one hour. Then they took the post-test and the stance survey online. All six treatment groups followed the same procedure. Hence, the experimental differences in treatments suggest itself absolutely in the resources themselves and not in the procedure.

Criterion measures

The criterion measures consisted of a posttest and a student stance survey. In addition, a pretest was used to assess subjects' knowledge (knowledge task) prior to the instruction.

Pretest

The pretest consisted of 20 multiple-choice queries covering the knowledge task with four response choice queries. A sample query that appeared on both the pretest and posttest is shown below:
What is the purpose of the counter?

a) Carry out instruction
b) Arty pliability instruction from the key memory
c) Track cycle instruction
d) Short-term memory location

The overall mean scores on the pretest were 45%, indicating that participants were not very knowledgeable about the knowledge tasks prior to instruction.

Posttest

The posttest consisted of the same 20 multiple-choice queries that were in the pretest. The reliability of the posttest was .65. The item breakdown done on the posttest revealed that query 17 was the most difficult with a difficulty level of .42, query 4 was at .60, followed by queries 1 and 2 at .62 and 63.

Stance survey

The stance survey appraised student stances towards the instructional program and the presence or absence of the instructional proceedings. The survey included 12 Likert-type queries that were rated strongly agree (scored as 4) to strongly disagree (scored as 0). The survey also included two open-ended queries that asked participants what they reminiscences best and least about the program. The survey was administered after the tutorial and the posttest was completed. The reliability of the stance survey was .83.

Statistical analysis

A 2*2 analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was conducted on statistics obtained from the accomplishment posttest and on the total time tired on the program. The stance results for the Likert-type items (Items 1 to 6) were analyzed using 2*2 ANOVA. All analyses disclosed significant differences.

RESULTS

Accomplishment

The scholarship queries first investigated the effects of arty pliability and navigation type on student accomplishment. Table 1 confirms the mean scores and standard deviations for accomplishment on the pretest and posttest by treatment. The average pretest score was 8.46 (SD = 2.26) and the post-test score was 15.91 (SD = 2.92). Participants who received arty pliability linear navigation scored the highest on the posttest (M = 17.14) and those who received arty pliability and had non-linear navigation scored the lowest (M = 14.78) on the posttest.

A 2*2 ANOVA conducted on the pretest statistics revealed no significant difference for arty pliability main effect, navigation main effect or interaction. 2*2 ANOVA conducted between the treatment groups on the posttest revealed a significant arty pliability main effect, F (1,196) = 22.388, <0.01. Therefore, there was a significant difference between the groups that received arty pliability and no arty pliability. Those who received arty pliability (M = 16.84) accomplished significantly higher on the posttest compared to those who did not receive arty pliability (M = 14.98). On the other hand, there was no significant difference for those who had control over the instruction using Linear navigation (M = 15.66) and Non-Linear navigation (M = 16.16). There was moreover no significant interaction between arty pliability types.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviation (SD) for post-test scores by treatment.

Treatment	Preset			Preset		
	Linear navigation (SD)	Non-linear navigation (SD)	Total	Linear navigation (SD)	Non-linear navigation (SD)	Total
Arty program	8.24 (2.75)	8.50 (2.32)	8.37 (2.53)	17.14 (1.92)	16.54 (3.42)	16.84 (2.77)
Non-arty program	8.62 (2.60)	8.48 (2.25)	8.55 (2.40)	15.18 (2.51)	14.78 (2.77)	14.98 (2.76)
Total	8.43 (2.66)	8.49 (2.25)	8.46	16.16 (2.59)	15.66 (3.22)	15.91 (14.78)

Stance

The studious queries that will be dealt with next were the effects of arty pliability and navigation type on student stances. Table 2 shows the means for responses to the 6 Likert-type items on the stance survey. The items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale from strongly agree (N = 4) to strongly disagree (N = 0).

A MANOVA conducted on the overall stance statistics revealed a significant difference in the 6 stance queries. F (18,533.06) = 4.33, <0.01. Follow-up 2*2 ANOVA conducted on the stance data indicated significant differences for items 1 (I learnt a lot this program) and 5 (The program gave me enough opportunity to pliability) between the treatments who received arty pliability and those who did not. No items showed significant differences for the navigation type (linear versus non-linear navigation). There was no interaction between arty pliability and navigation type on stance statistics. For both the above items that had arty pliability main effect, the participants who received arty pliability rated it significantly higher than those who did not receive arty pliability.

The stance statistics also showed that participants who used the program with arty pliability had rated higher on all six items compared to those who did not receive arty pliability. Item 3 “The overall worth of the program was good” was rated the highest (M = 3.28) by both the arty pliability and no arty pliability group. Those who did not receive arty pliability recognized the absence of pliable in their programs and rated item no 5 “The program gave me adequate break to pliant what I was learning”, the lowest (M = 2.48). There wasn’t much difference in the stance of the participants when comparing the navigation method, they received and were almost alike in their ratings based on navigation.

The stance survey also included two open-ended queries that asked the participants what they reminiscent and least about the program: (1) the arty pliability queries (n = 65); (2) clear navigation and configuration (n = 45); (3) the review segment (n = 43); (4) graphics, animations and visuals (n = 34); (5) Highly informative (n = 30). The most frequent response for what parts liked the least were (1) Very long program (n = 36); (2) Lot of information (n = 23).

Table 2. Means for stance survey by treatment.

Treatment	Non-arty program			Arty program		
Stances Items	**Linear navigation mean (SD)**	**Non-navigation mean (SD)**	**Total**	**Linear navigation mean (SD)**	**Non-navigation mean (SD)**	**Total mean**
1. I learnt a lot from the program.	3.32 (.587)	3.32 (.648)	3.27 (.617)	3.06 (.620)	3.12 (.659)	3.09 (.637)
2. The overall quality of the program was good	3.36 (.252)	3.26 (.600)	3.31 (.563)	3.32 (.600)	3.22 (.507)	3.24 (.673)
3. I would recommend this program to other students	3.22 (.648)	3.10 (.678)	3.16 (.662)	3.00 (.676)	2.94 (.586)	2.99 (.631)
4. I will enjoy using computer graphic program for like this one in the future	3.00 (.736)	3.04 (.755)	3.02 (742)	2.90 (.735)	2.94 (.712)	2.95 (.720)
5. The Program gave me enough opportunity to produce what I was learning	3.20 (.639)	3.26 (.694)	3.23 (.644)	2.56 (.760)	2.40 (.760)	2.08 (.772)
6. The program gave me enough control to move around the program	3.22 (.616)	3.36 (.663)	3.29 (.640)	3.12 (.718)	3.30 (.644)	3.21 (.641)

Time

Calculating time expended in the program (Table 3) there was no significant difference between the groups based on arty pliability and navigation. Those who received arty pliability spent more time on the program (= 35.56) than those who did not receive arty pliability (M = 31.33), but there were no significant differences. Both navigation types, linear (M = 33.49) and non-linear (M = 33.40) spent about the same amount of time in the program.

Table 3. Means of Standard Deviation (SD) for times spent in minutes by treatment.

Treatment	Linear standard deviation (SD)	Non-linear standard deviation (SD)	Total
Arty program	35.98 (13.59)	35.14 (18.84)	35.56 (16.34)
Non-arty program	31.00 (13.15)	31.65 (16.10)	35.65 (14.68)
Total	33.49 (13.53)	33.40 (17.56)	33.34 (15.64)

DISCUSSION

This erudition tartans the effects of arty pliability (performative triangulation) and navigation type (linear and non-linear) on accomplishment, stance and time. Diploma/undergraduate students registered in a computer graphics course used a web-based tutorial delivered on the web to learn (theatrics dummy run) input, processing, storage and operation of a computer (IPSO). The computer-based tutorial included multiple choice arty items and two types of navigation (linear and non-linear), linear navigation directed them from one folio to the next whereas in non-linear they had the autonomy to navigate any path. They had control over the cycle of instruction.

Results indicated that there was a significant difference between the groups that received arty pliability and no pliability, but there was no significant difference in the linear and non-linear navigation. There was no significant interaction between arty and navigation type.

Accomplishment

Arty pliability resulted in a significant difference both in accomplishment and stance. Arty pliability provided possibilities for learners to confirm their correct understanding, execution of the acknowledged instructions, and the repetitive opportunity it provides in augmenting the probability of retention of the new knowledge (Kruse and Kevin, 1999). In this web-based tutorial, participants who receive arty pliability were also given feedback that braces the probability of correct responses and reduces the probability of subsequent incorrect responses (Philips et al., 1988, Kress and Ven Leeuwen, 2001). The substantiation of the answer during arty pliability increased the likelihood of retention of the knowledge task. Manifestation of arty pliability results in interaction between the tutorial and the learner. It is effective in performance when it is aligned with the appraisal in the form of posttest and with the application task, knowledge and stances replicated in the objectives (Reiser and Dick, 1996). In this web-based lesson, arty pliability was directly aligned with the posttest with the information presented. The finding of the current study is consistent with previous scholarship on computer-based instruction that found arty pliability had an effect on learning (Hannafin, 1987; Philips et al., 1988; Otobo and Tukur, 2021).

Navigation type (linear, non-linear) did not result in a significant difference. This could have been due to the fact that even though the linear treatment had the pliability to take any path that they decided, the computer-based tutorial was well configured and organized. The tutorial was designed using all the instructional components and the instructions aligned from objectives to assessment. The results could have been different if the instructional material was not well configured and did not have the other instructional components or instructional alignment. Though there was no significant difference, participation in the linear navigation program scored higher than the participants of the non-linear program.

Participants who received arty pliability and linear navigation scored the highest on the posttest and those who received no arty pliability and had non-linear navigation scored the lowest on the posttest. When an adequate amount of configuration is provided and the instructional material is well designed, students do better when navigation is linear and they are faced through every screen where they learn from an every-instructional component such as the objective, arty pliability, feedback and review. The absenteeism of the instructional component arty pliability and non-navigation resulted in the lowest post-test scores.

Manifestation of ‘arty’ not only indentures the importance of other instructional components such as objectives (Hannafin, 1987; Phillips et al., 1988) but also indentures the importance of other non-instructional components such as navigation. Arty pliability was an instructional component which was as the crow flies aligned to the objectives and posttest and had an effect on student accomplishment, and navigation was the non-instructional component and did not have an effect on student accomplishment.

Stance

The stance survey had only 6 Likert-type items. Participants who received arty pliability in their computer tutorials had higher stances compared to those who did not receive arty pliability had the opportunity to interact with the web-based tutorial and it helped them perform better and have higher stances. Higher stances of the participants who received ‘arty’ could have been due to the feedback they received during ‘viso-spatial’ renderings, which strengthened the probability of correct

response and reduced the possibility of subsequence incorrect responses. The stance results remained reliable with the accomplishment results.

Item 1 “I was cultured from this folder” and item 5 “The database gave me enough chance to practice what I was learning” resulted in significant differences between the treatments which received ‘arty’ and those that did not receive arty pliability. The significant difference on item 5 (The folders gave me enough chance to practice what I was learning) divulges that the participant got the manifestation of arty pliability in their computer base tutorials. And also on item 1 (I was cultured a lot from these folders), those who received ‘arty’ had a higher stance that they had learned a lot from the program. The presence of interactive well aligned arty pliability items, which provided feedback and corrected their untangling of the acuities, must have been the reason for them to state that they had learned a lot from this program. Item 6 “The folder gave me enough control to “leap” around the folders” which is about the navigation aspect of the program did not result in significant differences Therefore, in both instances and accomplishments, there were significant differences for the manifestation of arty pliability but not for navigation type.

The open-ended segment, arty pliability bettered the list of what the participants liked preeminent about the program and was followed by the clear configuration and navigation. It can be noted that participants realized that arty pliability made a difference in the program. We may not have had a significance in the navigation types, but from the opened ended queries it is publicized that students were aware of the configuration and navigation used in the program and had rated it as the second-best feature in the program.

Time did not result in any significant difference for arty pliability and navigation type. Though the participants in the arty pliability treatment spent longer time in the program, it was not significantly different from the treatment who did not receive arty pliability. But the time spent by both the navigation types was virtually the same. Participants in the linear navigation treatment spent (M = 33.49) minutes and those in the non-linear navigation treatment (M = 33.40) minutes. This demonstrated that the different navigation types did not matter in regard to time spent.

CONCLUSION

This scholarship has once again buttressed the implication of arty pliability (performative triangulation) in web-based/computer-based tutorials. It once again endorses arty pliability to be effective in facilitating the student's (theatrics dummy run) accomplishment and stance. If the tutorial is instructionally sound with imperative instructional components such as arty pliability (‘visuality’, ‘acousticity’, and ‘textuality’) then irrespective of non-instructional components such as navigation type, learners have high accomplishment and stances. It is well bared that the tutorial is well configured but the effect of navigation is not seen.

This scholarship has implications for the design and development of web-based instructional material. ‘Arty’ is an effective instructional component for enhancing student accomplishment. This put forward that it should be swayed into web-based instruction especially when students are tested using items aligned with the objectives and arty items. We also recommend including different types of arty (iconographic) items. In this scholarship, multiple-choice arty pliability items with instantaneous feedback to students were included. Likewise, the knowledge task was more on learning safe-bet and concepts. Future inquiries should focus on disproportion in instructional content and the type of arty pliability and feedback involved. Added inquiries should look at how instructional components in computer-based instruction sway outcomes such as problem-solving and complex learning tasks. For paradigm, was done in this scholarship, inquiries in this situation should include measures of student accomplishment, stances and time. Further scholarships can be conducted to tartan the effectiveness of the other instructional components such as objectives, paradigms, and feedback along with the different non-instructional components such as gifted agents and other usability components including navigation type. It will be supportive to measure the arty pliability scores and their association with the post-test scores. Appraisals of this nature will continue to inform designers about the impact of instructional components on learning and performance.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, A. O. (**2017**). Effectiveness of talking drawing and conventional science teaching methods in basic technology in junior secondary schools in Maiduguri metropolis, Borno state, Nigeria. A dissertation for the award of Master’s degree of Education (Curriculum and Instruction) Unpublished.

Ahmed, A. O., and **Watila**, M. M. (**2018**). Implication of Hemispheric Tasks for Effective Arty Teaching Skills.

Atkinson, R. K., Mayer, R. E., and Merrill, M. M. (**2005**). Fostering social agency in multimedia learning: Examining the impact of animated agent’s voice. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 30: 117-139.

Boechler, P. M., and **Dawson**, M. R. W. (**2002**). Effects of navigation tool information on hypertext navigation behavior: A configural analysis of page-transition data. Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia, 11(2): 95-115.

Chung, J., and **Reigeluth**, C. M. (**1992**). Instructional prescriptions for learner control. Educational Technology, 32(10): 14-20.

Clark, R. C., and **Mayer**, R. E. (**2007**). Using rich media wisely. In R. A. Riiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds), Trends and issues in instructional Design and Technology (2nd Ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill-Prentice Hall.

Dee-Lucas, D., and **Larkin**, J. H. (**1995**). Learning from electronic text: Effects of interactive overviews for information access. Cognition and Instruction, 13(3): 431-468.

Delgado, A. R., and **Prieto**, G. (**2003**). The effect of item feedback on multiple-choice test responses. British Journal of Psychology, 94: 73-83.

Depover, C. E., and **Quintin**, J. J. (**1992**). Learner control versus

computer in professional training context. In M. Giardina (Ed.), Interactive Multimedia Learning Environments: human factors and technical considerations on design issues. Berlin, Springer-Verlag, 234-247.

Dias, P., and **Sousa**, A. P. (**1997**). Understanding navigation and disorientation in hypermedia learning environments. Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia, 6(2): 173-183.

Dick, W., Carey, L., and Carey, O. (**2005**). The Systematic Design of Instruction, (6th ed.) Boston: Pearson/Allyn Bacon.

Forcier, R. C., and **Descy**, D. E. (**2002**). The computer as an educational tool, (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Foshay, W. R., Silber, K. H., and Stelnicki, M. B. (**2003**). Writing training materials that work. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Freitag, E., and **Sullivan**, H. (**1995**). Matching /Learner Preference to amount of instruction: An alternative form of learner control. Educational Technology Research and Development, 43(2): 5-14.

Gagne, R. (**1965**). The Condition of Learning (4th Ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gagne, R. M. (**1988**). Mastering Learning and Instructional Design. Performance Instructional Quarterly, 1(1): 7-18.

Gagne, R. M., Wager, W.W., Goals, K. C., and Keller, M. (**2005**). Principles of Instructional Design. (4th ed.). Bellmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.

Gagne, R., Briggs, L., and Wagers, W. (**1992**). Principles of Instructional Design. Fort Worth, TX: HBJ College Publishers.

Hammond, N., and **Allinson**, L. (**1989**). Extending hypertext for learning: An investigation of Access and Guidance Tools, A. Sutcliffe and L. Macaulay (Eds.) People and Computer V, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 293-304.

Hannafin, M. (**1987**). The effects of orienting activities, cueing and practice on learning of computer-based instruction. Journal of Educational Research, 81(1): 48-53.

Hannafin, M. J. (**1984**) Guidelines for using locus of instructional control in the design of instruction computer-assisted. Journal of Instructional Development, 7(3): 6-10.

Hannafin, M., Philips, T., Rieber, T., and Garhart, C. (**1987**). The effects of orienting activities and cognitive processing time on factual and inferential learning. Educational communications and Technology Journal, 7(34): 75-83.

Klein, J. D., and **Pridemore**, D. R. (**1994**). Effects of orienting activities and practice on achievement, continuing motivation, and student behaviors in a cooperative learning environment. Educational Technology Research and Development, 42(4): 41-54.

Klein, J. D., Spector, J. M., Grabowski, B., and de la Teja, I. (**2004**). Instructor competencies: Standard for face-to-face, online, and blended settings. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Kopcha, T. J. (**2005**). Learner preferences, prior knowledge, and learner control over practice and examples in computer-based instruction. Paper presentation at the Association of Educational Communications and Technology.

Kress, G., and **Ven Leeuwen**, T. (**2001**). Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication. Language in Society, 33: 115-118.

Kruse, K., and **Kevin**, J. (**1999**). Technology-based Training: The Art and Science of Design, Development and Delivery. Jossey Bass Publication.

Ku, H. Y., and **Sullivan**, H. J. (**2002**). Student performance and attitudes using personalized mathematics instruction. Educational Technology Research and Development, 50(1): 21-34.

Kulhavy, R. W., and **Stock**, W. A. (**1989**). Feedback in written instruction: The place of response certitude. Educational Psychology Review, 1: 279-308.

Mager, F (**1997**). Preparing Instructional Objectives (3rd Edition). Center for Effective Performance: Atlanta, GA.

Martin, F., and **Klein**, J. D. (**2008**). Effects of objectives, practice, and review in multimedia instruction. Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia, 17(2): 171-189.

Martin, F., Klein, J. D., and Sullivan, H., (**2007**). The impact of instructional elements in computer-based instruction. British Journal of Educational Technology, 38(4): 623-636.

Mattiske, C. (**2001**). Train for results: Maximize the impact of training through review. Warri wood, Australia Business and Professional Publishing.

McDonald, S., and **Stevenson**, R. (**1998**). Spatial versus conceptual maps as learning tools in hypertext. Journal of Educational Hypermedia and Multimedia, 8(1): 43-64.

Merrill, M. D. (**1980***).* Learner control in computer-based learning. Computer and Education, 4: 77-95.

Merrill, M. D. (**2002**). First principles of instruction. Educational Technology Research and Development, 50(3): 43-59.

Milheim, W. D., and **Martin**, B. I. (**1991**). Theoretical bases for use of learner control: three different perspectives. Journal of Computer-Based Instruction, 18(3): 99-105.

Mitchell, W. J. T. (**2002**). Picture theory: Essays on verbal and visual representation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Mirzoeff, N. (**2002**). The subject of visual culture. In N. Mirzoeff (ed.) The visual culture Reader London: Routledge, 2002) 2nd ed., pp 3-21.

Morrison, G. R., Rose, and Kemp, J. E. (**2006***).* Designing effective instruction (5th Eds.), New York: John Wiley.

Nooriafshar, M. (**2003**). Factors contributing to making the learning of statistics an enjoyable experience. International Journal for Mathematics Teaching and Learning,

Otobo, A. O. A., and **Tukur**, H. R. (**2021**). Lack of logicality: A pictorial dialectic perspective. Journal of the Humanities, 22(1): 295-303.

Philips, T., Hannafin, M., and Tripp, S. (**1988**). The effects of practice and orienting activities on learning from interactive video. Educational Communication and Technology, 35: 93-102.

Reiser, R. A. (**2002**). A history of instructional design and technology. In Reiser, R. A., & Dempsey, P. (Eds), Trends issues in Instructional Design and Technology, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice Hall, 26-53.

Reiser, R. A., and **Dick**, W. (**1996**). Instructional planning: A guide for teachers (2nd Ed.). Allyn and Bacon.

Richey, R. (**2000**). The Legacy of Robert M. Gagne, Syracuse, NY: Eric Clearinghouse on Information and Technology.

Shneiderman, B., and **Kearsley**, G. (**1989**). Hypertext Hands-On! An Introduction to a New Way of Organizing and Accessing Information. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Schnackenberg, H. L., Sullivan, H. J., Leader, L., and Jones, E. K. (**1998**). Learner preferences and achievement under differing amounts of learner practice. Educational Technology, Research and Development, 46(2): 5-15.

Smith, P. A., and **Regan**, T. J. (**2005**). Instructional Design (3rd Ed.), Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Steinberg, E. R. (**1989**). Cognition and learner control: A literature review, 1977-88. Journal of Computer-based Instruction, 16(4): 117-124.

Su, Y., and **Klein**, J. (**2006**). Effects of navigation tools and computer confidence on performance and attitudes in a hypermedia learning environment. Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia. 15(1): 87-106.

Sullivan, H. J., and **Higgins**, N. (**1983**). Teaching for Competence. New York: Teachers College Press.

Wilson, F., and **Dwyer**, F. M (**2001**). Effect of time and level of visual enhancement in facilitating student achievement of different educational objectives. Journal of Instructional Media, 28(2):159-167.

Wong, A. Y. K. (**1994**). The use of animation in computer-assisted instruction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, [Carleton University].

Wolff, B. L. (**2008**). The psychology of illustration, Capacity 1, Basic research; Volume 2, instructional issues. New York: Springer.

Citation: Otobo, A. O. A., and Nwazue, U. C. (2023). Effectiveness of arty pliability in a liner and non-liner web-based learning atmosphere. African Educational Research Journal, 11(1): xx-108.