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ABSTRACT

To become competent professionals, students should work on both their strengths and weaknesses. Considering students’ limited amount of time and energy to work on multiple subjects, it is important to know what determines their allocation of effort to their perceived relative strengths or weaknesses. In a series of five studies, we examined the moderating effect of instructional strategy (i.e., self-directed versus test-directed) on the within-person relation between perceived relative strength (i.e., strengths versus weaknesses) and allocated effort across multiple subjects. We used different methodologies (scenario, field, and experimental studies), research designs (within-person and mixed factorial), populations (secondary school, college, and university students), and measures of effort (intentions, self-reported, and behavioral). The results consistently indicate that students in a self-directed instructional strategy condition tend to allocate more effort to their relative strengths, whereas students in a test-directed instructional strategy condition tend to allocate more effort to their relative weaknesses.

1. Introduction

To become competent professionals who are attractive on the competitive job market, students should work on both their strengths and weaknesses. By definition, students are no experts: typically, there is ample room for improvement, both in the subjects they believe they are relatively good at (i.e., their perceived relative strengths) and in those they believe they are relatively not good at (i.e., their perceived relative weaknesses). On the one hand, improving weaknesses is indispensable for mastering a profession. Students need to diminish the gap between their present level of competency and the prevailing standard for a particular profession or degree. On the other hand, further improving their strengths enables students to excel in specific subjects, which may be a valuable asset for their future careers (Hiemstra & Van Yperen, 2015).

To guide students in their competence development, it is important for educators to know what determines students’ effort allocation to their perceived relative strengths and weaknesses. Effort is key for developing competence (Ericsson & Lehmann, 1996; Ericsson, Krampe, & Tesch-Römer, 1993). Therefore, students’ effort allocation to their perceived relative strengths and weaknesses amply determines how their competence evolves in the course of their education: which subjects they will be good and less good at and whether they will be more specialists or generalists by the time they graduate.

Unfortunately, the extant literature is incomprehensive on the role of perceived relative strengths and weaknesses in allocated effort. In achievement settings, both working on perceived strengths and working on perceived weaknesses can be motivating. On the one hand, perceiving a subject as a strength may foster individuals’ expectations and encourage them to set their standards even higher (Atkinson, 1964; Bandura, 1997; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Weiner, 1974). On the other hand, perceiving a subject as a weakness may signal that more effort is needed to achieve a certain goal, such as passing an exam (Carver & Schreier, 1981; Dunlosky & Arieli, 2011; Son & Metcalfe, 2000; Vancouver, More, & Yoder, 2008). Hence, we do not know under which conditions students who have a limited amount of time and energy to work on multiple tasks or subjects tend to allocate more effort to their strengths or their weaknesses.

1.1. Perceived relative strength

Perceived relative strengths and weaknesses are competence self-perceptions that result from dimensional within-person comparisons (Möller & Marsh, 2013). Dimensional comparison entails that individuals use their competence in one dimension (e.g., spelling) as a reference for judging their competence in another dimension (e.g., calculating). Although individuals’ self-evaluations are typically based on social comparison information (Klein, 1997; Van Yperen & Leander,
2014; Wheeler & Miyake, 1992; White, Langer, Yariv, & Welch, 2006), research shows that students engage in dimensional comparisons as well. For example, in a diary study among 67 university students, a total of 436 dimensional comparisons (M = 6.51) over a 14-day period was reported (Möller & Husemann, 2006). It is likely that these self-perceptions of intra-personal strengths and weaknesses affect students’ learning behavior. Education is typically a multiple-tasks context, in which students work on different subjects during the same period of time. When attending lectures, following classes, doing homework, or preparing for tests, multiple subjects place competing demands on students’ limited time and energy. To regulate their effort allocation, students may apply a range of strategies, including attending or skipping lectures, paying more or less attention in class, working more or less concentratedly on their homework, or spending more or less time on preparing for their tests. In such a multiple-tasks context, self-perceptions of strengths and weaknesses are likely to guide students’ allocation of effort across different subjects.

1.2. Perceived relative strength and allocated effort

Students who believe they are good at a school subject tend to be more willing to put effort into that subject than students who believe they are less good at that subject. That is, at the between-person level, self-perceived competence is typically positively related to effort (e.g., Bandura & Locke, 2003; Latham & Pinder, 2005; Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991; Sadri & Robertson, 1993). However, at the within-person level, both positive and negative relations between competence self-perceptions and effort have been observed. For example, in a study in which participants engaged in a series of trials in a stock investment simulation, a positive within-person relation between self-efficacy and allocated effort was found (Soo & Ilies, 2009). In contrast, in a study on the relationship between students’ self-efficacy and effort across a series of tests over an introductory course, a negative within-person relation was observed (Vancouver & Kendall, 2006). Furthermore, in a study in which participants’ self-efficacy and effort allocation were assessed across successive trials of a board-hitting game, Vancouver et al. (2008) found both positive and negative within-person relations between self-efficacy and allocated effort, depending on the level of task difficulty. Similarly, across a series of anagram tasks, both positive and negative within-person relations between self-efficacy and allocated effort were found, depending on the level of performance ambiguity of the task (Schmidt & DeShon, 2010).

These findings indicate that, at the within-person level, both positive and negative within-person relations between competence self-perceptions and allocated effort exist. However, a shared characteristic of these studies is the reliance on temporal within-person designs. That is, participants’ competence self-perceptions and allocated effort were assessed on a single task across multiple occasions (i.e., a series of subsequent occasions). In contrast, educational contexts are typically multiple-tasks contexts in which students have a limited amount of time to work on a number of competing subjects. To assess the within-person relations between competence self-perceptions and allocated effort across multiple competing tasks, a dimensional within-person design is required, which entails that participants’ competence self-perceptions (i.e., their perceived relative strengths versus weaknesses) and allocated effort are assessed across multiple tasks on a single occasion (Möller & Marsh, 2013).

To date, there is surprisingly little empirical information on the dimensional within-person relations between self-perceived competence and effort allocation across multiple tasks (Sun & Fresé, 2013). In one study, in which students were instructed to self-direct their learning, a positive relation was found. Specifically, Hiemstra and Van Yperen (2016) found that students who worked on multiple online learning tasks tended to allocate more effort to the tasks that they perceived as their relative strengths rather than their weaknesses. In another study, in which participants were primed on external standards, a negative relation was found. That is, Schmidt and Dolis (2009) found that participants who worked on two different scheduling tasks tended to allocate more effort to the task they perceived as harder to complete. Furthermore, in a study on the relation between perceived goal-performance discrepancies and allocated effort to multiple tasks, controlling incentives were found to moderate this relation (Schmidt & DeShon, 2007). Hence, we suspected that self-directed versus externally-directed instructions may play a moderating role in individuals’ effort allocation to their relative strengths and weaknesses.

1.3. Instructional strategy and allocated effort

Instructional strategies refer to the approaches and methods that teachers use to achieve the aims of instruction (Akkoneniz, 2016; Moore, 2014). In education, the extent to which students are instructed to pursue self-directed versus test-directed learning goals and activities may vary across time, situations, teachers, and schools. For example, at the beginning of a semester, teachers may apply a self-directed instructional strategy (Candy, 1991; Loyens, Magda, & Rikers, 2008; Valjataga & Laanpere, 2010), by offering students a choice of readings, assignments, and exercises, and encouraging them to pursue their own interests. In contrast, toward the end of the semester, teachers may apply a test-directed instructional strategy (Roediger, Putnam, & Smith, 2011; Rohrer & Pashler, 2010), by informing students of the standards they will have to meet, and instructing them to prepare for the upcoming test-week. Similarly, some schools may apply a more self-directed instructional approach, in which students are allowed a fair amount of choice in what and how to learn. Other schools may apply a more test-directed approach, in which students are educated to pass the tests of a fixed curriculum. It is likely that these different instructional strategies (i.e., self-directed versus test-directed) affect students’ effort allocation to their strengths and weaknesses.

Interestingly, the extant literature suggests that both self-directed and test-directed instructional strategies may have both positive and negative consequences for students’ effort allocation (for reviews, see Black & William, 1998; Guay, Ratelle, & Chanal, 2008; Lee, 2008; Loyens et al., 2008; Roediger et al., 2011; Sheldon & Biddle, 1998). For example, students have been shown to put more effort into their learning as they pursued more self-directed learning goals (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998). However, students have also been shown to waste more time once their self-direction exceeded a moderate level (Wielenga-Meijer, Taris, Wigboldus, & Komppi, 2011). Similarly, students have been found to invest more effort as they were tested more frequently (Mawhinney, Bostow, Laws, Blumenfeld, & Hopkins, 1971), but students have also been shown to prefer less effortful learning tasks when they were motivated by external rather than intrinsic incentives (Pittman, Emery, & Boggiano, 1982). A important limitation of previous studies on the role of self-direction and test-direction in effort allocation is their reliance on single-task designs. This is a misalignment with educational practice, which is a multiple-tasks context. In multiple-tasks contexts, the positive effect of an intervention on one task may come at the expense of another task. For example, a teacher’s decision to test students more frequently may boost students’ effort in that particular class, but simultaneously diminish students’ effort in another class without more frequent testing (Mawhinney et al., 1971; Wielenga-Meijer et al., 2011). When a single task design is used in a multiple-tasks context (e.g., only considering the class in which students are tested more frequently), these adverse side effects (e.g., the negative effects on effort in another class) remain unobserved, which may lead to invalid conclusions. Therefore, in the present research, we used multiple-tasks designs to examine the effects of instructional strategy (i.e., self-directed versus test-directed) on students’ allocated effort across multiple subjects.
1.4. The present research

In the present research, we examined under which conditions students, who have a limited amount of time and energy to work on multiple subjects, tend to put more effort into their strengths or their weaknesses. We hypothesized that in a self-directed instructional strategy condition (i.e., a condition in which students were instructed to pursue their own interests), students would tend to allocate more effort to their relative strengths. Conversely, in a test-directed instructional strategy condition (i.e., a condition in which students were instructed to pursue test results), students were expected to allocate more effort to their relative weaknesses. That is, in a self-directed condition, self-perceptions of relative strengths represent a signal that more intrinsic gratification (Ryan & Deci, 2000) or a higher level of performance (Locke & Latham, 2002) is attainable in the subject concerned, whereas self-perceptions of relative weaknesses signal the likelihood of less intrinsic gratification or poor future performance. In contrast, in a test-directed condition, self-perceptions of relative strengths signal that less effort is required to meet the external standards on the tasks concerned (Carver & Schreier, 1981; Vancouver et al., 2008), whereas self-perceptions of relative weaknesses signal that more effort is needed to meet the standards.

Across five studies, we used a variety of methods and measures to test our hypothesis. Studies 1 and 2 are vignette studies in which we examined the effects of instructional strategy (i.e., self-directed versus test-directed) on students' self-reported effort allocation to their strengths and weaknesses. In Study 3, we used a repeated measures design in a field setting to examine students' self-reported effort allocation to their strengths and weaknesses as a function of changes in the instructional strategy. Finally, Studies 4 and 5 are experiments in which we tested the impact of instructional strategy on the relation between perceived relative strengths versus weaknesses and behavioral effort.

2. Study 1

2.1. Method study 1

2.1.1. Participants

A total of 95 undergraduate psychology students (34 men, 61 women; mean age = 19.27 years, SD = 1.29) of a university in the Netherlands, who were recruited through the university's psychology experiment management system, participated in the study for course credits.

2.1.2. Procedure

After indicating their self-perceptions of relative strength on five school subjects1 (Math, Economy, Dutch, History, and Biology), the participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: one self-directed instructional strategy condition and three variants of a test-directed instructional strategy condition. In each condition they read: “Imagine you had a total of 50 h to spend on these five school subjects: how would you allocate your time across these subjects? ...” In the self-directed instructional strategy condition, participants read, “... if you were free to spend this time on elective classes for extra course credits?”; in the no fail test-directed instructional strategy condition they read, “... if you were preparing for exams in which you had to score a minimum of 5.5” on each subject?”; in the compensate test-directed instructional strategy condition they read, “... if you were preparing for exams in which you had to score a minimum of 5.5 on average across all subjects?”; and in the excellence test-directed instructional strategy condition they read, “... if you were preparing for exams in which you aimed to score 8 or higher on as many subjects as possible?” Note that all situations were imagined.

2.1.3. Measures

Perceived relative strength and allocated effort. Participants were asked to rank five school subjects - Math, Economy, Dutch, History, and Biology - ranging from strength #1 (my relative strength) to strength #5 (my relative weakness) and, subsequently, to allocate 50 h across these subjects. For each school subject, the ranking was used as an index of perceived relative strength (where a lower ranking indicates a higher level of perceived relative strength: #1 is the highest level). Allocated effort was subsequently computed as the proportion of time, from the total of 50 h, allocated to each level of perceived relative strength (i.e., #1 through #5).

2.2. Results study 1

The means and standard deviations of allocated effort per ranking of perceived relative strength by instructional strategy are shown in Table 1. First, we examined whether any evidence could be found for differences between the three variants of the test-directed instructional strategy condition. A repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance (RM-MANOVA) could not be performed directly on the five proportions of allocated effort per level of perceived relative strength, because of their inherent dependencies (1.00 in total). Therefore, we conducted five separate analyses of variance (ANOVAs), with test-directed instructional strategy (no fail versus compensate versus excellence) as the independent variable and allocated effort at each level of perceived relative strength (#1 through #5) as the dependent variables. In order to reduce the chances of a type II error (i.e., false negative), we tested the effects at the p < .10 level, and considered whether the effect size was very small ($\eta^2 < 0.10$). No significant differences between the three variants of the test-directed instructional strategy condition were found. That is, the differences between participants' strength #1, $F(2, 65) = 0.13$, $p = .88$, $\eta^2 = 0.00$, strength #2, $F(2, 65) = 1.92$, $p = .16$, $\eta^2 = 0.06$, strength #3, $F(2, 65) = 0.21$, $p = .81$, $\eta^2 = 0.00$, strength #4, $F(2, 65) = 0.35$, $p = .71$, $\eta^2 = 0.01$, and strength #5, $F(2, 65) = 2.24$, $p = .12$, $\eta^2 = 0.07$ were all nonsignificant with respect to allocated effort and had a very small effect size.

Second, because no differences were found between the three variants of the test-directed instructional strategy, we merged the test-directed instructional strategy conditions and tested our focal hypothesis, which posited that the self-directed versus test-directed instructional strategy moderates the within-person relation between perceived relative strength and allocated effort. Fig. 1 graphically displays the mean proportions of allocated effort for each of the five levels of perceived relative strength by self-directed versus test-directed instructional strategy. Because a RM-MANOVA could not be performed directly, due to the inherent dependencies of the five proportions, we conducted two separate paired t-tests, testing in each condition (i.e., the self-directed instructional strategy and the test-directed instructional strategy) the within-person differences between strength #1 and strength #5. To reduce possible capitalization on chance, we tested these differences at the $p < .01$ level. Bias-corrected and accelerated (BCa) confidence intervals (CIs), based on 5000 bootstrap samples, were used to

---

1 We used secondary school subjects, because students have experience-based competence self-perceptions for these subjects. The five subjects were selected to include a range of both science and humanities subjects.

2 We used these three variants of the test-directed instructional strategy condition to examine whether avoidance-oriented (i.e., the no fail test-directed instructional strategy), versus approach-oriented (i.e., the excellence test-directed instructional strategy) framing of the instructional strategy affected students' effort allocation. Our results showed no differences in students' effort allocation across strengths versus weaknesses between the three variants of the test-directed instructional strategy condition.

3 The grading system in the Netherlands counts from 1 (lowest) through 10 (highest). Schools typically require students to score 5.5 to pass a single test, and to have an overall average of 5.5 on all subjects to be promoted to the next grade. High exam marks increase students' chances of admission to studies that have limited admittance (i.e., numerus fixus).
accommodate possible deviations from normality. The results showed that the participants in the self-directed instructional strategy condition allocated significantly more effort to their strengths ($M_{#1} = 0.33$, $SD = 0.18$) than to their weaknesses ($M_{#5} = 0.12$, $SD = 0.13$), 99% BCa CI of difference [0.6; 0.36], $t(26) = 3.96$, $p = .00$. In contrast, participants in the test-directed instructional strategy condition allocated significantly more effort to their weaknesses ($M_{#5} = 0.25$, $SD = 0.09$) than to their strengths ($M_{#1} = 0.14$, $SD = 0.07$), 99% BCa CI of difference $[−0.16; −0.05]$, $t(67) = −5.79$, $p = .00$. Thus, we concluded that instructional strategy (i.e., self-directed versus test-directed) moderated the within-person relation between perceived relative strength and allocated effort.

3. Study 2

3.1. Method study 2

The aim of Study 2 was to provide additional support for our hypothesis by replicating the findings of Study 1 with a different group of students and a different set of school subjects.

3.1.1. Participants

A total of 116 college students (65 men, 51 women; mean age = 22.64 years, $SD = 6.52$) of a university of applied sciences in the Netherlands, who were recruited via an email sent by their school, volunteered to take part in the study.

3.1.2. Procedure and measures

The procedure and measures were identical to those in Study 1, except for the set of school subjects, which were Math, Economy, Dutch, English, and Physics (instead of Math, Economy, Dutch, History, and Biology).

3.2. Results study 2

The results of Study 2 replicated the findings of Study 1. Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations of allocated effort per level of perceived relative strength by instructional strategy (i.e., self-directed versus test-directed). Again, no differences between the three test-directed conditions were found. Five separate ANOVAs, with test-directed instructional strategy (no fail versus compensate versus excellence) as the independent variable and allocated effort to each level of perceived

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived relative strength</th>
<th>Self-directed (n = 27)</th>
<th>Test-directed aggregated (n = 68)</th>
<th>Test-directed no fail (n = 19)</th>
<th>Test-directed compensate (n = 25)</th>
<th>Test-directed excellence (n = 24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$ $SD$</td>
<td>$M$ $SD$</td>
<td>$M$ $SD$</td>
<td>$M$ $SD$</td>
<td>$M$ $SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>0.33 0.18</td>
<td>0.14 0.09</td>
<td>0.14 0.07</td>
<td>0.15 0.07</td>
<td>0.14 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>0.23 0.13</td>
<td>0.16 0.07</td>
<td>0.14 0.07</td>
<td>0.18 0.04</td>
<td>0.16 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>0.16 0.09</td>
<td>0.21 0.07</td>
<td>0.20 0.06</td>
<td>0.20 0.07</td>
<td>0.21 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>0.15 0.11</td>
<td>0.23 0.13</td>
<td>0.24 0.09</td>
<td>0.24 0.07</td>
<td>0.22 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>0.12 0.13</td>
<td>0.25 0.09</td>
<td>0.28 0.09</td>
<td>0.23 0.08</td>
<td>0.26 0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Within each column, the sum of the mean proportions of allocated effort is 1. The test-directed aggregated column (n = 68) displays the aggregated data of the test-directed no fail (n = 19), the test-directed compensate (n = 25), and the test-directed excellence (n = 24) conditions.

Fig. 1. Allocated effort (mean proportions of allocated time) across the five levels of perceived relative strength by instructional strategy, Study 1.
relative strength (#1 through #5) as the dependent variables, yielded no significant \( p < .10 \) differences in allocated effort to strength #1, \( F(2, 82) = 0.69, p = .50, \eta^2 = 0.02 \), strength #2, \( F(2, 82) = 0.73, p = .49, \eta^2 = 0.02 \), strength #3, \( F(2, 82) = 1.04, p = .36, \eta^2 = 0.03 \), strength #4, \( F(2, 82) = 0.80, p = .45, \eta^2 = 0.02 \), and strength #5, \( F(2, 82) = 1.27, p = .29, \eta^2 = 0.03 \).

As in Study 1, we subsequently merged the three test-directed instructional strategy conditions (see Fig. 2), and conducted two separate paired \( t \)-tests, testing in each condition the within-person differences in allocated effort between strengths #1 and #5. The BCa CIs showed that the participants in the self-directed instructional strategy condition allocated significantly more effort to their strengths (\( M_{#1} = 0.29, SD = 0.20 \)) than to their weaknesses (\( M_{#5} = 0.12, SD = 0.08 \)), 99% BCa CI of difference \([0.16; 0.42]\), \( t(30) = 3.88, p = .00 \). The participants in the test-directed instructional strategy condition allocated more effort to their weaknesses (\( M_{#5} = 0.31, SD = 0.11 \)) than to their strengths (\( M_{#1} = 0.12, SD = 0.09 \)), 99% BCa CI of difference \([-0.15; -0.00]\), \( t(84) = -11.06, p = .00 \). Thus, in Study 2, instructional strategy was also found to moderate the within-person relation between perceived relative strength and allocated effort.

3.3. Discussion studies 1 and 2

The results of Studies 1 and 2 indicate that, in multiple-tasks contexts, when students pursue multiple subjects, instructional strategy (i.e., self-directed versus test-directed) moderates the relation between perceived relative strength and allocated effort. However, a limitation of Studies 1 and 2 is that we tested the effects of instructional strategy on students’ effort allocation under fully imagined conditions. To provide additional and ecologically more valid support for our hypothesis, we tested it under more natural conditions in Study 3.

4. Study 3

4.1. Method study 3

In Study 3, we sought to replicate the finding of Studies 1 and 2 in a secondary school setting, using a \( 3 \times 3 \) factorial within-subjects design. We asked students to indicate their strongest school subject, a neutral school subject, and their weakest school subject. We then assessed their effort allocation across these subjects under three repeated measures conditions: (1) when free to pursue their own interests (self-directed...
learning instructional strategy); (2) at the beginning of the first quarter (intermediate instructional strategy); and (3) at the end of the first quarter, during the first exam week (test-directed instructional strategy). We reasoned that from Conditions 1 to 3, the learning conditions would be progressively less self-directed and more test-directed. Hence, we expected that the relation between perceived relative strength and allocated effort would switch from positive (in Condition 1) to negative (in Condition 3).

4.1. Participants
The participants were 46 students (19 male, 27 female) from a secondary school in the Netherlands, who were recruited through their teacher and participated voluntarily in the study. Their mean age was 16.35 years (SD = 0.60).

4.1.2. Procedure
First, the participants listed their school subjects, indicated which of these they perceived as their strongest, neutral and weakest subjects, and completed the perceived competence measures. Second, in each of the following conditions, the participants completed the perceived instructional strategy and allocated effort measures.

Condition 1: Self-directed instructional strategy. On the last day of the second week of the first quarter, the participants imagined that they were attending a school that allowed them to follow their own interests completely. They then indicated their perceived self-direction and allocated effort at that school.

Condition 2: Intermediate instructional strategy. Immediately following this, the participants looked back at their current week at school (i.e., the second week of the first quarter) and indicated their perceived self-direction and allocated effort during that week.

Condition 3: Test-directed instructional strategy. Nine weeks later, on the last day of the exam week of the first quarter, the participants once more looked back at their current week at school and indicated their perceived self-direction and allocated effort during that week (i.e., the exam week).

4.1.3. Measures
Perceived relative strength. After listing their school subjects for the first quarter, participants were asked: “Which of these subjects do you see as ...” “(a) ... your strongest subject,” “(b) ... a neutral subject, that is, a subject between your strongest and your weakest subject,” “(c) ... your weakest subject.” Each participant’s strongest subject was coded as strength #1, the neutral subject as strength #2, and the weakest subject as strength #3.

Perceived competence. Participants’ self-perceived competence in their strongest versus weakest subjects was assessed using the following item (Bandura, 2006): “Please rate, for each of the following subjects, how certain you are that you can do the upcoming tests,” after which the participants’ strongest, neutral, and weakest subjects were displayed. Response categories ranged from 0 (cannot do at all) to 100 (highly certain can do).

Perceived self-direction. Perceived self-direction was assessed by asking the participants how true the following statement was for them: “During the past week at school ...” (Condition 1), or “During the past week at school ...” (Conditions 2 and 3), “... I could spend my time studying in accordance with my own interests.” Response categories ranged from 1 (completely true) to 7 (completely not true).

Allocated effort. Allocated effort was assessed by asking the participants: “Please assign 100% of your time across the following school subjects,” after which the three subjects that they had indicated as their strongest, neutral, and weakest subjects (i.e., strengths #1, #2, and #3) were displayed. In the self-directed instructional strategy condition (Condition 1), the general stem was: “At this imagined school, how would you allocate your time across the following subjects?” In the intermediate (Condition 2) and the test-directed (Condition 3) instructional strategy conditions, the general stem was: “During the past week at school, how did you actually allocate your time across the following subjects?”

4.2. Results study 3
4.2.1. Perceived relative strength
To check whether the students felt most competent in their strength #1 (their strongest subject), and least competent in their strength #3 (their weakest subject), we conducted a RM-MANOVA with perceived relative strength as the within-person factor and perceived competence as the dependent variable. The results revealed a significant overall difference in perceived competence between the three levels of perceived relative strength (M<sub>1</sub> = 82.52, SD = 20.83; M<sub>2</sub> = 64.30, SD = 19.97; M<sub>3</sub> = 45.85, SD = 21.65), F(2, 44) = 85.23, p < .001. Follow-up analyses indicated that all pairwise comparisons were significant at the p < .001 level and in the hypothesized direction. Thus, the participants perceived themselves as most competent in their strongest subject, less competent in the neutral subject, and least competent in their weakest subject.

4.2.2. Perceived self-direction
To check whether the participants felt most self-directed in the self-directed instructional strategy condition and least self-directed in the test-directed instructional strategy condition, we conducted a RM-MANOVA with instructional strategy (i.e., self-directed versus intermediate versus test-directed instructional strategy) as the within-person factor and perceived self-direction as the dependent variable. The results showed a significant decrease in perceived self-direction from the self-directed condition to the test-directed condition (M<sub>C1</sub> = 47.74, SD = 1.32; M<sub>C2</sub> = 3.72, SD = 1.57; M<sub>C3</sub> = 3.17, SD = 1.76), F(2,44) = 25.74, p < .001, η<sup>2</sup> = 0.54. All pairwise comparisons were significant at the p < .001 level and in the hypothesized direction. Therefore, we concluded that participants felt most self-directed in the self-directed instructional strategy condition and least self-directed in the test-directed instructional strategy condition.

4.2.3. Tests of hypothesis
The means and standard deviations of allocated effort per level of perceived relative strength by instructional strategy are shown in Table 3. To test whether instructional strategy moderated the relation between perceived relative strength and allocated effort, we conducted three separate paired t-tests, investigating in each condition (i.e., self-directed versus intermediate versus test-directed) the within-person differences in allocated effort between strength #1 (i.e., the strongest subject) and strength #3 (i.e., the weakest subject); for the analysis approach, see Study 1. In line with the findings of Studies 1 and 2, BCA Cls showed that in the self-directed instructional strategy condition, the participants allocated significantly more effort to their strongest subject (M<sub>4</sub> = 0.42, SD = 0.22) than to their weakest subject (M<sub>6</sub> = 0.26, SD = 0.18), 99% BCA Cl of difference [0.01; 0.31], t(45) = 2.85, p = .00. In the intermediate instructional strategy condition, no significant differences were found between the strongest subject (M<sub>4</sub> = 0.38, SD = 0.20) and the weakest subject (M<sub>6</sub> = 0.31, SD = 0.19), 99% BCA Cl of difference [-0.19; 0.06], t(45) = -1.32, p = .20. In the test-directed instructional strategy condition, the participants allocated significantly more effort to their weakest subject (M<sub>4</sub> = 0.40, SD = 0.17) than to their strongest subject (M<sub>6</sub> = 0.25, SD = 0.13), 99% BCA Cl of difference [-0.24; -0.07], t(45) = -4.40, p = .00. Thus, from the self-directed through the test-directed instructional strategy condition, the relation between perceived relative
After this, the practice session started. Participants were given a total of 30 exercises, the participants filled in the perceived competence and the perceived self-direction scales.
that participants in the self-directed instructional strategy condition allocated significantly more effort to strength #1 ($M = 0.64, SD = 0.19$) than to strength #2 ($M = 0.36, SD = 0.19$), 99% BCa CI of difference [0.17; 0.39], $t(78) = 6.49, p = .00$. In contrast, participants in the test-directed instructional strategy condition allocated significantly more effort to strength #2 ($M = 0.64, SD = 0.18$) than to strength #1 ($M = 0.36, SD = 0.18$), 99% BCa CI of difference [−0.17; −0.17], $t(68) = −0.58, p = .00$. Thus, in support of our hypothesis, instructional strategy moderated the relation between perceived relative strength and allocated effort.

6. Study 5

6.1. Method study 5

6.1.1. Participants, procedure, and measures

The aim of Study 5 was to replicate the findings of Study 4 with a different group of students and, accordingly, to provide additional support for our hypothesis. A sample of 78 college students, 39 men and 39 women, from different schools of a Dutch university of applied sciences, were recruited via social media and bulletin board adverts, and volunteered to take part in the study for a €10 allowance. Ages ranged from 17 to 33, with a mean of 21.19 ($SD = 3.01$). The experimental procedure and the measures were identical to those of Study 4.

6.2. Results study 5

6.2.1. Manipulation check

The results of an independent samples $t$-test showed that the participants in the self-directed instructional strategy condition ($M = 5.09, SD = 0.70$) were higher in perceived self-direction than the participants in the test-directed instructional strategy condition ($M = 4.66, SD = 0.95$), 95% BCa CI of difference [0.05; 0.83], $t(76) = 2.26, p = .03$.

6.2.2. Perceived competence

The results of a paired $t$-test revealed that the participants were higher in perceived competence on their strength #1 ($M = 5.49, SD = 0.89$) than on their strength #2 ($M = 4.18, SD = 1.11$), 99% BCa CI of difference [1.00; 1.65], $t(77) = 10.53, p = .00$.

6.2.3. Tests of hypothesis

The results of Study 5 (see Table 5), like those of Study 4, yielded clear support for our hypothesis. BCa Cs indicated that participants in the self-directed instructional strategy condition allocated significantly more effort to strength #1 ($M = 0.68, SD = 0.19$) than to strength #2 ($M = 0.32, SD = 0.19$), 99% BCa CI of difference [0.20; 0.51], $t(40) = 6.07, p = .00$. In contrast, the participants in the test-directed instructional strategy condition allocated significantly more effort to strength #2 ($M = 0.66, SD = 0.16$) than to strength #1 ($M = 0.34, SD = 0.16$), 99% BCa CI of difference [−0.46; −0.18], $t(36) = −0.22, p = .00$. Thus, the findings of Study 5 are consistent with those of Studies 1 to 4, showing that instructional strategy moderated the within-person relation between perceived relative strength and allocated effort.

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived relative strength</th>
<th>Self-directed ($n = 41$)</th>
<th>Test-directed ($n = 37$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. Discussion studies 4 and 5

Studies 4 and 5 yielded additional support for our hypothesis. Across both studies, we found that in a test-directed instructional strategy condition students tend to allocate more actual effort to their weaknesses, whereas in an self-directed instructional strategy condition students tend to allocate more actual effort to their strengths. These results replicate and extend the findings of Studies 1, 2, and 3. Because we experimentally manipulated instructional strategy (i.e., self-directed versus test-directed) and assessed behavioral measures of allocated effort in Studies 4 and 5, we may conclude that instructional strategy affects the amount of actual effort that students allocate to their strengths and weaknesses.

7. Conclusions and general discussion

In the present research, we examined the effect of instructional strategy on the within-person relation between students’ perceived relative strength (i.e., perceived relative strengths versus weaknesses) and allocated effort to multiple subjects. We conducted a series of five studies, using different methodologies (scenario, field, and experimental studies), research designs (within-person and mixed factorial), populations (secondary school, college, and university students), and measures of effort (intentions, self-reported, and behavioral). The results consistently showed that, in a self-directed instructional strategy condition (i.e., a condition in which students were instructed to pursue their own interests), students tended to allocate more effort to their perceived relative strengths. In contrast, in a test-directed instructional strategy (i.e., a condition in which students were instructed to pursue test results), students tended to allocate more effort to their perceived relative weaknesses. Hence, we conclude that instructional strategy (i.e., self-directed versus test-directed) moderates the within-person relations between perceived relative strength (i.e., perceived relative strengths versus weaknesses) and allocated effort to multiple subjects.

7.1. Theoretical contributions

These findings build on and contribute to the extant literature in several ways. First, our findings extend the literature on the role of competence self-perceptions in motivation. Building on Möller and Marsh (2013), we examined the concept of perceived relative strength, which we defined as competence self-perceptions that result from dimensional (within-person) comparison, rather than temporal (within-person) or social (between-persons) comparison. Our findings contribute to the extant literature by showing that not only temporal comparison (i.e., across a series of trials on a single task; Vancouver et al., 2008; Schmidt & DeShon, 2010), but also dimensional comparison (i.e., across multiple tasks, on a single occasion) may result in either positive or negative relationships between self-perceived competence and allocated effort. This is an important annotation to the literature because most research on the role of competence perceptions in learning effort has been done at the between-person level, and quite consistently demonstrates positive links between self-perceived competence and effort expenditure (e.g., Bandura & Locke, 2003; Latham & Pinder, 2005; Multon et al., 1991; Sadri & Robertson, 1993). Our findings amend the evidence-based belief that self-perceived competence enhances learning effort (Bandura, 1997; Colquitt, LePine, & Noe, 2000; Multon et al., 1991; Richardson, Abraham, & Bond, 2012; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Sitzmann & Ely, 2011). This is, at the dimensional within-person level, when students pursue multiple subjects, and are instructed to pursue test results, self-perceived competence appears to be negatively related to effort. Under these specific conditions, students prefer to allocate their effort to their relative weaknesses.
Second, a few studies have provided indirect evidence that self-directed versus externally-directed instructions may moderate the within-person relation between self-perceived competence and allocated effort to multiple tasks. Specifically, Hiemstra and Van Yperen (2016) found that students who self-directed their pursuit of multiple online learning tasks tended to allocate more effort to the tasks that they perceived as their relative strengths rather than their weaknesses. In contrast, Schmidt and Dolsi (2009) found that participants who pursued external standards on multiple scheduling tasks tended to allocate more effort to the task they perceived as harder to complete. The present research explains these inconsistent findings by demonstrating that instructional strategy (i.e., self-directed versus test-directed) moderates the dimensional within-person relation between students' self-perceived competence and allocated effort to multiple tasks. Specifically, when individuals pursue their own interests, the motivating effect of perceived competence tends to be more powerful. This is in line with self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1997) and self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In contrast, when individuals pursue external standards, the motivating effect of perceived discrepancies tends to prevail, which is in line with control theory (Carver & Schreier, 1981; Vancouver et al., 2008).

Third, our findings add to the literature on the effects of self-directed and test-directed instructional strategies on effort. The extant literature documents both positive (Pittman et al., 1982; Sheldon & Elliott, 1998) and negative (Mawhinney et al., 1971; Wielen-Maier et al., 2011) relations between each type of instructional strategy and effort (Guay et al., 2008; Loyens et al., 2008; Roediger et al., 2011; Sheldon & Biddle, 1998). However, due to their reliance on single-task designs, previous studies are misaligned with common educational practice as a multiple-tasks context. Single task designs do not consider - and therefore overlook - side-effects on other tasks which are likely to occur. Indeed, our findings indicate that, in multiple-tasks contexts, a positive effect on one task may come at the expense of another task. Therefore, in the context of education, we strongly suggest that future studies rely on multiple-tasks designs to examine students' self-regulation.

7.2. Strengths and limitations

To the best of our knowledge, this series of studies is the first to demonstrate that, at the dimensional within-person level, both positive and negative relations exist between self-perceived competence and allocated effort to multiple tasks, depending on instructional strategy (i.e., self-directed versus test-directed). Our findings are remarkably consistent across the studies, which strengthens our confidence in the accuracy and validity of the observed pattern.

A number of limitations should also be noted. First, we focused on one specific aspect of self-directed versus test-directed instructional strategies. That is, we defined instructional strategy as a condition in which students are instructed to pursue their own interests (i.e., self-directed) versus test results (i.e., test-directed). Self-directed and test-directed instructional conditions are broad concepts that can be defined by a range of characteristics, including physical, social, and psychological variables (Candy, 1991; Roediger et al., 2011). Hence, our results refer to a specific aspect of self-directed versus test-directed instructional conditions. Also, it is important to note that we do not claim that there is an inherent, one-on-one, association between self-directed versus test-directed instructional strategies and effort allocation to students' strengths versus weaknesses. Rather, we argue and demonstrate that students who are instructed to pursue their own interests tend to allocate more effort to their relative strengths, whereas students who are instructed to pursue test results tend to allocate more effort to their relative weaknesses.

Second, in the present research, we assessed the effects of instructional strategy on students' short-term effort allocation, which may differ from effects in the long term. For example, self-directed rather than externally-directed learning has been associated with persistence and sustained effort (Hardré & Reeve, 2003; Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992; Vallerand, Fortier, & Guay, 1997). Research also indicates that, relative to self-directed learning, test-directed learning may advance students' short-term rather than long-term learning performance (Grolnick & Ryan, 1987; Sheldon & Biddle, 1998).

Third, we did not assess the quality of students' learning effort. Several studies indicate that self-directed learning may promote conceptual learning and deep information processing, whereas externally-directed learning has been associated with rote learning (Viansteenkiste, Simons, Lens, Sheldon, & Deci, 2004; Vansteenkiste, Simons, Lens, Soenens, & Matos, 2005). On the other hand, it is also conceivable that strengths-oriented students in a self-directed learning condition effectively rehearse knowledge and skills they already master, resulting in no or minimal learning gains. Therefore, future research should also consider the quality of students' effort allocation and learning performance.

Relatedly, a fourth limitation is that we relied on effort rather than learning performance as an outcome variable. Students' effort expenditure is an important variable because it is a major and controllable determinant of learning performance (Ericsson & Lehmann, 1996; Ericsson et al., 1993; Weiner, 1994). In follow-up studies, the current research model may be extended with learning performance as the outcome variable so that the quality of students' effort can be tested as a mediator.

Finally, because we found consistent results across different groups of students, we are confident that our findings are not limited to a specific type of education (i.e., secondary school, college, or university). However, more research is needed to replicate our findings across different educational institutions.

7.3. Practical implications

The present research helps to clarify two phenomena that are commonly observed in classrooms, but have not yet been fully understood. The first is that sometimes students seem to work harder when they believe they are good at something, while at other times they seem to work harder when they believe they are not good at something. The second is that sometimes students seem to work harder when they pursue their own interests, while at other times they seem to work harder when they pursue test results. The present research provides a clear answer. That is, students tend to work harder on the subjects they believe they are relatively good at when they are pursuing their own interests. However, when pursuing test results, they show a tendency to work harder on subjects they believe they are relatively not good at.

These findings have practical implications for learning and instruction. In education, both improving strengths and improving weaknesses are legitimate objectives. On the one hand, an important goal of education is to help students discover and explore their talents and interests. Allocating effort to subjects they are relatively good at may enable students to cultivate their personal qualities and further develop their strengths, which may help them to stand out. On the other hand, helping students to improve their shortcomings is an important educational goal as well. Students need to improve their weaknesses in order to meet the prevailing standards for a degree or profession. Our findings give teachers a better understanding of students' effort allocation to their relative strengths and weaknesses as a function of
different instructional strategies. This understanding may help teachers to support students’ learning efforts, and may guide teachers in directing students’ learning endeavors. When teachers’ aim is to stimulate students to work on their strengths, they may apply a self-directed instructional strategy, by offering students a choice of learning activities, and encourage them to pursue their own interests. In contrast, when teachers’ aim is to stimulate students to work on their weaknesses, one option may be to instruct them to prepare for tests, since this tends to stimulate students to allocate more effort to their weaknesses.

Obviously, a strong emphasis on test requirements may be perceived as controlling by students, which may encourage rote learning rather than deep learning (Vansteenkiste et al., 2004, 2005), and short-term effort rather than sustained effort (Hardré & Reeve, 2003; Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992; Vallerand et al., 1997). This pitfall should be avoided when implementing the outcomes of the present research.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data related to this article can be found at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2018.01.003.
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