Implications of Regulatory Focus Theory for Simulation and Experiential Learning

James Carlson
Texas Tech University
james.carlson@ttu.edu

J. Duane Hoover
Texas Tech University
duane.hoover@ttu.edu

Ronald K. Mitchell
Texas Tech University
ronald.mitchell@ttu.edu

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to explore and contribute to an understanding of how the psychological concept of self-regulatory focus (Higgins, 1997; 1998) is relevant to simulation and experiential learning in general, and classroom settings in particular. An overview of self-regulatory focus theory, which describes how people pursue pleasure and avoid pain, is presented. The implications of self-regulatory focus for setting goals and giving feedback are reviewed in light of previous findings related to motivation in each literature. Some practical applications and recommendations are offered for ABSEL educators. Overall, this paper asserts that ABSEL scholars would do well to be aware of the concept of self-regulatory focus in both the design and execution of simulation and experiential learning exercises.

INTRODUCTION

Factors that can function as determinants of learning, including psychological factors, have occupied the attention of ABSEL scholars. Bernard and Cannon (2011) examined mechanisms to map student-learning motivation, and Hoover (2011) examined the implications of narcissism and complexity avoidance. Appreciating complexity was the focus of Long (2011), while Gosen and Washbush (2005) looked at processes of analyzing and thinking while playing a simulation. The goal of these papers would seem to be to find concepts that are highly pertinent to ABSEL scholars and to their students. The present paper adds the concept of regulatory focus to this list.

Educational settings are highly complex environments (Davis & Sumara, 2010). There is much more to successful education than what meets the eye in most teacher-student, student-environment, and teacher-environment interactions. Perhaps this is part of the reason that experiential learning tends to be more effective than other methodologies: it is better equipped to address the full scale of complexity that is inherently part of the classroom. Experiential learning can be thought of as an expansion of the boundaries of education—from the cognitive processes of the mind to the other domains of the "whole person" (Hoover, 2007).

One aspect of the complexity inherent in educational processes is learner motivation (Colquitt, LePine, & Noe, 2000). Motivation impacts educational processes because it is related to how individuals process tasks and to what extent they will pursue a task (Grimm, Markman, Maddox, & Baldwin, 2008). Motivation to learn varies between and within groups, and across time (Noe, 1986). Most with teaching experience would agree that at least sometimes the variations are substantial. Even simulation and experiential approaches, though often superior to lecture-only methods, are subject to variability in effectiveness and student outcomes, and as previously noted, at least in part due to psychological factors such as motivation.

For most of its existence, motivational psychology has heartily and unitedly suggested that people "approach pleasure" and "avoid pain." If we all have the same basic motivations, shouldn't students be expected to behave more uniformly in their responses to classroom activities than they actually do? The question of why there so much variability in student motivation in the classroom deserves further consideration and study.

Sensing that the prevailing thinking in the field of motivational psychology was not descriptive enough, Higgins (1997) offered a solution and a call to action to his fellow researchers: "It's time for the study of motivation to move beyond the simple assertion of the hedonic principle that people approach pleasure and avoid pain. It's time to examine how people approach pleasure and avoid pain in substantially different strategic ways that have major consequences." (emphasis added, Edward Tory Higgins, 1997, p. 1280)

What follows is a presentation of Higgins' theory of self-regulatory focus, which does move beyond the "hedonic" (pleasure-seeking) principle. While applications of regulatory focus theory have ranged widely, from decision-making (Crowe & Higgins, 1997), to leadership (Kark & Van Dijk, 2007), to creativity (Baas, De Dreu, &

Nijstad, 2008) and other topics, this paper will focus on the implications of the theory for the classroom.

SELF-REGULATORY FOCUS THEORY: AN OVERVIEW

Self-regulatory focus theory posits that part of why individuals appear to be motivated by different factors, even if each is seeking pleasure and avoiding pain, is due to the different strategies that individuals employ to do so. Self-regulatory focus theory describes what end-states people focus on as they regulate themselves: either accomplishments and aspirations (which is termed a "promotion-focus") or safety and responsibilities (a "prevention-focus"). The difference in focal end states suggests that pleasure and pain may not be the same for everybody.

The theory suggests that those with a focus toward promotion have an orientation toward ideals, and strive to eliminate the distance between their current state and their desired end-state(s), which are characterized or defined by aspirations and accomplishments. Those with a prevention-focus have an orientation toward "oughts"—duties or obligations that lead to safety or protection. Rather than eliminate distance between their current state and their desired end-state(s), they seek to increase the distance between their current state and an undesired end-state. Higgins additionally asserts that the two types of focus, promotion and prevention and promotion, are not just the opposite of each other. Those with a promotion focus see the world in terms of gain versus non-gain situations; those with a prevention focus see the world in terms of non-loss versus loss situations.

The connection between these two focuses and the hedonic principle is that each focus has implications for the strategies that an individual may undertake to approach pleasure or avoid pain. Pleasure, for the promotion-focused exists where there is a gain; pleasure for the prevention-focused is a situation where there is not a loss. Pain, for the promotion-focused, is where there is no gain; pain for the prevention-focused exists where there is a loss. Thus, the promotion-focused have sensitivities to the absence (or presence) of positive outcomes, and the prevention-focused have a sensitivity to the presence (or absence) of negative outcomes. The promotion-focused insure "hits," or successful achievement of their goals, and insure against errors of omission. The prevention-focused insure correct rejections, acting to avoid errors of commission. For the promotion focused, it is better to have acted and failed; for the prevention-focused, avoiding mistakes takes priority. This summary perspective, insuring against errors of omission or avoiding errors of commission, has important implications for student learning in the simulation and experiential learning classroom.

In light of the distinctions that self-regulatory theory provides, the concepts of "pleasure" and "pain" that are generally taken for granted are substantially enriched. Pleasure occurs when one's self-regulation is working; pain occurs when one's self-regulation is not working. Thus, individuals do not merely approach pleasure or avoid pain. They seek objects and events that match their self-regulatory focus, and avoid those that do not match. Table 1 provides a summary of regulatory focus theory.

EMPIRICAL SUPPORT

In the twenty plus years since Higgins suggested that "the implications of regulatory focus as a motivational variable have only begun to be examined" (Higgins, 1998, p. 38), many have responded to his assertion with empirical testing. Empirical support for regulatory focus theory has been consistent, as further described in the paragraphs that follow.

Higgins (Higgins, 1998) reviews empirical evidence suggesting that "ideals" and "oughts" form distinct end states. Higgins (Higgins, 1998) also presents new evidence providing support for the distinct emotional consequences promotion and prevention focused individuals feel when their self-regulation has failed. Individuals (who tend to be promotion-focused) who use self-guides that include ideals are prone to experiencing dejection-related emotions upon

Table 1
Summarizing Regulatory Focus Theory*

self-regulatory failure. Individuals whose self-regulation is ought-based (and who tend to be prevention-focused) are more prone to experience agitation-related emotions (Higgins, 1998).

Additional research has clarified the strategies individuals employ to either reduce or amplify the discrepancies between their actual state and their desired end states. Approach strategies are of four types, two each for approach and avoidance (Higgins et. al, 1994). Approach strategies include approaching matches to desired end states or approaching mismatches to undesired end states. Avoidance strategies include avoiding mismatches to desired end states and avoiding matches to undesired end states.

SOURCE OF INDIVIDUAL REGULATORY FOCUS

Regulatory focus is believed to be formed in early childhood as individuals interact with parents or caretakers (Higgins, 1996; Higgins, 1997; Idson, Liberman, & Higgins, 2000; Lee & Aaker, 2004). Self-discrepancy theory (Higgins 1987, 1989), a theoretical pre-cursor to regulatory focus theory (sometimes termed a "sister" theory, e.g. Sassenberg & Woltin 2008) suggests that it is interactions with parents or caretakers that ultimately leads an individual to predominantly use "ideal" versus "ought" self-guides.

A focus on promotion in an individual is likely the result of being raised in a situation where behavior was regulated by the presence or absence of positive outcomes. For instance, when behaving appropriately, an individual may receive some type of reward or physical affection from a parent. When children misbehave, parents withhold positive outcomes, such as by a parent expressing disappointment rather than praise. This method of regulating the behavior of children sends a message based in ideals. Individuals become concerned with and see the world in terms of advancement, growth, and accomplishment.

A focus on prevention in an individual is likely the result of being raised in a situation where behavior is regulated by the absence or presence of negative outcomes. Children may have parents who curb misbehavior by punishing children or by raising their voice. Conversely, these negative outcomes are absent when the child is behaving appropriately. This method of regulating behavior in children sends a message of that children ought to be responsible and meet obligations.

These child-parent or child-caretaker interactions lead to a chronic orientation toward a one of the self-regulatory foci; and this chronic focus is the one that tends to dominate one's self-regulation. The strength of individuals' chronic regulatory focus is related to how readily they can mentally access the discrepancies between actual and ideal or actual and ought selves, respectively (Higgins & Tykocinski, 1992; Keller & Bless, 2006).

While individuals have a certain predisposition and level of chronic activation toward promotion or prevention type of focus, the characteristics of a certain situation can trigger a shift in regulatory focus in a variety of ways (Keller & Bless, 2006). Regulatory focus can also be experimentally induced (Idson, Liberman, & Higgins, 2000). The language used to frame feedback or task instructions can activate a prevention or promotion regulatory focus by communicating the consequences of actions. Actions, choices, or alternatives can be framed in gain/non-gain or non-loss/loss perspectives.

EXAMINATION OF IMPLICATIONS

With an overview of self-regulatory focus theory and associated empirical findings in place, we are now able to turn toward an examination of the implications of these findings for simulation and experiential learning, with a focus on the classroom setting. While the majority of examples given in this section refer to the classroom setting, the authors do not intend that the ramifications of examining regulatory focus in educational or training situations apply only to the classroom. Simulation and experiential learning, in all of their training, skill development and personal growth venues, can be informed by the implications of regulatory focus. Clearly, understanding regulatory focus has the potential to aid instructors in understanding student motivation, which in turn empowers them to design more effective learning experiences. Two areas where the implications of regulatory focus are particularly able to be discerned are in goals and feedback, two areas which are inherent parts of educational and personal development processes.

GOALS

Goal setting is an inherent part of learning for students and teachers, albeit in different ways. For this paper, we will focus on the broad and narrow goals that students have in relation to their outcomes and performance. Educators are involved in this process because they design the courses or learning exercises that give rise to the opportunity to set goals. They also determine the mix of projects, assignments, exams and essays that form an "achievement landscape" for students. Simulations and experiential learning exercises have parameters related to goal identification, mechanisms that facilitate the pursuit of goals, identification and labeling of appropriate and/or inappropriate goal-directed behaviors, and feedback not only as to goal accomplishment or goal frustration, but also to the feedback given along the way as the goal becomes nearer or less attainable.

From the student perspective, student goals may be temporally aligned with the completion of a course (e.g. their final grade) or a particular exercise (e.g., attaining a target learning plateau), or may be focused on a particular exercise, course unit, exam, lecture, or assignment. Some goals are consciously deliberated and committed to, and actively serve as measures for progress and achievement. Goals may be implied by a situation, such as in cases where entrance to a desired program requires a certain GPA in required coursework. Institutional and environmental factors can also effectively impose goals of differing intensities on students or educators (e.g. mandates for

certain levels of performance or outcomes from state-sponsored schools or school donors).

Other goals are more subtle, and may not be verbalized or fully articulated. Even students that have not consciously set some type of achievement goal can be viewed as generally acting in response to some other goals. We recognize that this treatment of goals is a broad conceptualization that includes traditional definitions, but also extends to broader notions of purpose or instrumentation (i.e. doing something to accomplish an enabling objective).

Self-regulatory focus theory allows for significant enrichment and classification of goals since goals can be framed from either a promotion or a prevention focus. Table 2 contains some examples of how individual goals can match a certain regulatory focus.

We now offer a brief review of the motivation literature with respect to goal setting in educational contexts. The vast majority of this literature has been couched in the traditional approach-avoidance motivation theories that self-regulatory focus theory is meant to clarify. Following our review, we show how the findings of regulatory-self focus theory can be used to update thinking on motivation and goals.

GOAL-ORIENTED ACTIVITY AND REGULATORY FOCUS

Goal-oriented activity is central to motivational research (Elliot, 1999). Achievement-motivation goals have been central to educational research on approach-avoidance motivation and learning (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Elliott & Dweck, 1988). Achievement motivation has been defined as "the energization and direction of competence-based affect, cognition, and behavior" (Elliot, 1999).

Two types of achievement-motivation goals exist: performance goals and mastery goals (Ames & Archer, 1988). Performance goals are related to individuals being judged able to perform. A student goal that is concerned with out-performing another individual would be an example of a performance goal. Mastery goals attach importance to skill development. A student goal concerned with attainment of mastery is an example of a mastery goal. Performance goals necessarily require a comparison to the performance of others, whereas mastery goals involve a focus on one's own development toward maximal competence (Elliot, 1999). Performance goals have traditionally been associated with negative learning outcomes, and mastery goals with positive outcomes (Elliot 1999).

Elliot and Church (1997) propose adding the perspective of traditional approach-avoidance motivation to the idea of mastery and performance achievement goals. This is a break from previous thinking (e.g. Meece, Blumenfeld, & Hoyle, 1988) that performance and mastery goals were each a forms of motivational "approach" only. The theories did not account for motivation by avoidance. Elliot & Church tested and found support for mastery, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance goals. Mastery goals in this model are related to achievement motivation and expectations of high competence. Performance-approach goals are related to achievement motivation, expectations of high competence, and fear of failure. Performance-avoidance goals are related to fear of failure, and expectations of low competence.

Importantly, regulatory focus theory proposes that individuals with different regulatory foci are likely to employ different strategies for goal attainment (Förster, Higgins, & Idson, 1998). Higgins et. al (1994) showed that promotion focused individuals are more likely to use a strategy of approaching matches to their goal attainment than they are to avoid mismatches to their goal attainment, despite that being a possible strategy. They should therefore perform better when a situation is framed in a way that represents a match to their goal versus situations framed such that they avoid a mismatch to the goal or desired end state.

Individuals with a prevention focus are more likely to employ strategies that avoid mismatches than approach matches. Because this is their strategic inclination they are likely to perform better when the framing of a situation

Table 2
Examples of Student and Teacher Goals

Type of Goal	Students' Regulatory Focus	
	Promotion	*Prevention*
Completion of course	I am going to get an A in the course.	I should not get less than an A in this course.
Class unit	I am going to really learn this, even enough to apply it to my business.	I need to avoid getting behind in this unit.
Exam	I am going to get as close to a perfect score as possible.	I cannot do worse than a 90 on the test.
Lecture	I am going to do my best to listen attentively.	I am not going to get on Facebook during this lecture.
Simulation	My SimCorp company will be one of the top two most profitable companies in the simulation.	My SimCorp company has to avoid being one of the two least profitable companies in the simulation.
Experiential learning	After this communication exercise is over, I will have mastered the three behavioral skills of this exercise.	When this communication exercise is over, I must not be seen as lacking the three behavioral skills of this exercise.

highlights incentives such that they represent avoiding mismatches to a goal (rather than matches to a goal).

Thus, regulatory focus provides a meaningful addition to the approach-avoidance achievement motivation literature. As has been demonstrated, approach-avoidance motivation did not begin with Higgins and is not unique to self-regulatory focus theory. It is in fact a construal of the hedonic principle, (e.g. approach pleasure and avoid pain) which Higgins sought to clarify with the positing of self-regulatory focus theory. See Elliot (1999) for a review of approach and avoidance motivation in education.

The many pairings formed by regulatory focus theory may cause some to understand mistakenly that approach motivation would be identical to a promotion focus, and avoidance motivation identical to a prevention focus. However, this is not the case, because these concepts are orthogonal (Worthy, Brez, Markman, & Maddox, 2011). It is important to note that the promotion focus of regulatory focus theory and approach motivation are not the same; neither is prevention focus the same as avoidance motivation.

FEEDBACK

In addition to goals, feedback is another inherent part of the learning experience. Individual students receive performance feedback in the form of exam scores, simulation performance parameters and experiential learning exercises success and failure experiences. They may also receive feedback on essays, presentations, or other assignments as a group or as individuals. Feedback has been shown to have an important impact on motivation (DeNisi & Kluger, 2000).

Regulatory focus theory has been instrumental in clarifying the effects of feedback sign (positive vs. negative) on motivation. Van-Dijk and Kluger (2004) found that self-regulatory focus could explain the variability in individual motivation based on feedback sign. This finding helped resolve the issues raised by a previous meta-analysis that found that the impact of feedback sign on motivation was inconclusive (cf., Kluger & Denisi, 1996).

In the interest of fairness, grading requires a uniform approach (e.g. an explicit rubric, multiple-choice exams, etc.) However, instructors who embellish feedback with personalized comments may benefit greatly from knowing the regulatory focus of their students and providing feedback in a sign that will be most motivating. Perhaps unanticipated negative consequences from feedback to students will be decreased as feedback comes to be delivered in a way that comports well with the self-regulatory focus of the student. An alternative approach would be to communicate to the students that (for example), a particular regulatory focus orientation, such as a promotion-based orientation, would be adopted and used exclusively in the classroom or learning exercise. Note: the authors have an experiential exercise that illustrates how this can be done. However, it is beyond the scope of this paper and the page allotment of an ABSEL paper to present that in this paper focused on conceptualization and importance of the implications of regulatory focus for simulation and experiential learning.

It is important to note that high levels of motivation are not found solely in one regulatory focus or the other (i.e. in promotion vs. prevention). Rather, higher levels of motivation occur when there is a match between regulatory focus and feedback sign: positive feedback is more highly motivating to the promotion-focused than the prevention focused; and negative feedback is more highly motivating to the prevention-focused than the promotion focused (Van-Dijk & Kluger, 2004). The importance of this matching of simulation and experiential learning parameters to individual regulatory focus is central to the conceptualizations in this paper.

VALUE FROM FIT: CHRONIC VS. SITUATIONAL REGULATORY FOCUS

Perhaps the easiest way to view the implications of regulatory focus theory for simulation and experiential learning are in light of regulatory fit (Higgins 2000, 2005, 2006). Regulatory fit is an experience that individuals have when the means they use to pursue their goals match their regulatory focus. Shah, Higgins, and Friedman (Shah, Higgins, & Friedman, 1998) found that a fit between task incentives, means of achieving a goal, and the chronic regulatory focus of individuals increased motivation and subsequently performance. Thus, when instructors give assignments or exams, design and implement learning exercises, or otherwise require measurable effort or an outcome from students, the means that are provided to students for their accomplishment of that goal have significant impact on the students' subsequent motivation.

Some methods used to show empirical support for regulatory focus theory are highly applicable to certain aspects of education. For instance, most exams administered during the course of a year require students to recall information. Importantly, individuals tend to remember information that is framed in a way that fits their regulatory focus (Higgins 1998). Thus, for example, instructors can write test items such that they are couched or framed in language that activates a certain focus. If the language on the exam is similar to the regulatory focus that was activated when the information was presented, individuals with a regulatory focus matching that of the presented information will be more likely to remember the information. For more on regulatory fit and cognitive performance, see Keller & Bless (2006).

How might a teacher learn about the regulatory focus of their students? Teachers could find value in administering a simple instrument, perhaps the same used in research. In a meta-analysis of the nomological network of regulatory focus, Gorman et. al (2012) identified 14 different self-report measures of regulatory focus. The most widely used to date, by their count, is the General Regulatory Focus Measure (Lockwood, Jordan, & Kunda, 2002) with the Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (RFQ) as another popular measure (Higgins et al., 2001). Both measures are available in their entirety in the cited references. As relatively short instruments, they could be completed quickly in class or as an early assignment as part of a "getting to know you" exercise.

Promotion- or prevention-focused language can appear on syllabi, in the directions for exams or quizzes, in classroom discussion, in learning exercises, or in student-student or student-teacher interactions. ABSEL educators would do well to consciously consider how their current learning goals are communicated and framed.

It is also helpful to note that national cultures have been found to differ in their approach-avoidance motivation and regulatory focus (Hamamura, et. al, 2009). North Americans have a greater orientation toward a promotion-focus, whereas East Asians tend to have a greater prevention-focus orientation. As an increasingly global world brings more diversity to classrooms, situations of regulatory focus conflict may become more prevalent.

To the extent they have control over the presentation of their content and the design of learning exercises; instructors are capable of framing class activities, exercises, exams, and assignments in a certain regulatory focus. Instructors attempting to match the regulatory focus of their students will essentially need to determine what situations can be generally construed as a match to a particular regulatory focus (such as casting a class exam as entirely prevention- or promotion-focused) and which situations will need situational priming (such as providing prevention - or promotion-focused preparation for a standardized exam such as the GMAT, or CPA exam). In the case of experiential learning or simulations, regulatory focus considerations may entail how an activity, simulation, or game is couched. For instance, a strategy simulation class winner can be defined either in terms of "best strategy" or "avoided strategic mistakes." In simulations where there is a "winner," the game ought to match with the self-regulation of the students, if reasonable.

Brodscholl, et. al (2007) find that two conditions of goal pursuit, attainment and maintenance, are served by different self-regulatory strategies. They hypothesize and find that goal attainment is better served by the eagerness associated with approach strategies, and that goal maintenance is better served by the vigilance of avoidance strategies. Thus, one final implication for the classroom is that mechanisms that dynamically adjust to the level of student goal achievement, by responding with prevention-framed cues when goals are attained, and promotion-framed cues when goals have yet to be achieved, will outperform a single classroom strategy rooted in only prevention or promotion framing.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The literature addressing self-regulatory focus and the classroom is scant. Leung and Lam (2003) examined the impact of regulatory focus in Chinese elementary-school teachers. They found that the teachers tended to employ classroom management strategies that fit their regulatory focus (e.g. teachers with a promotion focus tended to praise students whereas prevention- focused teachers tended to punish students). When experiencing failure, teachers with a promotion focus experienced more dejection-related emotions and teachers with a prevention focus experienced more agitation-related emotion. This study is helpful in highlighting the ramifications of the regulatory focus of the teacher in a classroom, but offers little in the way of understanding student regulatory focus.

We hope that this article will guide ABSEL educators in their understanding of regulatory focus theory and its applications in simulation and experiential learning. We propose that we may do well to step back and consider the student experience of our simulations and learning exercises in light of the present discussion. Benefits could come from considering what the overall "air" or "atmosphere" of our learning experiences are with respect to regulatory focus, and whether such is aligned with the regulatory focus of students. Where differences are brought into alignment, student motivation is potentially greater. It is likely that an individual educator's regulatory focus is communicated and embedded in their teaching and class design. In the process of considering the regulatory focus of their students, educators and trainers may find it beneficial to also take time to consider their own regulatory focus.

Additionally, the analysis of problems found in educational or in training settings may be facilitated by considering regulatory focus theory. Regulatory focus may be a fruitful variable to consider when analyzing root causes of interpersonal problems or conflict. For example, a mismatch of regulatory focus may be the reason for an individual's or instructor's unspecific or nebulous feeling that some person or some class "just bothers" them.

Providing some degree of motivation is part of the social contract of education, and has been the focus of too many ABSEL papers written by ABSEL scholars over the last 40 years to list here. At the very least, ABSEL educators should ensure that their class does not inhibit motivation. Inappropriate motivational alignment or a lack of regulatory fit may negatively impact student perceptions of a course or of the instructor. Additionally, most educators likely desire to see what their students are capable of, and greater regulatory fit resulting in greater motivation is likely to lead to greater accomplishment both in the classroom and in the world. Examining the regulatory focus of an individual classroom is possible and potentially important. As has been alluded to, some of the perceptions student have about their environment come from factors other than an individual class. For example, past student experience with education can be an influence. Perhaps further work could consider if individual schools or even educational philosophies have an orientation toward prevention or promotion foci.

Many aspects of education can be identified as seeming to emerge from a prevention-focused orientation. This could be for several reasons. Perhaps some educational systems, as they attempt to match value systems of institutions, key stakeholders, or large groups of people, are better adapted to teach "oughts" versus "ideals." Higgins (2000) has pointed out that ideals function as maximal goals, which require continual effort and striving, and oughts function as minimal goals that a person should attain. It may be that the reason the educational system has evolved to teach "oughts" is because it is simply easier to do so.

Further research in this area should also consider the work of updating traditional approach-avoidance motivation with respect to educational settings. As

mentioned previously, the implications of regulatory focus theory have been studied widely, and across multiple disciplines. However, implications of regulatory focus theory for the classroom heretofore remained unexplored empirically. We believe that regulatory focus theory has much to offer in understanding motivation in the classroom.

Admittedly, many studies of motivation (including regulatory-focus theory) are content-neutral, by which we mean the theory seeks to explain human motivation abstractly enough that the findings are applicable to a variety of settings. Even if this is the case, empirical work should consider whether such findings hold in environments as complex as simulation and experiential learning applications. Further, explorations into ways to simultaneously engage both types of regulatory focus with a single activity or framing could be helpful for situations where the regulatory focus of the group is split fairly evenly. Since a simulation or experiential learning exercise begins with the design of the activity, ABSEL scholars could be well-served in their learning system objectives by including the concept of regulatory focus in their design considerations.

REFERENCES

Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(3), 260–267.

Baas, M., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Nijstad, B. A. (2008). A meta-analysis of 25 years of mood-creativity research: Hedonic tone, activation, or regulatory focus? *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(6), 779–806.

Brodscholl, J. C., Kober, H., & Higgins, E. T. (2007). Strategies of self-regulation in goal attainment versus goal maintenance. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 628–648.

Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Noe, R. A. (2000). Toward an integrative theory of training motivation: A meta-analytic path analysis of 20 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 678–707.

Crowe, E., & Higgins, E. T. (1997). Regulatory Focus and Strategic Inclinations : Promotion and Prevention in Decision-Making. *Organizational Behavior and Humand Decision Processes*, 69(2), 117–132.

Davis, B., & Sumara, D. (2010). "If things were simple...": Complexity in education. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 16(4), 856–60.

DeNisi, A. S., & Kluger, A. N. (2000). Feedback effectiveness: Can 360-degree appraisals be improved ? *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(1), 129–139.

Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist*, 41(10), 1040–1048.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 256–273.

Elliot, A. J. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educational Psychologist*, 34 (3), 169–189.

Elliot, A. J., & Church, M. A. (1997). A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(1), 218–232.

Elliott, E. S., & Dweck, C. S. (1988). Goals: an approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(1), 5–12.

Förster, J., Higgins, E. T., & Idson, L. C. (1998). Approach and avoidance strength during goal attainment: regulatory focus and the "goal looms larger" effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(5), 1115–31.

Gorman, C. A., Meriac, J. P., Overstreet, B. L., Apodaca, S., McIntyre, A. L., Park, P., & Godbey, J. N. (2012). A meta-analysis of the regulatory focus nomological network: Work-related antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(1), 160–172.

Grimm, L. R., Markman, A. B., Maddox, W. T., & Baldwin, G. C. (2008). Differential effects of regulatory fit on category learning. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(3), 920–927.

Hamamura, T., Meijer, Z., Heine, S. J., Kamaya, K., & Hori, I. (2009). Approach--avoidance motivation and information processing: A cross-cultural analysis. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(4), 454–62.

Higgins, E. T. (1996). The "self digest": Self-knowledge serving self-regulatory functions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(6), 1062–83.

Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *The American Psychologist*, 52(12), 1280–300.

Higgins, E. T. (1998). Promotion and prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 30, 1–46.

Higgins, E. T. (2000). Making a good decision: Value from fit. *American Psychologist*, 55(11), 1217–1230.

Higgins, E. T., Friedman, R. S., Harlow, R. E., Idson, L. C., Ayduk, O. N., & Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: Promotion pride versus prevention pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 3–23.

Higgins, E. T., Roney, C. J. R., Crowe, E., & Hymes, C. (1994). Ideal versus ought predilections for approach and avoidance: Distinct self-regulatory systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(2), 276–86. Higgins, E. T., & Tykocinski, O. (1992). Self-discrepancies and biographical memory: Personality and cognition at the level of psychological situation. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18(5), 527–535.

Hoover, J. D. (2007). How "whole" is whole person learning? An examination of spirituality in experiential learning. *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning*, 34, 324–330.

Idson, L. C., Liberman, N., & Higgins, E. T. (2000). Distinguishing gains from nonlosses and losses from nongains: A regulatory focus perspective on hedonic intensity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36(3), 252–274.

Kark, R., & Van Dijk, D. (2007). Motivation to lead, motivation to follow: The role of the self-regulatory

focus in leadership processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 500–528.

Keller, J., & Bless, H. (2006). Regulatory fit and cognitive performance: The interactive effect of chronic and situationally induced self-regulatory mechanisms on test performance. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(3), 393–405.

Kluger, A. N., & Denisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review , a meta-analysis , and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(2), 254–284.

Lee, A. Y., & Aaker, J. L. (2004). Bringing the frame into focus: The influence of regulatory fit on processing fluency and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(2), 205–18.

Leung, C., & Lam, S. (2003). The effects of regulatory focus on teachers' classroom management strategies and emotional consequences. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 28(1), 114–125.

Lockwood, P., Jordan, C. H., & Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by positive or negative role models: Regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(4), 854–864.

Meece, J. L., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Hoyle, R. H. (1988). Students' goal orientations and cognitive engagement in classroom activities. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(4), 514–523.

Noe, R. A. (1986). Trainees' attributes and attitudes: Neglected influences on training effectiveness. *The Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 736.

Shah, J., Higgins, E. T., & Friedman, R. S. (1998). Performance incentives and means: How regulatory focus influences goal attainment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(2), 285–93.

Van-Dijk, D., & Kluger, A. N. (2004). Feedback sign effect on motivation: Is it moderated by regulatory focus? *Applied Psychology*, 53(1), 113–135.

Worthy, D. A., Brez, C. C., Markman, A. B., & Maddox, W. T. (2011). Motivational influences on cognitive performance in children: Focus over fit. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, 12(1), 103–119.