On Observing Learning
An Essay for the DI Teacher

By Ziggy Engelmann

Observing things in nature grow and develop is an extremely interesting phenomenon, and trees and human beings are fascinating — the way the buds form and develop into leaves; the way new growth sprouts out to give the plant a form that is unique to the species; the way the plant protects itself from competing plants. For example, if a young tree is growing next to another tree that is almost as tall, the tree will try to extend a branch in the small gaps of the competing tree, thereby shading the top. Once the top is shaded, the tree's growth slows and the tree is no longer a serious competitor. The most amazing facet of growth is the way things in nature achieve their shape or form. A young fir tree assumes a conical shape. If its top is cut off, it shoots out a new top and within a few years it again has a perfect conical shape.

Humans are even more fascinating than plants because they are more complex and are capable of growth in more ways than a tree. The human mind, the topic of thousands of books, is probably the most fascinating growing part of the young human because of the amazingly complex way that it matures. How the mind works is basically a mystery, but the way in which it works is remarkably clear. The mind grows in response to demands from the environment and encouragement from the environment. The mind begins as something more than a blank slate. In the infant, the mind has a full program of responses, most of which are emotional. Even the simplest activities amuse, frustrate, or dramatically anger the infant. States, such as mild hunger, create incredibly strong emotional responses; and environmental changes, such as a smile from the infant's mother, create a response that seems to be pure joy. From these emotional responses and the magnificent human brain comes learning and habits. At first, the learning is meager. Even after infants have been exposed to their new environment for a year, they may give no evidence that they understand the basic assumptions of language — which is that the same word or utterance means the same thing each time it occurs. But when these infants have talked with the language code for a few more months, they begin to understand it, and they begin to learn at a rate that is almost frightening. Now meager gains are replaced by astonishing leaps, generalizations, and "role playing." Still driven by the very strong emotions that characterize early childhood, these youngsters want to do the things their parents and older siblings do. Their incessant tendency to socialize is reflected in their pretend behavior, their play, and their insistence on tagging along and doing what the others do.

(Continued on page 10)

Direct Instruction: The Child's Creative Future

Byroyn Maggs, M. Psych.
Clinical Psychologist

Alex Maggs, Ph.D.
Senior Lecturer in Education
Macquarie University, N.S.W., Australia

Editor's Note: The following article is taken from the Australian version of DI News called Teach Every Child (Somersby, NSW). The article has been slightly abridged. The reader may wish to know that the research on teaching effectiveness has been summarized by Barbara Rosenthal who first noted that converging research points to a model of effective teaching which he called "direct instruction." The references are:


Never before have teachers been so well qualified to make professional judgments about the academic programs they elect to use. An ever-increasing number of teachers extend their formal training, attend in-service courses, and give up weekends to participate in a wide range of workshops that have little to do with promotion and a lot to do with teaching children more effectively.

Just as research moved medical practices out of the dark ages, so has the teaching profession come of age in its recognition that all professional developments must be based on reputable research data rather than "I think, ... I assume, ... I know, ... I prefer." In the 1970s educational research finally moved into the classroom. Not only did this give teachers instructional facts to work with and change the emphasis from "failed" child or "failed" teacher or "failed" homelife to "failed" instruction, but encouraged teachers to control their own destinies. To their credit, Australian teachers have been amongst those most open to involving themselves in classroom research and assessing their own teaching. Their program choices and teaching techniques for the children whose skills and development they determine can change. In our own professional lives we've had to do it several times, and expect to again. We've trained in areas heavily dominated by the traditional body of knowledge in psychodramatics, psychology, cognition, information processing, perception, memory, linguistics, etc. When trying to apply these theoretical structures to a wide range of children — the "bright," the "retarded," the "normal," the "disturbed," the results were frustratingly patchy. As happens in any developing body of knowledge, there were fortunately researchers able to draw the best from the past and move into a more effective future. In the 1960s it was the term "backward," and by the 1980s the major body of educational development was direct instruction. Again we charted a new course, and in the 1990s we make an educated guess that the major field of educational change and development will again take the basis of recent educational knowledge and apply it to the field of microcomputers. Somewhat nervous, but reassuringly challenged, we go back to basics and start learning again.

Over the past decade classroom research looked at "good" teachers and "good" students to try and tease out contributing factors. International work in schools has elevated to date about ten new factors that are known to contribute to effective teaching and effective learning. Independent researchers, drawing together the pattern of classroom evidence at several different research sites, found that the most effective (Continued on page 15)
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Letters-to-the-Editor

Editor's Note: Each issue, the DI News will publish letters received by the editors since publication of the previous issue. We invite your comments, criticisms, opinions, inquiries, and other forms of comment on any aspect of the News, the Association, or other issues pertaining to direct instruction. Letters requiring replies will be responded to directly; other letters will be printed without comment. Please send all letters-to-the-editor to:

Stan Paine, Co-Editor
Direct Instruction News
Follow Through/Education University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

Advertise Polices and Rates

The Direct Instruction News will publish advertising material (programs, books, training, conferences, workshops, and services (consultation, evaluation) related to direct instruction. All proceeds from the sale of advertising space will be used to help pay for publication costs incurred by the News. Ad sizes and corresponding costs are as follows:

- Full page: $200
- Half-page: $125
- Quarter-page: $75

20% Off
List Price
Direct Instruction Reading
and Direct Instruction Mathematics
Send $14.95
plus $1 for shipping and handling
for each book
The Association for Direct Instruction
P.O. Box 10252
Eugene, Oregon 97440

ADI Officers Elected

Officers of the Association for Direct Instruction for the 1981-82 membership year were elected at the fall meeting of the ADI Board of Directors. Officers for the current year are: Stan Paine, President; Doug Carmine, Vice-President; Linda Zedeck, Secretary; and Wes Becker, Treasurer.

Stan Paine, a former project manager and research associate with Project Follow Through, is currently managing director of ADI and co-editor of the DI News. Doug Carmine is the Director of Direct Instruction Follow Through Model and is a Direct Instruction consultant for the current program author. Wes Becker is the former Follow Through director for the DI model, co-director of the Engelmann-Becker Corporation, direct instruction author, co-editor of the DI News, and one of the developers of the DI Model.

In keeping with the by-laws of the Association (see DI News, Vol. I, No. 1, September 1981), these officers will serve through the 1982 Summer Conference in Eugene. New officers will be elected at the time of the conference, which marks the end of one membership year and the beginning of another.

Teacher-to-Teacher

Editor's Note: We are pleased to announce a new column, "Teacher-to-Teacher," which will appear in each issue of the News beginning with Volume 1, No. 3, scheduled for publication in December, 1982. This column will be written by classroom teachers about issues of interest or concern to them.

The column will be edited by Jane Cote, teacher at Whitaker Elementary School in Eugene, Oregon. Jane has been involved with Direct Education since 1974; for the past seven years she has taught first and second graders using a comprehensive Direct Instruction curriculum complemented by a variety of behavior management procedures. Jane is also active in the Bethel-Eugene Springfield Teacher's Center and is a member of the Board of Directors of the Association for Direct Instruction. She is considered by many to be one of the best teachers in the United States. We are extremely pleased about her involvement with the News as editor of "Teacher-to-Teacher."
Dear Ziggy

Do you know students who add when they should subtract, who hold their books upside down when they read, or who hang from the light fixtures when you turn your back? Have you ever wondered how to help the students make more sense out of the basal reading program you’re stuck with? Have you ever asked, “Can this classroom be saved?” If you have ever had a question about your curriculum, your instruction, or your classroom management (or about those of someone you supervise), this column is for you. And who would be more likely to have an answer to your questions than “Dear Ziggy”?

In each issue, beginning with the Spring, 1992 issue, we will publish letters from readers along with answers from “Dear Ziggy” — about common (and unique) educational problems. Whether you are a teacher, administrator, parent, or student, we invite your letters. You have enough other things to think about — give your problems to “Dear Ziggy.”

Write to:
Dear Ziggy Coleman
Association for Direct Instruction
P.O. Box 10252
Eugene, OR 97440

DI Preschools
Please Help

Do you use DI in a preschool? Paul Weisberg wants to find out about the scope and extent of usage of Direct Instruction in preschools across the country. If you know of a Head Start, day care, or special school that uses D.I., please contact Paul either by calling (203) 348-5083 (or 5553) or by writing P.O. Box 2968, Department of Psychology, University of Alabama, University, AL 35486.
Direct Instruction Outcomes with Middle-Class Second Graders

By Siegfried Engelmann and Doug Carnine

Because the Distar programs are used extensively with lower performing children, many educators have assumed that the programs are designed only for low performers and that they are either not appropriate or are even stultifying for "average" children. The Distar authors, on the other hand, maintain that the programs are designed for any child who has not mastered the skills necessary to read, to solve arithmetic problems, or to handle basic language operations.

Data on the Engelmann-Becker Follow Through Model (Becker & Engelmann, 1979) tend to substantiate the authors' contention that Distar does not inhibit middle-class children's achievement. Within Follow-Through classrooms, there are 20 percent middle-class children. At the end of second grade, the average performance in reading decoding for 3,363 poor children who started in first grade was grade level 3.7 (based on the Wide Range Achievement Test norm; for 874 middle-class children, the average reading performance was grade 4.5.

To further document the effects of Direct Instruction on the attitudes and achievement of "average" children, data were collected on a classroom of 30 middle-class second graders in Springfield, Oregon. The top half of the total second-grade enrollment — as determined by teacher assessment — was placed in the experimental classroom (28 children). These children had been in Distar as first graders also. Two low-performing children were added to the experimental classroom. One was a repeater (the only student who had been retained). The other was placed in the classroom on the recommendation of the reading specialist.

During both the first-grade year and the second-grade year, the children were taught primarily by trainers (students at the University of Oregon enrolled in a practicum on Direct Instruction techniques). Two academic skills — reading and arithmetic — were taught by trainers each morning during a two-hour period. For reading the second-grade year, each child received one-half hour of small-group instruction in Level III Distar (which focuses heavily on science content), one-half hour of independent reading, and one-quarter hour of entire class instruction. The daily arithmetic instruction involved one-half hour of entire class presentation and one-quarter hour of independent work.

The second-grade classroom teacher was rated as a superior teacher; however, the trainers were responsible for the bulk of academic instruction in reading and arithmetic.

A supervisor was responsible for training the trainers and for monitoring their performance. A total of six trainers taught the children over the two-year period. The trainers usually switched subject areas or small groups at the beginning of each new quarter, which meant that the children were frequently taught by three different "teachers" during the year, some of whom initially had never taught children before. Based on training data and children's performance on the follow-through, one would expect that the inexperienced teachers would not be able to achieve performance gains as great as those of experienced teachers.

These tests were given from late April to early June of the second-grade year:

Stanford Achievement Test (Primary Battery 2) for Reading, Arithmetic, and Science. Wide Range Achievement test for oral reading.

The ten children who performed best in reading achievement also received the Gates-MacGinitie test of Speed and Accuracy (for fourth through sixth graders).

An attitude questionnaire (developed by the investigators) was designed to tap the children's feelings about their reading program, their teacher, and themselves. (See Table 1.) The attitude questionnaire was presented to the entire class. The tester told the students that he was going to ask questions about their reading program and that the children were not to write their names on the test form. The tester then read each item aloud and the children circled the words that indicated how they felt. (The questions did not appear on the children's answer sheets.)

Results

Figure 1 presents bar graphs of the reading test scores.

The first bar shows the mean reading (comprehension) score for all 30 children on the Stanford Achievement Test and the publishers norm (crosshatched). The mean performance for the 30 subjects was at the 4.6 grade level. The only two children who scored below grade (below 2.7) were the two low performers added to the classroom. Both scored 2.6.

The second bar shows the mean performance for all children on the WRAT Reading (oral decoding). No child scored below grade norm.

Results of the Gates-MacGinitie tests of Reading Speed and Accuracy appear on the third and fourth bars. Only the top ten children received this test. Although the children were in the second grade, they received the fourth through sixth grade battery because that is where they were performing. The ten children's mean performance was grade level 7.6 for speed and 7.5 for accuracy. The lowest score for speed was 4.6 (both scores achieved by the same child).

Figure 2 shows the performance of all 30 children in Science and Arithmetic as measured by the Stanford-second grade battery.

The children were not taught science as a subject. What they had learned about science derived from Distar Reading III. The 15-minute daily entire class activity could be labelled "science," since the children learned the various science rules presented in Distar III during this time. In science performance, the mean of 4.8 is significantly above the expected norm of 2.7. Only four children scored below grade level.
The mean Arithmetic performance grade level 3.4 is not as high as that of reading and science. This trend is consistent for arithmetic performance was one of the factors that contributed to the overall esteem of the children. The results of the attitude questionnaire are summarized in Table 1. The children who scored 85 or higher on the attitude questionnaire were considered to have a positive attitude towards school. The children who scored below 85 were considered to have a negative attitude towards school. The results of the attitude questionnaire were analyzed using a t-test. The t-test was used to compare the mean scores of the children who scored above 85 and those who scored below 85. The results of the t-test indicated that there were significant differences between the two groups. The children who scored above 85 had a higher mean score than those who scored below 85.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Enjoyment</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. How much did you enjoy the stories?</strong></td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>a lot</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. How much did you enjoy the workbook?</strong></td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>a lot</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Were the materials too easy, just right, too hard?</strong></td>
<td>too easy</td>
<td>just right</td>
<td>too hard</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Which part of the program did you enjoy the most?</strong></td>
<td>beginning</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>end</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Which part of the program did you enjoy the least?</strong></td>
<td>beginning</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>end</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Interest and Curiosity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. How much did you talk about what you’ve learned with other people?</strong></td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>a lot</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Have you read other books to find out more about something you read in a story?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Self-Image</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. How smart are you compared to other kids who you know?</strong></td>
<td>smarter</td>
<td>smarter</td>
<td>smarter</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. How well are you going to do next year in school?</strong></td>
<td>very well</td>
<td>O.K.</td>
<td>not too good</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. How smart are you going to be when you grow up?</strong></td>
<td>very smart</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. How much did the teacher expect you to work?</strong></td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>a lot</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of children who indicated that response.

**Reference**
the Singer or the Song?

Does the Programme Make a Difference with a Good Teacher?

= 0.90. This gave a highly significant difference (p < 0.002) for Distar gains over Remedial gains given equal teaching time during phase one. The group mean gain scores are shown in Figure 1, and were used to predict performance at 22 weeks by extrapolation. Both types of intervention exceed the conventional prediction of 12 months gain for 12 months instruction.

It should also be noted that the conventional prediction gradient has in fact been plotted at its most optimistic level, namely that of 12 months gain for a teaching year of around 40 weeks.

Table 2 indicates that within the Distar group the average gain was 2.63 months lower in the second 11-week phase. Although the acceleration rate is still far superior to both conventional and remedial gradients, this difference is statistically significant and needs to be accounted for. A possible explanation may lie in the greater task-complexity encountered further along in the programme; if this is correct, the fall-off in rate of gain may be an artifact of hierarchical programme construction. It may also be simply an artifact of the skills tested in relation to what the programme teaches.

From Table 3 the reverse effect can be seen. Although remedial teaching accelerated these children at a rate well in excess of conventional expectation, transfer to the Distar reading programme boosted them still further. The difference between the mean gains for each phase, 6.17 and 12.20 months respectively, yielded a t-value of 15.87 which was significant at the .001 level. A

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gains at 11 Weeks Over Status at Start</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distar Group</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Group</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Distar Group Gains in Months</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gain at 11 Weeks</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain from 11-22 Weeks</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remedial to Distar Group Gains in Months</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Gain at 11 Weeks</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distar Gain from 11-22 Weeks</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1:**

**Prediction From 11 to 22 Week Status**

- **Months Gain**
  - **Distar Prediction**
  - **Remedial Prediction**
  - **Conventional Prediction**

- **Weeks Instruction**

Reading assessment and teaching were executed by a remedial specialist of some years experience. She had no ancillary help in the classroom, and while one group received tuition, the other completed an alternative assignment. To keep seatwork going, housepoints (popular amongst the children) were awarded for on-task behaviour.

The appropriate Direct Instruction programme for the age-range involved was Distar Reading II. The placement test from this programme was administered to all children, with the outcome that 7 of them scored between 4 and 10 errors, the recommended error range for entry at lesson 1 of the programme. The remaining 7 children were assigned to a routine remediation group.

"Routine" remediation included criterion-referenced assessment, phonemic skills, regular small-group teaching of sound and word discrimination, and individualised activities based on Tansley's (1974) "Sound Sense," Rubot's (1977) "Word-Perfect" series of readers, East Riding Remedial Service phonemic work-cards, and individually designed back-up materials. Reading assessment was carried out before instruction commenced and again at the end of each phase of instruction, using the school's standard reading instrument, Schonell's graded word reading test (1972 revision).

**Results**

Analysis of the data shown in Table 1 using t for independent samples yielded t
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Dissent

The editors believe that publishing a dissent is critical to the health of the field, which tends to be fair and open, which encourages readers to think through issues for themselves, and which wants to avoid a prevailed dogmatism. Therefore, we welcome expressions of dissent on various direct instruction issues—in either from those who consider themselves direct instruction professionals or from those who view the field from a different perspective. You may submit your views as either two or four page formal dissents or, in brief form, as letter-to-the-editors. All dissents should be based on issues, not on personalities, and should be signed by the author. Submit dissenting opinions to the editors.

Employment Exchange

As a service to our readers, we would like to publish notices of positions available, positions wanted, and job exchange opportunities in each issue of the News. To do so, however, we need information which only you, the readers, or your colleagues, can provide for us. This is one feature of the News for which we cannot generate our own information. If you want to hire someone, but want to make sure they have a direct instructional background, or if you are frustrated about your efforts to use direct instruction in your present position and are looking for a more supportive environment, the Employment Exchange might be a source of assistance for you. In many cases, people find direct instruction staff and direct instruction positions at all levels of employment in both service delivery (teachers, supervisors, administrators) and higher education (teaching, research) settings. Send your notices, marked "Employment Exchange," to the editors. Restrict your length to 50-60 words. For the immediate future, no charge will be made to members for this service.
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You Can Help Us Reach New Members

If you are attending any conventions that would likely attract persons interested in DI we will provide you with copies of this newsletter for distribution. Write Wes Becker at ADI indicating how many copies you will need.
The CORBEH Behavior

By Hill M. Walker

CORBEH (Center at Oregon for Research in the ehavioral Education of the Handicapped) was a research and development center at the University of Oregon from 1970-1979. CORBEH was directed by Hill Walker and funded by the Office of Special Education Programs within the Department of Education.

The Center contracted in 1970 to develop, test, and evaluate four behavior management packages for use by school personnel inremediating commonly encountered child behavior disorders. The four packages were developed for each of the following behavior disorders: (1) acting out behavior, (2) low academic survival skills, (3) survival skills, and (4) social skills. Research and development activities on the packages are incomplete. Each package contains the following components: (1) a consultant manual, (2) a teacher and counselor-supervisor's manual, (3) a program materials packet, and (4) a tape cassette/filmstrip T.I.P. (Total Information Program) that provides overview of the package. The approximate cost of each package is $25-30, excluding the T.I.P. (which can be borrowed for up to a year). The program has also been successfully replicated within additional costs. The package supporting research and ordering information can be obtained by writing to CORBEH, Clinical Services Building, Office of University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403.

The remainder of this article describes: (1) the behavior management packages, (2) the research process used to develop them, and (3) references on their effectiveness.

THE BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT PACKAGES

The four packages developed by CORBEH are: (1) CLASS (Contingencies for Learning Academic Skills) for acting out children; (2) PASS (Program for Academic Survival Skills) for children with low academic skills; (3) PES (Program for Establishing Effective Relationship Skills) for socially withdrawn children; and (4) RECESS (Reprogramming Contingencies for Effective Social Skills) for socially aggressive children. CLASS and PASS are focused on academically related behavior within classroom settings; PES and RECEESS focus on social behavior in playground settings. All four packages have been field tested and are used extensively in this country, Canada, and Australia. The CLASS and PASS packages have also been successfully replicated within additional costs. Negotiations are currently ongoing with commercial publishers for publication of the packages.

The program packages are implemented over a two to three month period, and then, either terminated or followed up with a low cost maintenance program. Although designed for use primarily in mainstream educational settings, the packages can and have been used in special classes and resource rooms. However, efficacy studies of the packages have only been carried out to date in mainstream settings.

CLASS

The CLASS program is a set of procedures designed to modify the disruptive behavior of the acting out child. Its goal is to decrease the occurrence of these behaviors which interfere with academic and social achievement. To reach this goal, the program involves as many social agents as possible (parents, teachers, classmates) to build in positive behavior across multiple settings.

The program is implemented via a teacher-consultant, e.g., school psychologist, counselor, or resource teacher, who works closely with the regular classroom teacher. The consultant provides direct intervention in the regular classroom setting, and when necessary, involves additional personnel in the program, e.g., school psychologist, social worker, or guidance counselor.

The basic components of the CLASS program include: (1) the identification of a child likely to benefit from the program; (2) procedures for obtaining the involvement and cooperation of all principal participants; and (3) the implementation of the remedial procedures. Children are selected through teacher ratings and classroom observations by the consultant. After the case is accepted, the program is explained to the child's teacher and principal, his parents, the child himself, and his classmates. Each party signs an agreement which specifies his/her role and responsibility in the program. The program does not proceed unless the agreement has been signed by all.

The great majority of acting out children who are judged to be appropriate candidates for the CLASS program are boys. The behavioral characteristics of such children often include one or more of the following: (1) disrupting the classroom, (2) noncompliance with teacher instructions, directions, and commands, (3) hurting others, (4) destroying property, (5) low levels of academic achievement, and (6) low self-esteem. The behavior pattern can be characterized as acting out against classroom rules, procedures, and established structures.

PASS

The PASS program is a group-behavior-management system designed to improve the academic performance of primary level children on academic survival skills. Academic survival skills (attending to assigned tasks, listening carefully to instructions and directions, following directions, and talking with peers about academics) are the prerequisites for effective academic performance. The program is designed to include children in classrooms who have low rates of academic survival skills. However, the program is applied on a classwide basis. Thus, low-functioning children are not singled out by the intervention procedure.

The PASS program is designed to be used by the consultant (either a school psychologist, teacher, or school psychologist, team leader, in-service instructor). Included in the materials are solutions to problems situations that invariably arise, suggestions for engineering the program to the idiosyncratic nature of most classroom programs, and alternative suggestions regarding situations in which the program would be beneficial or inappropriate for use. Research has shown that if the procedures and techniques are systematically and consistently applied, significant improvement can be expected.

PASS is divided into five implementation phases:

1. Preliminary assessment. Observations are carried out by the consultant to determine the need for the program.
2. Teacher baseline observations. The teacher learns to record and graph the time all students are demonstrating classroom behavior, including academic performance, for a two-day period.
3. The full program. The teacher and consultant instruct the child in using the survival skills group, reward using available school activities, and give praise for improvement in survival skill score.
4. Random checks. The teacher randomly monitors the child's performance in the classroom setting. The teacher begins a gradual removal of program components.
5. Maintenance. The teacher carries out two random checks on the survival skills score and the teacher's praise rate. These options are available for maintaining the program to remain improved. If maintenance checks indicate a drop in performance.

The complete program takes 25-45 consecutive school days of the rate of progress and the number of daily academic periods involved.

Children with low academic survival skills are not behavior problems in the same sense as are acting out children. They are not, as a rule, disruptive of classroom atmosphere, nor are they usually defiant of teacher commands and directions. However, the types of inappropriate classroom behavior of children in these categories are incompatible with academic performance and achievement.

As a result, such children are often below grade level in achievement. The ratio of boys to girls low on academic survival skills in approximately 6:3.5.

PEERS

The PEERS program for socially withdrawn children utilizes an individual contingency with group activity
RECESSION consists of the following components: (1) discrimination training for the target subject and peers in appropriate versus inappropriate social behavior and/or behaviors which operate during recess, (3) adult praise (consultant, teacher, playground supervisor) for positive, appropriate interactive behavior, and (4) group reward available at school and the individual reward available at home. The point system, praise, and school and home contingencies are in effect throughout the entire program. The discrimination training procedures are implemented just prior to the start of the program with review sessions programmed intermittently during its early stages.

THE RECESS program consists of four sequential phases occurring over a 6 to 7 week period: (1) Recess Only, (2) Full Program, (3) Failing, and (4) Maintenance. The Recess Only part of the programs lasts two weeks and the consultant assumes primary responsibility for operating it. The intervention procedures are implemented in all three recess periods simultaneously, and, if the target child has zero negative/aggressive behavior in 2 out of the 3 recesses, the daily group reward is earned and made available at the end of the school day. Whatever recess points remain at the end of the day can be exchanged for tickets which are taken home to count toward special home privileges. During this two-week period, the consultant gradually trains the recess supervisor to operate the program.

A social skills training program using the program smoothly and effectively, the consultant begins making arrangements to extend the program to classroom areas. The consultant asks the teacher to allow the investigation access to each of the three recess periods during the day. In order to earn access to recess, the child must follow classroom rules and remain seated at his/her desk. The consultant and teacher. Unless access is earned to at least two daily recesses, the class group reward cannot be earned.

To build in long term maintenance of treatment efforts, a low cost variation of the intervention program in installed on a "permanent" basis, i.e., until the end of the current school year at a minimum. In this procedure, the playground supervisor rates the child's overall behavior in each recess as either + or - on a daily basis. The child's teacher also rates his/her classroom behavior as either + or - twice each day — once in the morning and once in the afternoon. Each + counts toward a happy face on a wall poster. When completed, the poster is exchanged for a bonus reward — approximately once every 2-3 weeks.

Socially negative/aggressive children are extremely difficult for school personnel to manage effectively. A characteristic behavioral profile of such children includes: (1) argues and must have the last word in verbal exchanges, (2) intimidates other children, (3) is physically and/or verbally aggressive with other children. These children are frequently reinforced for behaving in this way via the natural consequences that are present in the school environment, e.g. for getting their own way, and so forth. An extremely powerful intervention program is required to change this pattern of behavior and to teach the child more positive cooperative style of interacting with others.

The great majority of socially negative/aggressive children are boys. Of 31 children working with, to date, have been girls and the rest boys.

THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Four to five years were invested in developing, testing, and validating the four behavior management packages. The early research was incorporation in a preschool center. The focus was upon development of an economical, yet effective, set of procedures for changing the behavior of targets and controls. This research utilized a careful analysis of the functional relationships between different treatment variables and behavioral outcomes. The research in stage I took place within an experimental classroom for a 3 to 4 month period and then returned to the students regular classrooms. Once a set of treatment variables were identified that proved effective for remedializing a given behavior disorder within the experimental classroom, the development process shifted to children in regular classrooms.

The focus of this stage was on adapting the identified procedures for use within the regular classroom. Target children representative of the behavior disorder in question were selected and program consultants (employed by CORBEH) worked with school personnel in delivering the treatment procedures. The goal of activities at this stage was to produce an intervention package that would be practical, cost effective and viable for use by regular school personnel. The emphasis was upon producing replicable effects on the behavior of target children across different classrooms/program settings and teachers and supervisors. Once this goal had been achieved, the procedures were packaged for field testing in stage III.

The primary research questions in stage III were answered by the other consultants employed by each package. Districts could be trained to a sufficient skill level within a short-term workshop (2 to 3 days) to apply the packages effectively and correctly. Field testing afforded an opportunity to test the external generalizability of the package procedures through the use of experimental/control group designs. In field testing, the package effectiveness was compared against whatever ongoing treatment procedures the control children were exposed to. By the time a given package was judged effective, there was no longer a question of whether the procedures were effective in changing child behavior. Instead, the issues of concern related to the packages' overall cost effectiveness, their practicality, and the extent to which school personnel could be trained to implement them correctly.

Each of the four packages went through this development cycle or process. After completion, the only additional work carried out on the packages related to dissemination of and in-service training activities associated with the implementation process.

EFFECTIVENESS

Each of the packages was shown to be effective during the R & D cycle. Results on program effectiveness were described in the other reports. A bibliography on the respective packages is provided below.

CLASS
Walker, H.M. & Hops, H. The CLASS program for acting out children: R & D procedures, program outcomes and implementation procedures. P.A.S.S.
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Consumer satisfaction measures by program users consistently yield positive results. However, a major concern is the amount of time that program implementation requires, e.g., approximately 35 hours of consultant time distributed over a 2-4 month period. It is sometimes difficult for busy school consultants to make this amount of time available for the implementation process. In such cases, it would be feasible for consultants to consider program variations that involve partial rather than full versions of the program. Alternatively, the program could be produced in many cases with less costly applications of the packages.
Direct Instruction Programs from SRA

The programs you've been hearing about...programs designed to get results...
programs for a wide range of student abilities...
programs in Reading, Language, Spelling, and Math...

What is Direct Instruction?

Close interaction between teacher and students to provide the immediate feedback that's so important to mastery.
Presentation Books with detailed lesson scripts that take the guesswork out of teaching.
Lessons that stress clear presentation of concepts, plenty of reinforcement, and cumulative sequencing.
Daily teacher-directed activities followed by independent work that reinforces learning.

What's available in Direct Instruction?

- Developmental programs
  - in Reading: DISTAR® Reading for preschool—grade 3
  - Reading Mastery for grades 3-8
  - in Language: DISTAR® Language for preschool through grades 3
  - in Spelling: Spelling Mastery for grades 2-8
  - in Mathematics: DISTAR® Arithmetic for preschool through grade 3

- Remedial programs
  - in Reading: Corrective Reading for grades 4 to adult
  - in Spelling: Corrective Spelling through Morphology for grade 4 to adult
  - in Mathematics: Corrective Mathematics for grades 3 to adult

What's new for 1982 in Direct Instruction?

Reading Mastery III — leads from DISTAR® Reading II into basal reading for the upper elementary grades.
ESPAÑOL para niños — works alongside DISTAR® Language I to help more Spanish-speaking youngsters quickly into English.
The Solution Book — provides specific solutions to specific classroom discipline problems.
BiDi — new test screens students for language deficiencies in a way that points to specific remedies.
Corrective Mathematics — provides flexible remediation in whole-number mathematics.
Mathematics Modules — offers modular convenience in teaching upper-grade mathematics concepts.

What are the key benefits?

Minimal lesson planning time, freeing you to focus on teaching rather than preparation.
The confidence that comes from using a proven method.
The satisfaction of knowing you have done the best possible job to help all your students.

Seeing is believing

If you'd like to visit a schoolroom to see the DISTAR® System and other Direct Instruction programs in action, the Direct Instruction Programs Administrator can usually arrange such a visit. We can also notify you of the next Direct Instruction Workshop in your area.

We think that seeing is believing, and when you see the enthusiasm and excitement that success breeds, you'll be convinced that Direct Instruction programs are indeed "programs that work." You can find the name and number of your SRA Representative by calling (804) 521-9005. In Illinois call 312/884-2550.

SRA

SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES, INC.
150 North Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
A Subsidiary of IBM

Copyright © Science Research Associates, Inc., 1981
Generalized Compliance Training

By Kim Wielandmann

(Editors' Note. This is the first in a series of articles on the psychology of instruction-based compliance training programs. Here, a teacher (Kim Wielandmann) discusses the design, implementation, and evaluation of such programs.)

It was late spring when it started. I was teaching social studies with warm air thickening the air. Young people got into trouble in my class, and it was not easy to say I was the problem. The students were not always respectful, and they would argue with each other. But when I heard the news of the latest incident, I was devastated. A student had been arrested for possession of a knife. This was not the first time something like this had happened in my class. In the last few years, there had been several incidents of students getting into trouble, and I felt like I was failing as a teacher.

2. Teachers and other professionals who read this article should not attempt to train themselves without special supervision. It is essential that training be done under the supervision of an experienced and knowledgeable teacher. The training should include the procedures and monitoring of the teacher and student behavior.

3. Generalized compliance training involves the teaching of the learner a wide range of situations in which compliance leads to reinforcement, and the teaching of the learner a wide range of situations in which non-compliance does not lead to reinforcement. According to Engelmann and Colvin (in press), non-compliance is not a single response, but a "chain of possible responses that are ordered from 'mild non-compliance to 'frantic non-compliance.'" These responses occur when the learner is required to comply and reinforcement is achieved when the person making the demands leaves, or the learner leaves the situation. Compliance, on the other hand, occurs when the learner does something the teacher tells him to do, not what the learner wants. Therefore, we must teach the learner about compliance and non-compliance.

4. In Phase I, the learner is assessed to determine if he or she is ready for Phase II. The assessment is based on the learner's performance on a series of tasks that require compliance and non-compliance. The learner is then divided into groups based on their performance. Phase II involves the establishment of the compliance set. In this phase, the learner is taught to comply with the teacher's requests. Phase III involves the expansion of the compliance set. In this phase, the learner is taught to comply with the teacher's requests in different situations, across different individuals, and across different tasks. The procedures are lengthy and require precise implementation to ensure success. I can try to give a brief summary here, but first I wish to stress the following points:

5. Compliance training is used only with learners who exhibit extreme noncompliance and who have been unable to improve behavior problems for coping with situations that demand compliance. Thus, a very severe situation may result. Behavior problems with behavior problems will only require compliance training.

Phase III

Phase IV

Phase V

Phase I — Assessment

The purpose of the assessment is to test the learner's tendencies to noncompliance. This is accomplished by establishing a context in which the noncompliance learner will demonstrate a full range of noncompliance. The assessment involves three steps in which the teacher follows a chair and begins conversing with him in a reinforcing, conventional tone. The second step, the teacher uses slow pacing and affects physical responses when providing commands to the learner. In the third step, the teacher reverses slow pacing and coaxes, while giving the student commands. In the final step (which is not presented if the learner complies with all the tasks in Step 4), the teacher uses fast pacing and a harsh voice. The teacher enforces all commands the learner does not comply with. The teacher uses the commands "stand up" and "sit down," and does not reinforce the learner.

Phase II

The training begins with the non-compliance set in this phase. In the non-compliance set, the teacher presents both a "stand up," "sit down," using fast pacing and no reinforcement. All noncompliant responses result in the teacher using vigorous physical prompts. The tone varies from harsh to flat according to the learner's performance. The learner remains in the non-compliance set until s/he completes eight consecutive commands.

Once the learner meets criterion on the non-compliance set, the compliance set is established. Here the teacher presents simple tasks the learner can respond to. If at all possible, "stand up" and "sit down" should be avoided. Fast pacing and lots of social reinforcement are used. The tone is reinforcing. For the compliance set, the exit criterion is 30 consecutive tasks. If, however, the learner noncomplies in this set, s/he returns to the non-compliance set.

Phase III

In Phase III, the compliance set is expanded while the non-compliance set is continued as a punishment for noncompliance. The compliance set is expanded so that it promotes generalized compliance. Specifically, generalization across places, persons, time, form and content, immediacy of reinforcement, and latency to training are taught. According to Engelmann and Colvin, to
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McDonogh 15: Becoming a School

Compliance

Compliance training is a cornerstone of many educational programs aimed at ensuring that students and staff adhere to institutional policies and procedures. Effective compliance training is critical for maintaining a safe and supportive learning environment. The process involves several key components, each of which is essential for its success.

1. **Understanding the Core Message**
   - **Clarity and Accuracy:** The training material must be clear, concise, and free of unnecessary jargon. This ensures that all participants understand the expectations and standards set forth by the school.
   - **Relevance:** The content should be relevant to the audience, whether it be students, staff, or parents, to maintain their engagement and interest.

2. **Modality and Accessibility**
   - **Format Variety:** Utilizing a mix of delivery methods (e.g., online modules, in-person workshops, videos) can cater to different learning styles and needs.
   - **Technology:** Incorporating technology, such as interactive quizzes and simulations, can enhance learning and retention.

3. **Feedback and Reflection**
   - **Continuous Improvement:** Regular feedback from participants helps identify areas for improvement and what aspects work well.
   - **Reflection Opportunities:** Encouraging reflection on what was learned can reinforce understanding and application.

4. **Ongoing Support and Resources**
   - **Resource Accessibility:** Providing easy access to additional resources, such as FAQs, FAQs, and contact information for support, is crucial.
   - **Follow-up:** Regular follow-up sessions can reinforce learning and provide additional support.

5. **Incorporating Best Practices**
   - **Evidence-Based:** Using evidence-based practices ensures that the training is effective and grounded in research.
   - **Community Involvement:** Including community members in the training process can increase relevance and relevance.

By focusing on these key areas, compliance training can be designed to be effective, engaging, and beneficial for all involved. It not only educates but also empowers individuals to make informed decisions that contribute to a safe and inclusive learning community.
DI at ABA: Convention Schedule

Since 1980, the Annual Convention of the Association for Behavior Analysis (ABA) has provided a national forum (in a central location) in which interested people could discuss issues pertaining to direct instruction from a variety of perspectives and in several formats. This year’s ABA Convention is scheduled for May 27-31, 1982, and will again be held at Milwaukee’s Hyatt (agency) Hotel. The direct instruction events scheduled for the Convention are unannounced below. The theme of this year’s symposium is “Bringing the Gap with Compatible Technologies.”

Events Sponsored by the Direct Instruction Special Interest Group to be Held at the 1982 ABA Convention (some titles are tentative)

Thursday, May 27
9:00-11:00: Symposium: Direct Instruction and Precision Teaching, Doug Carnine, Ogden Lindsey, and others (Michael Maloney, chair)
11:00-12:00: Invited Address: Theory of Instruction, Wes Becker and Doug Carnine (Galen Alesi, chair)
12:00 -1:00 Lunch Break
1:00-3:30: Symposium: Direct Instruction — Joining Forces with Compatible Technologies, (Stan Paine, chair), Direct Instruction with the Severe Handicapped, Rob Horner, University of Oregon, Jeff Sherman & Peter Lorimer, Thistlewood Regional Centre, Ontario
Saturday, May 29
3:00-4:30: Conversation Hour: Wes Becker, Doug Carnine, Galen Alesi, others
4:30-5:30: Direct Instruction Special Interest Group Meeting (Stan Paine, Marilyn Monteiro, and Galen Alesi, chairs)

Presentations in the Group Poster Session on Direct Instruction

Jane Howard, Cal. State, Stanislaus — Training of generic direct instruction skills in special education personnel.


Ed Kanewuri, University of Montana — Direct Instruction: Analysis of reading comprehension.

Peter Lenz & Paul Knight, Kalamazoo Valley Intermediate School District — Direct Instruction principles applied to the “non-performer.”

Paul Knight, Western Michigan University — Child Development Center — Application of stimulus-focus and response principles to the teaching of self verbatim instruction. An initial analysis and results.

Steve Enge, Peter Lenz, Paul Knight, George Thompson, & Dave Ray, Kalamazoo Valley Intermediate School District — An integrated language curriculum for multiply-impaired children based on Skinner’s Operant Behavior, an Engelmann’s DIRSTAR language and low-performer material.

Michael F. Masters, David M. Keanan, David S. Snyder, Joetta J. Long, & Elizabeth W. Slouc, Foundation for Behavioral Research — The effects of a nutritional training program on young children.

Timothy I. McKinley, Western Michigan University; Michael F. Masters, David M. Keanan, Joetta J. Long, Foundation for Behavioral Research; Cheryl E. Poche, Western Michigan University — A comparison of two procedures for teaching toothbrushing concepts.

Michael F. Masters, Foundation for Behavioral Research; Jon Boss, Western Michigan University — A comparison of two procedures for teaching toothbrushing “concepts.”

Richard Parker, University of Alabama — Beginning reading acquisition and generalization: Effects of letter-sounds, rhyming, and word training.

Kathy Wright, Western Michigan University — Untitled.

Compliance Training

(Continued from page 12)

difficult students in a positive manner. However, the most important consideration in my continued use of compliance training with severely handicapped students is that it results in student behavioral and academic progress such as I have never witnessed before. Even more, it is the students themselves who have convinced me of the effectiveness of compliance training. I mentioned the 10-year-old student whose "cancer" had developed to the point where he was destroying clothing and furniture, not to mention himself and his parents. Since he has been through compliance training, he is now sleeping in pajamas in a bedroom that has wallpaper and furniture in it. Something that was impossible 18 months ago.

The three other students who made up that "impossible" class have all made such remarkable gains that the class has been dissolved. The four students are now in trainable and educable mentally handicapped classes in the Eugene School District. The children themselves are proof of the effectiveness of compliance training. If you were to ask their parents, they would tell you so much more than I. You wouldn’t have to ask the children; they would merely show you.

References:

Annual Conference on Direct Instruction at the Eugene Hilton and Conference Center August 16-20, 1982

The new Eugene Hilton has been reserved for the 1982 Conference. This means first class recreational facilities along with the conference. The more conference participants who stay at the Hilton, the lower the cost to the Association for conference rooms. The single rate will be $30 per day and the double rate $40 ($20 per person), plus tax. We will double you with someone on your request. Reservations and first night’s cost must be in at least 30 days before the conference. Be early.

The five-day conference fee will be $100, Direct Instruction Association members receive a 25% discount on this. Also, group reservations of 8 to 9 persons receive a 10% discount, and groups of 10 or more receive a 20% discount. The member discount and group discount cannot be used on the same application however. College credit (3 graduate hours) will be available from the University of Oregon at $24 per credit hour.

As usual, there will be many options for training to choose from. These will be detailed in the next Newsletter, with application forms. Since we are interested in your input to the conference, we are listening to all suggestions for new types of sessions. The suggestions below were made at a recent ADI Board Meeting. Check the possibilities you like and make your own suggestions.

Please clip and return to:
Wes Becker, ADI: P.O. Box 10252, Eugene, OR 97404
Attn: Summer Conference

Which of the following topics do you think would make good additions to the Direct Instruction Conference program this year and in the future? (Check and list as many possibilities as you like.)

- Law and special education
- Direct Instruction in secondary level programs
- Using Direct Instruction procedures with basal programs
- Evaluating and selecting basal programs
- Increasing educational effectiveness — a session for principals
- Theory of Direct Instruction
- Structuring classrooms for success (preventive classroom management)
- Use of computers in Direct Instruction
- Others:
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Direct Instruction Programs

from E-B Press

Cursive Writing Program

* 160 complete lessons.
* Specific teacher direction.
* Lots of practice for students.

Teacher Presentation Book ........................................ $25.00
Student Workbook .................................................... $2.95

The program teaches cursive skills as simple transformations of manuscript writing.

O becomes o, ™ becomes ™, by changing the slant and adding tails.

Prompts teach appropriate slant and form.

Practice with joined letters actually teaches the more complicated letters.

DISTAR® Continuous Progress Tests

A breakthrough in simplifying behavioral objective diagnosis and remediation. Available for: DISTAR®
Reading 1 and 2, Language 1 and 2, Arithmetic 1 and 2.

* Individually administered.
* Specific remedies specified.
* Results show the lesson number each student has achieved for each skill, simplifying IEP’s.

The essential core of a quality control management system identifies problems with individual students and with the teaching of specific skills.

Tutorial Series

Programmed Time Telling
Sounds, Symbols, and Blending
Word Endings
Math Combinations

Number Skills
Carrying and Borrowing
Functional Decoding and Vocabulary
Building

I Love Library Books

Level 1

• An exciting program for introducing popular library books to first graders.
• Thoroughly field tested and effective.
• Lessons keyed to all major basal reading programs.
• Complete worksheet and teacher-presentation material for 37 popular books.

The program is based on a computer analysis of the words that appear in the different library books and the words that are introduced in every major basal. You simply select the books that you wish to introduce and then refer to the program, which tells exactly when it is wise to introduce the book. The worksheet for the introduction presents all the new words the children need to read the book (no more than 10 words) and comprehension activities for the major concepts and vocabulary of the book.

The teacher-presentation material tells exactly how to present the worksheet exercises to the children.

With this program, you can introduce library books so that the teaching is easy and virtually all your first graders learn to love library books.

Teacher Presentation Book $25.00
Student Workbook $1.95

The World of Facts

• A new concept in teaching vocabulary, relationships, and facts for social studies and science.
• Program requires very little teacher-directed time.
• Uses a game-type format that assures important facts and relationships are taught.

Ideal as both a stand-alone program or as an introduction to the key facts and relationships presented in social studies and science texts.

Module 1 teaches 10-20 key facts and relationships for each of 25 topics, including Western Hemisphere, solar system, the human breathing mechanism, continents and oceans of the world, game birds of North America, parts of a tree and a flower, and the internal combustion engine.

Module 2 introduces a broad range of topics, such as characteristics of mammals, climate and climate regions of North America, geological areas, and industries that are associated with climate regions.

Module 3 focuses on plant physiology, plant classification, diet, different systems of the human body (circulatory, skeletal, nervous) and food chains.

Subsequent modules of the program will introduce the full range of traditional science concepts as well as study skills and procedures for students to make up their own “visual-spatial” charts on various topics.


Teacher Presentation Book ........................................ $20.00
Student Workbook .................................................... $2.00

Send for free E-B Press Catalog:
Engelmann-Becker Corporation
P.O. Box 10459
Eugene, Oregon 97440
or call (503) 485-3163
By Robyn and Alex Maggs

Academically engaged students, as new research evidence is further direct instruction (in some cases) is not any particular program, but an evolving model of effective teaching. The basic features of this rich evidence and the resultant instruction model follow:

Higher academic gains result from more content being covered and mastered. Teachers who moved at a faster pace and covered more content obtained higher achievements.

"Academically engaged minutes" or "academic engaged time" is a critical factor in academic achievement. Few programs or teaching strategies let the teacher know if the child's attention is really engaged. A teacher does not need evidence that every student perfectly engaged at the same time. The critical aspect is the total academic engaged minutes that occur during instruction.

Success at the beginning of a number of studies, were those who maintained a strong academic focus and spent less time in non-academic activities. Students in formal rather than informal classes had the highest engagement in reading and mathematics. The teacher reading stories, arts and crafts, physical education, and even academic games, consistently had negative correlations with achievement.

Contrary to many expectations, teachers who were high in affect but low in cognitive emphasis had the most student failure. Programs which more unstructured had students with lower self-esteem.

Teacher-centered classrooms provided the most effective teaching. Permissiveness, spontaneity, and lack of control were negatively related to achievement gain and growth in creativity, inquiry, writing ability and self-esteem.

Giving students activities, toys and puzzles and even academic games, consistently had negative correlations with achievement.

Small group or large group instruction of students has been found effective in producing better academic achievement. A range of studies has shown that the best time the teacher time spent with students was positively related to achievement gain, and teacher time spent with individual students was negatively related to achievement gain.

All classroom instructional programs have to be resisted because the basic ones have few of the above components. The only programs is yet available in Australian instruction that do have the four components by Direct Instruction programs originating from the University of Oregon. This use of the "Direct Instruction" model is an attempt to capitalise on the differences between the Oregon program and the "new" construction teaching model discussed above.

Beyond all their instructional brilliance, these programs are based on the emotional reaction of a man who could not accept the distress of falling children, and who believed teachers could teach brilliantly if given adequate tools. A Professor at Oregon University, Zig Zag Reppen's innovation in instructional design partly reflects his early Philosophy background and his understanding of the structures and knowledge.

Constructive criticism plays an important part in each. The myth that the direct instruction teaching model is a flexible attempt to test and improve on the current teaching evidence. We find peer professionally are disappointed that criteria of direct instruction have remained inadequate and sometimes. When a critic has errors at a very simple level it becomes apparent that no real knowledge of the research, the teaching model, or these complex programs exists.

To have professional papers reduced to the level of "a red under every bed" now being cited by "a multinational under every bed," barely requires a response! Teachers have more sense and are better trained in rational decision making. We would like to briefly look at some of the less sensational but equally inaccurate criticisms of the Direct Instruction programs.

1. The growing body of Australian criticism that is supposed to exist about Direct Instruction is purely existent. The myth that the House and Glass critique (and that is all it was) somehow demolished the greatest educational revolution of the world has yet seen would be laughable if not so constantly repeated by people determined to ignore the evidence of Malcolm and Glass. The least serious methodological flaws of Follow-Through" are unavoidable in the real-life complexity of their study. They were acknowledged, taken into account, and followed. In the absence of the House and Glass critique (Harvard Education Review, May 1970), it should be so biased as to ignore the two effective refutations of the critique contained in the same journal, or the others that followed.

Suffice it to say that even when House and Glass used their own analytical tools to rank the different educational approaches of Follow-Through from best to worst, they virtually replicated the rankings of the Abi analysis with Direct Instruction at the top of the list. The argument seems rather out-dated with a decade of scientifically Australian research already behind us.

* We believe will detail the problems of this critique in a future issue.

2. Testing

It is commonplace for Australian children in properly implemented Direct Instruction programs to obtain higher scores than other children on tests of the academic skills the program has taught (reading, spelling, math skills). It is also commonplace for them to obtain higher scores on tests of self-image or self-concept, psycho-linguistic, intelligence tests, etc. Claims that the good DI results in Follow-Through were due to "improvement" are, remarkable, ignored when DI results on tests of self-esteem and other educational achievements are, ranked highest in recent years. In spite of this, the DI model ranked first in this area with results for the other tests were negative, as they also were on the academic tests.

In Australia, we have the children who are "retarded" child should stay in a regular class because he has not been taught how to achieve yet his learning results. Yet attempts are made to explain away the dramatic academic gains and constant "improvement" in DI taught children on the grounds that they have been taught how to take tests. No research is due to the fact that the tests are based on what we call "follow through" tests in these areas. In spite of this, the DI model ranked first in this area with results for the other tests were negative, as they also were on the academic tests.

In Australia, we have the children who are "retarded" child should stay in a regular class because he has not been taught how to achieve yet his learning results. Yet attempts are made to explain away the dramatic academic gains and constant "improvement" in DI taught children on the grounds that they have been taught how to take tests. No research is due to the fact that the tests are based on what we call "follow through" tests in these areas. In spite of this, the DI model ranked first in this area with results for the other tests were negative, as they also were on the academic tests.

3. Teacher-Child Relationships

One of the greatest incentives for a child's learning in the early school years is a friendly, caring teacher who can teach the child's supplemen st the child's "hunch" in honor, progress, and is a means of being challenged in the world of reality, not every child relates well to his teacher and not every student is concerned. Parents whose child "dislikes" his teacher is it is more likely that he dislikes the teacher's teaching, and he allows the behavior to call down the teacher's wrath, or that inadequate skills don't get him enough praise, attention. Consequently we are surprised that the direct instruction classrooms where children are able to see clearly and obvious progress, where there is consequently more positive attention, and where the goals of the process are learned by hundreds of small successes instead of unconnected failures, produces a highly positive teacher-child relationships.

The well-meaning lies of a caring teacher do not convince the child that he is not "dumb," simply that adults are dishonest, Effective teaching creates a sound basis for more fulfilling teacher-child relationships. This relationship combines with the achievements to extend to the only reward most direct instruction teachers need even. Concrete rewards are only used in cases or extreme high skill deficit and when past learning experiences fail to work with new programs, until instead learning can become its own reward.

4. The Direct Instruction Programs

For educational historians we have programs that supported where necessary by behavioral management principles, Direct Instruction teach every child. The basis for this is simple. When a child learns, the child feels good, comfortable. But for every child, who involves the basic skills of being able to take his turns, he needs to learn to share, to put one foot in front of the other in a sequence of balanced steps. The Direct Instruction programs teach the same essential or required skills across a range of over thirty programs including reading, spelling, language, math, creative writing, cur- lative writing, etc. They are based on the fact that while children differ, they need to learn to do the same. We recognize individual differences by ensuring the child is taught at an appropriate level in each of his skills area that different motivation strategies are used when necessary.

The programs, when best used, are incredibly flexible. The most "retarded" to the most "gifted" child can be extended. A major factor is ensuring that the appropriate program is chosen; for instance Dimart Reading is particularly suited to severely retarded children, with "regular" kindergarten children and Fast Reading, and other remedial children or adults beginning learning to read. Thinking "Work-Around" can be used on any level. The flexibility of the programs and the emphasis on "reading for meaning," or effective or "reading," is as in the upper primary reading programs, where the three reading books have resulted in half the students reading two and a half thousand pages of comprehension work.

A regular first class may have one group on Fast Cycle, one group on Dimart Reading, and another on "thinking." This first-class reading includes stories such as "Little Bear Finds Out Which Ike." The third-grade Reading Three: Their first-class reading programs teach children comprehension and teaching strategies presented to them, including graphs, advertising, and political speeches, an essential teaching Materials Covers stories over changing deserts to farmland, the effects of aspirin, progress in modern medical skills, the Arctic, sunrise and sunset, the oceans and more. The instructional strategies, which is for children who ensures that a small amount of learning is specifically made to generate in these areas, is self-generated learning.

Past programs have not been able to ensure that all high ability intelligent children will finish twelve years of schooling with the sufficiently advanced basic skills to set them for changing social and technological era. Direct Instruction is a teaching method that provides the child who actively learns his critical skills, freeing him for their creative application and opening wider options for his future.
An Essay for the DI Teacher

and you must make sure that the messages are valuable ones — those that will lead to generalization and growth. So make sure you are modelling the kinds of emotional responses you want the children to emulate. You show great interest in the material you are presenting. You reinforce effectively, and you make sure that the children can do whatever tasks you ask them. You have many opportunities to be reinforced and learn that indeed the teaching activities you direct are reinforcing. You challenge; you enthuse; you set the pace so that the children understand that their work in school is as important as playing in the NRA championship. When they are having trouble with a particular skill or activity, you are empathetic, but urgent. "This is hard. Everybody, take a deep breath. We can do it. Back to the beginning and thinking big. Here we go..."

When they succeed, you let them know that their success is a major one, not something that was less than expected. "I told you we could do it. That was easy. Not one person in this group gave up. Give yourself a double pat on the back and say, 'I'm the greatest'."

But you do not stop here. You work on the technical details of your presentation. You practice your skills of presenting, correcting, reinforcing, and going back to tasks that the children had trouble with earlier. You work on your pacing, your signals, the pauses you present before signaling responses that require some thinking time, and the other details that make a difference in your presentation (such as the way the children are seated in front of you, and the scheduling of daily events). And you practice designing activities that permit the children to use the skills that they have learned after they have mastered them — perhaps the most important single detail in guaranteeing that the skills will be strong and that the children will recognize their importance.

Now you observe. Single out a child in the group. While you are present to the entire group, observe that child. Attend to the specific responses the child makes. Say to yourself that the child will be able to do some things at the end of the school day that she could not do when she entered the classroom in the morning. See if it happens — make it happen.

On the next day, single out another child and do the same thing. See what it takes to teach each specific skill that you present. See how long it takes for the child to become perfectly facile, to generalize, to use the skill.

When you observe the learning progress on this moment-to-moment basis, some very nice things will happen to you.

The first is that you will have a much better understanding of children and therefore be in a better position to view the problems they experience from their standpoint.

The second is that you will learn to be the better actor. You will see the influence that your response to the children has, and your responses will be shaped so that you do not act inconsistently and you show approval or disapproval more fluently, despite your mood.

The third thing that happens is possibly the most interesting: time seems to fly during those interactions. Your mind is completely occupied, as if you are playing some kind of super-chess game that has all the intellectual challenges of chess and nearly the emotional involvement of an overtime basketball game. You present a task.

The children respond. You respond. You note their reaction. You present... and before you know it, the period is over.

Certainly, there will still be times of the day that are most trying and times of the school year when the game gets old and you have trouble getting into the role of the teacher-observer. But in most cases, you will be surprised when the period is over. Your mind will not have been on the time, but on your behavior and the children's responses. And sometimes, you will actually think that only about 10 minutes have passed when the clock indicates that a 30-minute period has already elapsed.

The direct instruction programs play a part in this game because they make it possible for you to provide relatively clear messages to the children. In one sense the part they play is important because if the programs are followed both carefully and sensibly, the children will learn the intended skills and you will have the opportunity to observe their learning from the first time a particular task is introduced until the skill is integrated with others the children have been taught. In another sense, however, the programs are minor ingredients because they are passive. For them to become an active part of the interaction, somebody — you the teacher — must take them and transform them into effective communications. Also, you must add the personal elements that are suggested by but not provided by the programs. The model that you present, the urgency you convey, the patience, the reinforcement, and all the other responses to the children's efforts are not part of the program. But when you make them a part and when you transform those printed sentences and specifications into a convincing, technically well-designed presentation, you will be able to observe some things that only a few people have ever seen in detail — the magnificent growth of human minds.

Get "Smart"? Kids? Help Me

Direct instruction proponents often say that DI is not just for low-performing students — that it is effective with average- and high-performers, too. Critics continue to doubt this. As a consultant, Louis Mensing, a teacher at Coburg Elementary School in Eugene, Oregon, is collecting information to support the effectiveness of the performing students. He will use this information as the basis for an article and present it in a forthcoming issue of the News. If you have any information on this topic (research reports, program descriptions, anecdotes, etc.) that you are willing to share, please send it by February 15, 1982 to:

Louis Mensing
Coburg Elementary School
1274 N. Coburg Rd.
Eugene, OR 97401

You will receive credit in the article for any information you send which is used. Thanks for any help you can lend.

New Programs

The News will regularly publish descriptions of newly developed instructional programs based on the best of modern learning technology. If you know of new data-based programs, we invite you to describe them for us. Program descriptions should describe the population for whom the program is intended, the skills it is designed to teach, and a brief summary of the content or components. We invite you to submit pictures of program materials and brief summaries of program validation data. If you would like to publish a longer description of your validation data (or your program or someone else's), we would be pleased to consider your work in the form of a research article, as well. Both program descriptions and research articles should be sent to the editors.

The DI Philosophy

- THERE IS A VIABLE TECHNOLOGY OF TEACHING THAT IS NOT BEING USED.
- TEACHERS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR CHILDREN'S LEARNING.
- EVERY CHILD CAN BE TAUGHT.

How to Help the Association for Direct Instruction Get Going

1. Subscribe to the DIRECT INSTRUCTION NEWS. Five dollars will bring four issues in the coming year (Sept., Dec., Feb., April).
2. Become a charter member of the Association.

For the school year, you need to create a different

Student members receive the NEWS and a 25% discount on all Association sponsored products and events, such as:
- A Future Journal of Direct Instruction
- Books to be presented by the association such as Theory of Instruction by Zieg Engelmann and Doug Carnine, and Research on Direct Instruction edited by Wes Hedlund.
- Direct Instruction Conferences (after 1981) will include the Eugene Direct Instruction Conference which the Association will sponsor. For 1981, all students will receive a 40% discount and paid participants who join the Association at the conference will receive a $10 rebate.

Join the association, clip out this form and mail it in.

ASSOCIATION FOR DIRECT INSTRUCTION
P.O. Box 10532, Eugene, Oregon 97401

MEMBERSHIP FORM

1. YES I want to receive the NEWS a year's subscription.
2. YES I wish to become an associate member. Enroll me as:
   a. Student Member (At University)
   b. Member (At University)
   c. Retiring Member (At tow)

NAME ____________________________
ADDRESS _______________________
CITY ___________ STATE ___ ZIP ___

SCHOOL ___________________________
TEACHER NAME ____________________________________________
TEACHER ADDRESS ____________________________________________

 inserts the N in the word "INDUCTION".