Prior to the study, the teachers involved with the experimental group attended three workshop sessions which introduced the philosophy and components of precision teaching. The participants had no previous knowledge or experience with precision teaching techniques.

The statistical analyses focused on a multiple analysis of variance test (MANOVA) with nested designs and a Scheffe test of multiple comparisons. Analyses of the data revealed that the experimental and control groups differed significantly at the .05 level of significance in their mean scores on the tests of speed, computational skill development, and concept development in favor of the experimental group. The Scheffe test showed that some of the lower achieving classes of the control group differed significantly from some of the higher achieving classes of the experimental group.

In summary, this research shows that a group using precision teaching techniques achieved better than a comparable control group. A group that used brief systematic practice during the unit of rational numbers had higher performance on all three researcher-constructed evaluations. Moreover, when such intensive practice was accompanied with classroom activities and explanations, greater scores on speed, computational skill development, and concept development of rational numbers was found.
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---

Chart-sharing

PRINCIPAL PRIDE WALLS

Malcolm D. Neely
Federal Way School District

In the spring of 1984 our building principal, Barbara LaFray, requested samples of pupil work that we teachers thought deserved recognition on her new Principal's Pride Wall (LaFray, 1984). From each classroom came good penmanship, clever poems, impressive stories, nice art work, accurate math, and a few papers that just showed completion. In one sense or another each displayed a "well done performance".

One of my submissions was the learning record of a 6 year old first grade girl before and after help by her 12 year old brother. The learning chart and its story were each mounted on light blue construction paper to highlight the chart lines (first grade teachers quickly learn about such detail), and a large gold star was placed on the presentation. The principal wrote praise to both children and signed her name. After a weeks' display, the chart, story, star, and praise were sent home for the parent to see. The story and the chart are displayed in Chart 1; the children's names were changed, though they really deserve full recognition.

In most schools do an adequate job publishing pupil performances in some manner. Reminders and new ideas are usually welcome. Publishing pupil performances on the Principal's Pride Wall is a grand idea. Since performance and learning are different school products, precision learning/precision teaching teachers need two walls--The Principal's Pride Performance Wall for rewarding pupil frequency and The Principal's Pride Learning Wall for rewarding pupil learning.

Reference
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CLEARING THE SMOKE

John R. Caimi
Southeast Missouri State University

In order to gain experience collecting and plotting data on a Standard Celeration Chart, our class (taught by Dr. Larry Lowrance) was given the assignment to select a few behaviors (our own or those of others) which we would be able to keep track of and possibly affect. I chose to try a structured reduction of the number of cigarettes I smoked each day. In the past, I had found that I could easily quit cold turkey for a day or two, but would soon revert to my original level of consumption.
Chart 1. John quits smoking
Baseline was a pack a day (20 cigarettes). I chose a minimum celeration line (MCL) of /2, which meant I would be reducing my consumption by one-half each week (White & Haring, 1980). This decision was firmly accepted only after calculating where I would actually have to be on the chart in one, two, and three weeks. On reflection, my success was the direct result of a realistic goal.

My first (and only) intervention was sheer willpower with the stipulation of no substitutions--oral or nicotinic in nature. I found the act of actually plotting the data each day to be reinforcing--when it was under my MCL. I also had a friend asking about my progress periodically.

The gradual reduction of cigarettes allowed my system to slowly cleanse itself and become acclimated to the lower-level intakes of nicotine. I had no uncontrollable attacks, nor did I experience cravings for more than one or two cigarettes over quota on a given day. If the temptation to yield to one of these cravings became too strong, I could go over and still stay with my program as long as this did not happen more than two days in a row (in keeping with the three-day rule for intervention change) (White & Haring, 1980).

There were a few tricks I pulled in manipulation or self-assistance. For example, I found myself looking in advance to note how many days I could have three, or two cigarettes before I was reduced again. Twice I waited until after midnight so I could use one of the following day's cigarettes and still stay under the MCL. This practice cost me on the following day, of course.

I met my aim rate a week early and have maintained my abstinence for three weeks as of this writing.

Reference


IMPROVING RESPONSES TO PARENTAL REQUESTS

Janis L. Martin
University of West Florida

My daughter, Amy, is a ten-year-old with a mind of her own. My husband and I had tried for years to have her respond to our requests immediately when asked to (or not to) do something. We had tried both positive and negative reinforcements with virtually no success. Amy would usually do what we asked, but took her time getting to it.

I decided to try a precision teaching technique to hopefully modify this behavior. The results were gratifying. Rather than having her dad and I responsible for her responding to our requests, I wanted her to be responsible for her own behavior. I collected a week of baseline data on her responses to requests which appeared to show Amy's rate of non-compliance. On Sunday, September 8, 1985, I began an intervention which consisted of a contract between Amy, her dad, and I. Amy agreed that for every response to a parental request begun within five seconds she would receive one point; she would not be penalized if she responded after the time limit. Amy made a list of items and privileges she wished to work toward earning to which I assigned points. Amy selected a privilege "costing" 100 points. The data in Phase 2 show an increase in "responses within five seconds" and appear to show an increase in "responses taking longer than five seconds to begin". Amy was pleased with herself, but I wanted to decrease the responses taking longer than five seconds to begin.

A second intervention, begun on Tuesday, September 24, 1985, allowed Amy one week from that date in which to "earn" the remaining points toward the 100-point item. If the remaining points were not accumulated, Amy would be asked to "spend" the earned points for items on the list "costing" less and begin earning points toward the 100-point item after the allotted time. The data in Phase 3 show a greater increase in the number of responses begun within five seconds and an apparent decrease in responses begun after five seconds. The data suggest that control of the time factor in Phase 3 caused more positive results than were observed in Phase 2.

The results of this charting were pleasing to both Amy and me. Her dad and I were amazed that she would respond so quickly, and we