

Letter to the Editor

29811 6th Avenue, South
Federal Way, WA 98003
17 Mar 1993

Dr. Claudia E. McDade
Editor, *Journal of Precision Teaching*
Center for Individualized Instruction
Jacksonville State University
Jacksonville, Alabama 36265-9982

Dear Claudia:

...How much basic information to include is always a puzzle for me when I write. If we are doing our job, *JPT* should have beginning readers, experienced readers, and all those in between. I feel the *Journal* should not only inform, but continually teach and reteach.

On 18 Jun 93 I wrote to point out the lack of standardization when *JPT* forbids add/subtract charts but permitted add/subtract tables and dialogue. It appears we should examine the Standard Celeration Society's standards and standard celeration some more.

Whalen, Willis and Sweeney's article in the *JPT* XI, 1 issue reports timed trials without reference to a calendar scale. When they do this, they violate the definition of *celeration*. This data could have been charted on successive calendar days: it just was not. Had it been, Phase II celerations would be more dramatic. As it is, the *data trends* mean nothing outside of this report. In fact time-trials without reference to calendar days or parts of calendar days (e.g. count per min., per ten min., per hour, as charted on a modified monthly Chart) show no standardization--but should in the Standard Celeration Society's Journal.

Review of the Whalen and all article also suggests we have not done a good job teaching other concepts and terms. First of all they write on page 6, "Due to the large variability evident during the alternating treatment sessions of Phase I, it was difficult to determine appropriate celerations for the 1 and 3-minute timings." A wide variability (bounce) does not impede the drawing of a celeration; celerations can have any size of bounce. What caused the difficulty of determining any trend line, here, was lack of enough data. Three trials or days does not establish a trend. The authors could have discussed median and variance for their references and comparisons with their Phase II.

Secondly, Whalen and all discuss "jump up" when comparing the first three days of Phase II with Phase I. Precision Teaching uses *jump* to refer to frequency changes from one phase to the next, and *turn* to refer to celeration changes. In the Whalen article, the frequencies and trend-lines of Phase I's three one-minute timings and the first three one-minute timings of Phase II probably show a jump down and turn up. Actually the pupil simply rank-ordered his Phase I trials with his first three Phase II trials. The four-minute trials suggest a x1.3 jump-up and similar turn-up--hard to tell without calendar charting.

Stump, Boone, Higgins, and Notari's article in the *JPT* XI, 1 issue is a combination of calendar and trial data. The text describes the procedure, but the

Charts do not show what the text describes. All four Charts show one-minute timings, but the text describes 30 second timings. Other than that, baseline data looks to be charted as described.

Stump and all's text intervention data tells us timings were once on Friday and twice on Monday or twice on Friday and once on Monday depending upon the group. All Charts show Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday timings. Actually, only two calendar days are involved--the twice-on-a-day timings are trials.

Stump and all's text maintenance data tells us timings were Monday, Wednesday, and Friday; yet the Charts show Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. In addition, all chart phases are connected leading one's eye to blend every phase into one.

Table 1 would have made a grand static chart to show no differences other than the medium pupils. Table 2 (un-numbered) shows another add/subtract comparison in a multiply/divide journal, and I'll not belabor that more.

And finally Stump and all's article compares *celeration*. On page 26 they define *celeration* as "last correct data point divided by the first correct data point." Last I checked Pennypacker, Koenig, and Lindsley *celeration* was the rate of change of count per minute per day per week determined geometrically either by visual analysis or split-middle, quarter intersect methods and drawn with a pencil and straight edge. Determining a *celeration* is not dividing Sunday's data by the previous Monday's data. *Celeration* is read from the seventh day angle distance on the Standard *Celeration* Chart.

Perhaps there is something I do not know about our journal. Ogden tells me no one is reading it--including the subscribers. How about the field editors and editors?...

Yours in Charting,

Malcolm D. Neely
(206) 941-7529 (home)