ABSTRACT
        The presentation addresses ways in which appropriate
criteria for behavioral objectives with the severely handicapped are
developed. Two kinds of criteria--those that established specified
units and those that provide a standard to determine when the student
has completed work on a specific objective--are identified. Specific
considerations in selecting criteria are discussed and examples given
for each: functionality, safety, social acceptability, normalization,
accuracy, evaluability (all criteria should be measurable), random
occurrence (which may make it difficult to determine whether mastery
or luck was responsible for performance), and overlearning (enough
practice to insure that the skill will maintain after discontinuation
of instruction). (CL)

Beyond Behavioral Objectives: Criteria

Dick Sobsey

Assistant Professor

Department of Educational Psychology

University of Alberta

Edmonton, Alberta, Canada   T6G 2G5

Beyond Behavioral Objectives Criteria

This part of this afternoon s presentation will focus on the development of appropriate criteria for beha oral objectives and will discuss nine specific considerations in setting apapropriate criteria for objectives Of course. criteria can not be developed without considering the conditions and behavior that tney help to evaluate, and so conditions and behavior will also enter into this discussion

Two Kinds of Criteria

Two kinds of criteria exist in most objectives and are generally required First. criteria for a correct response help determine if the performance of the behavior falls within prespecified limits They often tell how long. how fast or how hard something must be done (e.g. within ten seconds. before the ball hits the floor; hard enough to ring the bell) They may specify error conditions (e g. without spilling. without touching the floor) They are particularly important for response acquisition and fluency building objectives Stimulus control objectives (which are less concerned about the exact nature of the response and more concerned about when it occurs) may also use them to indicate how quickly the response must follow the stimulus (e y. within 15 seconds of being asked)

Second. mastery criteria provide a standard to determine when the student has completed work on a specific objective and training can be discontinued They may provide information about the number of correct responses. a proportion of responses to opportunities. a percentage of responses that are correct and or a period of days. weeks. cr months over which this level of performance must be maintained (e g. on nine out of ten trials for five consecutive days)

Before going on to discuss more specific considerations in setting criteria, I want to say a few words about conditions and behavior Conditions often distinguish between instructional control and functional control of a

behavior   For example. taking off a shirt might be under instructional control ("When asked to remove her shirt") or functional control ("At bedtime. after going to her room")   Usually our ultimate goal is functional control. but instructional control may be a valuable intermediate step   It is often used during initial training of response acquisition to ensure lots of opportunity for practice   Ten or even a hundred trials per day might be used at this stage   Bedtime. however. usually only occurs once per day and so repeated trials would be incompatible with true functional control   The difference in these conditions must aiso influence our criteria   A criteria of "on nineteen out of twenty trials for three consecutive days is fine for the instructional control phase but is obviously inappropriate for the functional control stage   Look at this example and see if you can find the problem

> At lunchtime. when given a 250 ml cup full of milk. Chandra will drink all the milk without spilling on 19 of 20 trials for three consecutive days

As written. this objective requires Chandra to drink almost five litres of milk each day at lunch   Repeated trials are fine in most instruction. but here totally out of place   Replacing this mastery criterion with "on 19 of 20 consecutive days" might be more appropriate

By the way. consecutive days should always refer to calendar days   If consecutive school days are the real intent, be sure to state it

Specific considerations in selecting criteria

FUNCTIONALITY   As stated above most objectives ultimately must produce functional behavior.   Often conditions and behavior statements in an objective point toward functional behavior, but criteria are inadequate to ensure functional behavior.   Look at this example

> After putting his shoes on in the morning. Phil will tie them with bows on 19 of 20 consecutive days

On first inspection this may not look too bad, but what if it takes Phil ninety minutes to tie each shoe. Is the skill likely to be functional outside the training environment? A rate specific criterion is needed here. How much time to allow would depend on the environmental requirements, but perhaps "in two minutes or less" would be suitable. Similarly, some objectives may need to specify duration, latency or amplitude of a behavior to become functional. Sometimes this can be accomplished by focusing on the environmental effect rather than an arbitrary measure. If we were concerned about a student pushing hard enough on a doorbell, for example, we could carefully measure the required force and then make that part of the criterion for a correct response. It would be a lot easier, however, to simply state "hard enough to activate bell."

SAFETY No concern is more relevant to setting some criteria than safety. This is easily seen in the following objective

When encountering a controlled intersection, Pete will cross without being hit by a motor vehicle on 9 of 10 trials for 3 consecutive days

No doubt you can find more than one problem with this objective, but the most glaring is the low safety criterion. For many objectives nine out of ten would be okay, for crossing the street, using powertools, using stoves, and other behavior with potential risk much stricter criteria are required

SOCIAL ACCEPTABILITY Closely related to the safety issue is the issue of social acceptability. Forgetting a belt or socks may be slightly unacceptable, but generally tolerated forgetting pants or skirt is totatlly unacceptable and not tolerated Stsrict criteria must be set for objectives that may influence social acceptability This concern may be most clearly seen in deinstitutionalization. Often acceptable social behavior is a major determinant of community acceptance

NORMALIZATION   Clearly social acceptability is closely related to community norms and at first glance these concerns may seem almost identical However, there is another aspect of normalization which we should consider Non-handicapped individuals generally have some leeway in meeting community standards   Handicapped individuals often are faced with arbitrarily high criteria for the standards of their behavior   At a baseball game, if you see eight teen-aged, boys wearing suits and ties, don't be surprised if someone asks. "I wonder what group-home they're from?"   Such remarks may be unkind, but setting abnormally strict standards for behavior may foster these attitudes and it is important that we work toward the normal range not toward 'perfection' For example, in teaching eating skills we were concerned about our students using rotary chewing rather than munching   Our initial goal was 100%   When we observed non-handicapped individuals, however, we found that only 80 to 90% of their chewing was rotary   We were pursuing an arbitrarily high standard and had to lower our criterion to more normal levels.   Looking at the performance of others is the best way of determining the normal range of behavioral standards

ACCURACY   Many objectives use a percentage of accuracy   For some cases this is useful, but in the majority of cases it creates more problems than it solves   Look at the following objective

When sitting in a chair and asked to stand, Joe will stand with 85% accuracy

In this case we must ask ourselves what accuracy means   We can measure accurately or answer questions accurately, but can we stand accurately (or inaccurately)?   In order for a measure fo accuracy to occur, two forms of response class (correct and incorrect) must be identified (White & Haring. 1980) Then we can compute a percentage of accuracy by dividing correct responses by the total of correct plus incorrect responses and multiplying by one hundred Note that this formula only deals with correct and incorrect responses it never

incorporates non-responses   So in our example, if we ask Joe to stand ten times and he stands correctly four times and stands incorrectly once (on his head perhaps), his percentage of accuracy is 80% (four out of five) not 40% (four out of ten)

A second problem with percentages is that they don't tell us how large a sample of behavior is needed   For example, if we specify 100%, and Joe performs correctly on the first trial, he has attained 100% and needs no more training   If, on the other hand, he performs incorrectly on the first trial, he is at 0% and even if he then does ninety-nine correctly in a row, he will still only be at 99% because of that first trial   So that if we are going to use percent, it is still essential to specify the number of trials and/or responses evaluated

A third problem is compatability of the number of trials and percent required   For example, if 85% accuracy is specified and ten trials are evaluated, eight out of ten would yeild 80% and nine out ot ten would yeild 90%   For the student to meet the 80% criterion, he must actually perform at 90% or 100%   The 85% criterion is meaningless unless at least 20 trials are provided

Usually the best solution is to avoid accuracy and simply state the number of correct responses out of a specified number of trials   Some objectives, however, in which right or wrong answers, correct or incorrect responses can occur may include accuracy as part of the criterion

EVALUABILITY   Care must be taken that all criteria are measurable   Attention to conditions and behavior may be as important as the criterion itself for evaluation   For example, consider the problem with this example

When sitting at his desk and asked to "stand up", Lance will be able to stand on 9 of 10 trials for 3 consecutive days

Of course, if Lance does stand up, it is reasonable to assume he is able to, but if he doesn't stand, does that mean he is not able to stand   We can

observe and measure standing. but not his ability   Now. some people argue
that when we say 'be able to' or 'can' in an objective that it means the same
as 'will'   If this is true "be able to" are three extra meaningless words and
are best eliminated   If they do have meaning. however, it is even more
essential that they be eliminated. since they make the objective unmeasurable
Similarly any description of behavior that can't be counted or measured makes
the setting of the criterion meaningless

RANDOM OCCURRENCE   Criteria must consider the probability of random
occurrence   Consider the following example

When presented with a blue and red sock and told 'give me
the red one. Louise will give the requestor the red sock on 4 or 5
consecutive trials

If we assume that Louise will give one of the two on each request.
what are the chances of her getting at least 4 out of 5 correct?   Actually,
they are about one in five   This would mean that given five trials every day,
chance would favor getting 4 out of 5 correct within 6 days of instruction
When this occurred it would not be possible to determine if mastery had been
achieved or merely some lucky guessing   Increasing the number of trials.
raising the ratio and requiring consecutive repetitions would greatly reduce the
random chance of occurrence   For example. "9 out of 10 correct for 5
consecutive school days' would be extremely unlikely to occur by chance

OVERLEARNING   Since mastery of an objective indicates that teaching of
the objective will come to an end. we must be satisfied that the student has
had ample practice so that the skill will maintain after instruction has been
discontinued   This may be less essential when lots of natural practice will
follow as part of the students daily routine or as part of instruction on the
next objective   Some might suggest that if the student won't be using the skill
frequently, we shouldn't bother teaching it in the first place   However. there
are numerous exceptions   For example, emergency safety procedures may be

rarely used. but essential to learn and maintain

The principle of overlearning requires that a mastery criterion be set that ensures frequent repetition of the correct response before mastery is assumed Ten consecutive correct responses may be enough to demonstrate learning, but requiring ten consecutive correct responses each day for two weeks will greatly increase the prospects of maintaining the behavior weeks or months after training has been discontinued

In considering these factors for setting criteria. it becomes apparent that no single criterion can be applied to every objective The nature of the behavior. the student and the environment must be considered Criteria often are given less attention than behvior and conditions in developing objectives Often we observe entire IEPs with "90% accuracy" tacked on to each objective regardless of its appropriateness However, it is essential that more meaningful criteria be applied if objectives are to be utilized as part of a wowrkable data-based teaching program

Dick Sobsey

References

Alberto P.A. and Troutman A.C. Applied behavior analysis for teachers. Influencing student performance. Columbus OH Charles Merrill. 1982

Baine D. Instructional design for special education. Englewood Cliffs. NJ Educational Technology Publications. 1982

Becker. W.C. Englemann. S. and Thomas. D.R. Teaching 2. Cognitive learning and instruction. Chicago Science Research Associates. 1975

Kibler JR. Cegala D.J. Watson KW Barker LL. and Miles DT Objectives for instruction and evaluation. Boston Allyn and Bacon. 1981

Koenig C.H. Projecting the future course of behavior. Kansas City. KS University of Kansas. 1972

Mager. R.F. Preparing instructional objectives. Belmont. CA Fearon 1962

Pennypacker. HS Koenig. C.H. & Lindslev. O.R. Handbook of the standard behavior chart. Kansas City KS Precision Media 1972

Sobsey. D. & Ludlow. B. (1983) Some criteria for setting instructional criteria. Manuscript submitted for publication

Vargas. JS Writing worthwhile behavioral objectives. New York Harper and Row. 1972

White. O.R. and Haring. N.G. Exceptional teaching. Columbus. OH Charles Merrill. 1980

Williams, W. and York, R. Developing instructional programs for severely handicapped students. In N.G. Haring and D.O. Bricker. (Eds). Teaching the severely handicapped. Vol. III Seattle American Association for the Education of the Severely Profoundly Handicapped 1978