DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 936 SP 026 128

AUTHOR Davidman, Leonard
TITLE The Hunter Staff Development Model: Why Is It Working? How Can It Be Improved?
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Learning Strategies; *Program Implementation; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Methods; *Teaching Models
IDENTIFIERS Hunter (Madeline); *Hunter Staff Development Model; Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

An analysis is presented of the Hunter Staff Development Model. Suggestions for improving the implementation of the model are based on a review of the literature pertinent to the Hunter model, and a series of interviews with: (1) teachers and administrators who have received training in the Hunter model; (2) a group of Hunter Staff Development Model-oriented trainers; and (3) Madeline Hunter, the chief architect of the clinical theory of instruction from which the various staff development programs are derived. Part one consists of an overview of the origins and content of the Hunter model. Part two enumerates and discusses factors which help to explain the model's high degree of success with teachers, school district administrators, and university-based teacher educators. In part three, aspects of the program which are likely to contribute to some misunderstandings and tension between school district based Hunter model advocates and university-based teacher educators are discussed, along with recommendations designed to reduce such misunderstandings. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED258936

THE HUNTER STAFF DEVELOPMENT MODEL: WHY IS IT WORKING?- HOW CAN IT BE IMPROVED?

LEONARD DAVIDMAN, Ph.D.
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
SAN LUIS OBISPO

STOP 12 8

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Davidman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

In recent years the model of instruction and supervision synthesized by Madeline Hunter has gained steady influence in the world of education. At the same time, there has been and remains a paucity of analysis of her body of work. To help bridge this gap, I will analyze the success of the model and also make suggestions for improving the implementation of the model in the American context. These suggestions are based on a review of the literature pertinent to the Hunter model,[1] and a series of interviews with (a) teachers and administrators who have received training in the Hunter model,[2] (b) a group of Hunter Staff Development Model oriented trainers,[3] and (c) Madeline Hunter, the chief architect of the clinical theory of instruction from which the various staff development programs mentioned above are derived.[4]

This essay will be divided into three parts. Part one will consist of an overview of the origins and content of the Hunter model. In part two the factors which, cumulatively, help to explain the model's high degree of success with teachers, school district administrators, and university-based teacher educators will be enumerated and discussed. Finally, in part three, aspects of the programs which are likely to contribute to some misunderstanding and perhaps tension between school district based Hunter model advocates and university-based teacher educators (professors of education) will be discussed, along with recommendations designed to reduce such misunderstanding.

The Hunter Staff Development Model revolves around concepts which stem from Madeline Hunter's clinical theory of instruction.[5] Teachers and administrators who have been "cycled" through a Hunter Staff Development Model-oriented professional development program, learn among other things that there is a set of essential elements of instruction which include:

1. selecting an objective at the appropriate level of difficulty (this typically involves diagnostic work which is based upon a task analysis);
2. teaching to the objective (with a focus on one clear measureable objective rather than several fuzzy intentions);
3. monitoring students' learning and adjusting the teaching (when necessary); and

4. making the appropriate use of the "Principles of Learning," which include a set of research-based ideas and tactics related to: motivation, active participation, anticipatory set, closure, reinforcement, and retention and transfer. In this set the element of closure is an add on to the Hunter Staff Development Model, and is one that Dr. Hunter does not agree with. The reader should appreciate, first, that some elements in any given Hunter Staff Development Model-oriented program will not correlate totally with Hunter's clinical theory of instruction, and second, that the model is not static. For example, by the time this essay is read a new principle of learning may have been added to the model.

The teachers have also been taught that these four major instructional skills are essential to effective teaching, and further, that if these skills are developed and judiciously employed, it is predictable that teachers will significantly "...increase the quantity and quality of learning for almost all students."[6]

In a Hunter Staff Development Model-oriented program, depending to a certain extent on who is the trainer,[7] teachers and administrators may also learn about: (a) the assumptions and expectations which serve as a foundation for Madeline Hunter's clinical theory of instruction, (b) the caveats which Hunter has delineated to help avoid misunderstandings based on misintepretation of her theory, (c) the Bloom Taxonomy of the cognitive domain, and (d) hemisphericity, practice theory, and the three types of decisions Dr. Hunter considers basic for effective teaching. At this point, however, because all of the variations of the Hunter Staff Development Model have been heavily influenced by Dr. Hunter's clinical theory of instruction, selected assumptions, expectations, defining characteristics and caveats which help to elucidate this theory will be shared.

After noting in her unpublished essay, "A Clinical Theory of Instruction," that she is vastly oversimplifying things, Hunter describes the following eight statements as assumptions upon which her model, or clinical theory of instruction, is based:

1. Learning is our critical concern but instruction is what we control; therefore, we should focus on and be held accountable for our instructional decisions and actions.

2. If teacher and student behaviors are not random but are directed to an identified objective, the probability of intended student achievement will be increased. Those objectives can vary in scope from long range to daily teaching outcomes. (This assumption includes the objective that the student will be in charge, select an objective, and direct his/her own learning.)

3. Everyone can learn the next thing beyond that which (s)he already knows, and that is the only thing anyone can learn. If the objective is too difficult or too easy, learning will not be efficient and probably not effective.

4. Achievement will be accelerated if the teacher monitors the effectiveness of student and/or teacher actions and adjusts instruction in light of the emerging data (formative evaluation).

5. There exists a substantial body of knowledge articulated as principles of learning which, when appropriately implemented by the teacher, through teaching decisions, results in increased motivation to learn, an accelerated rate and degree of learning, improved retention, and transfer of that learning to new situations requiring problem solving, decision making and creativity.[8]

6. Professionals continue to improve their performance if they know what they do well and why, if they learn theory-based, effective alternatives to less satisfactory decisions and actions, and if their performance continues to incorporate new regularities and cause-effect relationships as those emerge from research.

7. Most teachers have demonstrated they are eager to improve their professional skills and can learn the research basis for making the professional decisions required by the model.[9]

8. Artistry in teaching cannot yet be articulated and taught, but artistry is not in violation of, but is based on science. The Taj Mahal does not violate principles of physics or design but implements them creatively and a stically.[10]

Please note that there is a direct correspondence between: assumption #3 and

what ultimately became Essential Element of Instruction #1 (select an objective at the appropriate level of difficulty); assumption #2 and Essential Element of Instruction #2 (teach to the objective); assumption #4 and Essential Element of Instruction #3 (monitor the learning and adjust the teaching); and assumption #5 and Essential Element of Instruction #4 (use the principles of learning). Assumptions #6 and #8 are also worthy of note: #6 underscores Hunter's belief that teachers will improve their performance if they utilize behaviors which receive their rationale from cause/effect, that is, experimental research, and #8 reminds us that Hunter believes that the "scientific" basis for teaching will place teachers in a better position to manifest artistry in their teaching. In her eyes there is no conflict between the art and science of teaching, but rather an interactive, supportive relationship. This viewpoint is further clarified in a second Hunter essay, "What's Wrong with Madeline Hunter,"[11] where she makes an Aristotelian type of distinction between (a) <u>propositional knowledge</u>, which consists of research validated generalizations which identify behaviors which affect learning; (b) <u>procedural knowledge</u>; and (c) <u>conditional knowledge</u>. When a teacher has mastered the latter types of knowledge, she knows how and when to make judicious use of the propositional knowledge provided by the Hunter model, and at that point is in a position to use propositional knowledge to create artistry in teaching.

In her "Clinical Theory of Instruction" essay, Dr. Hunter also addresses this question: "What may we expect of this clinical theory?". Her response illuminates the theory by enumerating a number of its positive characteristics. For example, she notes that the theory:

1. provides an articulated basis for making and sequencing teaching decisions and also suggests facilitating teacher and student actions, thereby enabling instructors to perceive and interpret what they are doing in order to more efficiently predict, promote, and control learning;

2. suggests the substance but <u>not</u> the form (didactic, interactive, discovery, etc.) of instruction and, consequently, takes into account the teacher's style of the learner's needs and the contextual milieu in which instruction occurs;

3. is generalizable to any content, school organization, pupil-teacher ratio, methodology and to students regardless of age, socio-economic status, or ethnicity;

4. provides a common language with a set of descriptive terms that can effectively communicate what teachers decide about and do in the classroom;

5. yields testable conclusions and therefore has the potential to promote important, clinical relevant investigation.

6. (It) is not a static theory nor the "final answer," but one that can be validated, modified and extended as new research emerges.[12]

In addition, in this same thought provoking essay Professor Hunter, realizing that "With any effective theory, there always exists the danger of producing closed minded, unctuous, rigid practitioners," shares another set of observations about her theory, "...to avert some of the seemingly inevitable malpractice." Included among these are the following:

1. The model will not tell a teacher what to do. The model is not a recipe but requires constant teacher decision making. The theory identifies a data base for decisions not what the decision should be.

2. A teacher does not have to teach a certain way. The model identifies the substance of instruction not the form. In the same way, nutrition theory identifies the nutrients of a health-giving meal, not the menu, or how and when it is served.

3. The model is not the "right" way. The model is not an encapsulated system but open to new discoveries. It does not claim to be the best system but the more effective system when compared to common practice.

4. The model is not based on a certain philosophy or theory of learning. The model is eclectic and draws from all theories, identifying research supported cause-effect relationships that could help the teacher achieve any philosophic or curricular goal.[13]

After this list of caveats, Professor Hunter makes note of the widespread use of the model in California, Washington State, etc., as well as a number of

foreign countries. In the closing sections of the essay, she calls for research to help evaluate and improve the theory upon which the model is based.

> *Needed now are additional systematic data from program teacher preparation and professional development which will result in further refinement or impeachment of our understandings of the nature of instruction so we can predict and control with an intent to improve.*[14]

While what follows is not the type of systematic data Hunter alludes to, it is my hope that the analysis and recommendations provided in this essay will lead to some productive refinement in the conceptualization and implementation of Hunter Staff Development Model-oriented programs. However, before going further, I want to make clear that this essay is, in part, an analysis concerning the successes, etc. of an offshoot of the Hunter model and theory, and not a full blown analysis/critique of the theory itself. However, the Essential Elements of Instruction Staff Development Program is derived from, and is obviously influenced by, the theory. Therefore, because of the intimate relationship, at times the analysis/critique of the Essential Elements of Instruction will briefly become an analysis/critique of Madeline Hunter's clinical theory of instruction. At the same time, it would be wise to remember that, in reality, the theory and the Essential Elements of Instruction Program are independent constructions. Therefore, a critique of the one is not necessarily a criticism of the other.

With the distinction between the Hunter model and the Essential Elements of Instruction partially clarified, the following question will now be addressed: "What are the factors which have led to the widespread adoption of the Hunter Model-oriented Staff Development Program?"

The Success Factors

My analysis of the success of the Hunter model and its close approximations has uncovered five major explanatory factors. The first, and possibly, the most important, factor is the fact that the model is derived from a generous, flexible, open minded, forward looking, optimistic, confident, "clinical" theory. This is a theory which synthesized knowledge gleaned from research with knowledge gleaned from classroom teaching, to reach the timely and psychologically important conclusion that principals and teachers are crucial

variables which can make a difference in learning. Related to this factor is the perception that the theory, and the Essential Elements of Instruction, emanated from a "lab school,"[15] and from the mind of an elementary school principal/university professor, Madeline Hunter, who was in daily contact (for over a decade) with the running of a school, as opposed to theorizing and research conducted away from the field. In terms of external validity, the results of Madeline Hunter's on-going field experiment, in the U.C.L.A. Lab School, had an advantage in terms of plausibility and generalizability simply because she did her work in a school which was perceived as sufficiently realistic by school administrators. It is also noteworthy that the conclusion specified above was reached during an era (the Seventies) when (a) other research was declaring exactly what teachers and administrators did not want to hear, namely that schools did not make a significant difference in students' learning, and (b) the target teaching and management/education by objectives movement was gaining legislative support at the state and federal level.[16]

The second factor concerns the "research status" of the Hunter theory/model. The theory is presented as one (a) that "...was originally validated in Project Linkage, a project funded by the California State Department of Education in a difficult Los Angeles inner-city school," and (b) whose propositions have been corroborated in major studies such as the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study and Effective Schools Studies.[17]

A third explanatory success factor is that the program satisfies certain fundamental needs of school district administrators, and school site administrators. To begin with, the program tells administrators (both school district and school site level) that they can create high degrees of successful learning without getting involved in the complexities (and wasted energy) of school reorganization. The model strongly suggests that one can increase learning for almost all students without changing the pyramidal and self-contained structure of school district and school site organization. Thus, independent of whether or not the program significantly improves teaching and learning, initially at least it serves to rationalize and solidify the existing administrative structure in a school district because one of the characteristics of the Hunter Staff Development model (and therefore, the Essential Elements of Instruction) is that, "The principal of the school accepts and fulfills the central role of instructional leader by practicing the model in the education

and supervision of staff and students."[18] Therefore, in fact, the model and the Essential Elements of Instruction have given a new life to, and rationale for, the idea that the principal should be the most knowledgeable and influential instructional leader at a school site. However, if these principals are going to fulfill their newly emphasized instructional leadership and evaluation responsibilities, they will need a relatively clear, and generalizable (good for all grades, content areas, and ethnic populations) idea of what "good teaching" looks like, or appears to be. And, this is exactly what the Essential Elements of Instruction, with its "direct instruction"[19] research underpinning, and "science of instruction" depiction by Madeline Hunter and other Essential Elements of Instruction trainers, provides. With a model of instruction that is presented as scientifically derived and validated, administrators can now assert that they have a solid, legitimized, knowledge and staff development base, a base which can be used to help less effective teachers improve their teaching. But, note that for the ineffective teacher who doesn't improve, the 1985 Hunter model and Essential Elements of Instruction trained administrator has a sharper, more credible, more defensible dismissal process than did the 1975 and 1965 school site administrator. Note also that a scientifically sanctioned evaluation program needs to be carefully modulated lest it be abused by administrators who have forgotten, or never heard, all the caveats Professor Hunter placed in her 1978 essay, and her later essay, "What's Wrong with Madeline Hunter?". While the stronger dismissal process is not a major objective of the Hunter Staff Development Model, and while linking the model too closely to evaluation can interfere with the acceptance of the model by teachers, the stronger dismissal process is something which some administrators, state legislators, school boards, and parents feel good about.

This more defensible dismissal process is strongly supported by what I view as a fourth major explanatory success factor, namely the creation of the Essential Elements of Instruction "language." The Hunter model has provided a common, shared, comprehensible, plausible language of instruction for teachers and administrators, and this common language has brought lucidity, consistency, and a sharper edge to the administrator/teacher evaluation process and dialogue. In so doing, the Essential Elements of Instruction has satisfied a fundamental need of school site administrators at the same time that it has satisfied a cluster of significant teacher needs:

The fact that the Hunter model and language (task analysis, anticipatory set, active participation, instructional objective, modeling, overt/covert behavior, reinforcement, level of concern, performance level, motivation, monitor and adjust, transfer, etc.) fulfills important teacher needs is the fifth and most speculative of the success factors.[20] I believe that this program is viewed as desirable and logical by teachers, and teachers' unions, because it:

a) says loud and clear that teachers <u>can</u> make a difference, <u>can</u> significantly affect learning;

b) provides instructional guidelines and skills which teachers value;

c) provides a framework in which administrators can be held accountable for objective evaluation and responsible supervision (supervision guided by the Essential Elements of Instruction, and often called clinical supervision);

d) is viewed as a flexible, general model which leaves abundant room for teacher decision-making, intelligence, and artistry;

e) is presented in such a polished, sophisticated manner (the trainers really model the Essential Elements of Instruction as they teach them);

f) provides an encapsulated classroom-focused model which appears to reduce the ambiguity and complexity in the teaching/learning process, and thus makes teaching in a complex setting manageable; and

g) raises the status of the teaching profession by arguing that progressive teaching, teaching guided by the Essential Elements of Instruction, is a <u>scientifically</u> informed enterprise.

Point (g) above is worthy of elaboration. It is not only that this program raises the status of the profession; I believe it also makes teachers <u>feel</u> more professional. The line of reasoning which supports this view is as follows. To begin with, the model gives experienced teachers new labels for the kinds of teaching behaviors they already manifest, to some degree. Thus, the model, for many teachers, provides positive reinforcement for what they're already doing, or agree that they should be doing. After completing one, two, or more one week cycles of the Essential Elements of Instruction program, teachers can see what was only dimly perceived prior to the program, namely that they were already utilizing most, but not all, of the Essential Elements

of Instruction. Along with this realization is a new fact already alluded to: the teachers, and their administrators, now have their own scientifically sanctioned, very precise, commonly understood vocabulary which can be utilized in conversations with other teachers, administrators, parents, and in certain settings with student teachers as well. Although it has not been established empirically, I believe the above-mentioned factors provide many teachers with a greater sense of intellectual, or cognitive, control over their very complex work environment. This control, in turn, may contribute to anxiety reduction, and higher degrees of teacher satisfaction and morale, as well as improved instructional techniques. The end result is that many teachers, because of their new vocabulary, and the enhanced clarity it brings, and the scientific model which is now their tool, feel more professional. Certainly the possibility that this is true calls for more investigation into the alleged phenomena.

It is also quite noteworthy that the type of comparative research which would shed light on these status-related questions has not been widely initiated by school district administrators or professors of education, and the Essential Elements of Instruction model itself does not appear to facilitate such research. Although, as noted earlier, Madeline Hunter has indicated that additional systematic data are needed to help test the hypotheses embedded in her theory, the Essential Elements of Instruction Staff Development Program as implemented does little by way of instruments, encouragement, and examples to stimulate the collection of such data. Indeed, paradoxically, it may be that the high level of advocacy which the model appears to stimulate in the administrators who initially sponsor the program, may serve to diminish any impulse for gathering objective data about the performance and feelings of Essential Elements of Instruction trained teachers.

It may also be true that: (a) administrators who value the leverage which the program provides for dealing with incompetent/recalcitrant teachers, do not wish to collect data which might undermine the legitimacy and scientific prestige which the program now possesses; (b) some districts do not perceive their programs as polished enough to qualify for research; (c) many districts are simply not research oriented organizations; and (d) funds for research are hard to come by. Whatever the exact reasons, the successful dissemination of the Essential Elements of Instruction program, and its actual achievements in various school districts are an understudied phenomenon, and are likely to remain so unless the trainers and disseminators of the Hunter model themselves

more actively encourage research in the above-mentioned areas. Technical support for such encouragement should come, in the near future, from the instruments and stragegies developed in two inquiries currently under way in Napa County, California and Minneapolis, Minnesota.[21]

All of the above factors, and even the dearth of school district sponsored research concerning the improved teaching effectiveness of Hunter model trained teachers, serve to explain why the Hunter model and the Essential Elements of Instruction have been enthusiastically received, and advocated, by administrators, even to the point of demanding that teacher education programs incorporate the Essential Elements of Instruction model, language and assumptions into their curricula. This extension of the strong advocacy for the Essential Elements of Instruction model into pre-service teacher education is also understandable, particularly if you are an administrator who has, in the past several years, received a scientifically-validated model of instruction that seems to fulfill important instructional objectives at the classroom, school, and district levels of operation. But, it should be noted to school district administrators and professors of education that a model of instruction and a "language" which meets the needs of school district administrators and teachers in their ethos, may not meet, might indeed clash, with selected needs and aspirations of professors of education who carry out their mission in a university. For example, by their nature, I believe many professors of education are interested in having their students examine competing models of instruction, as opposed to having their students, future student teachers and teachers, become expert in one model of instruction, even one as intriguing as Professor Hunter's. Although there are other reasons why some professors of education might resist pressures to create and implement Hunter model-oriented pre-service teacher education programs, I think, at bottom it is the university ethos which views scientific knowledge as tentative and emergent, and values the clash of competing theories and languages, along with scientific objectivity, rigor, and skepticism, which is the root cause. It makes sense for a school district to (a) create one language for internal district affairs and (b) be open to new concepts which might enrich their instructional language. Contrastingly, it makes sense for a Department of Education to "represent" and analyze several models of instruction and to seek out knowledge to refine and challenge the models/languages in use. Obviously, there is common ground, but there is also room for conflict if educatiors do not respect the different missions and

priorities in their respective organizations. These observations are made remembering the threat of one school district administrator who recently suggested that his school district might not be open to student teachers unless the student teachers started to learn more about "THE" Essential Elements of Instruction.

With this as background, and from the perspective of a university professor working in a region (the Central Coast of California) where the Essential Elements of Instruction model and language has become the official model and language of K-12 education, I will now discuss several ways in which the Hunter model and the Essential Elements of Instruction can be improved. The improvements, while mainly semantical in nature, could lead to a "language" and model of instruction better suited to both school district and university levels of organization and responsibility.

Improvable Areas

To begin with, as many others have already done, I would choose a more modest name for the Essential Elements of Instruction program. I would prefer the name Critical (or Significant) Elements of Instruction because (a) it is too easy for the Essential Elements of Instruction to become ***THE*** Essential Elements of Instruction, and (b) the "essential" suggests that elements of instruction not included in the Essential Elements of Instruction are, at best, less than essential, and, at worst, unimportant. While this may not be the intent, it could be the effect.

Related to this modification, in the context of Hunter model implementation, is a recommendation that the term "science" and label "science of instruction model" be used more cautiously. Cautious use here implies that in the course of staff development, Hunter model trainers will note that:

a) the Hunter theory/model has been partially, but not widely or systematically validated, and is, therefore, quite worthy of more rigorously defined, longitudinal, comparative inquiries;

b) the model, because it is scientifically based and oriented, is an emergent growing model;

c) even though various investigators have in recent years uncovered cause-effect relationships between selected instructional variables

and student achievement, the predictability which follows from the discovery of cause-effect relationships is, in this instance, a limited "predictability" because of the numerous other variables in the organizational climate which can undermine the "alterable" variables in the Hunter model;

d) the scientific aspect of the model, i.e., the proportional knowledge provided, and the prior validation of the model in one context under one type of implementation, does not guarantee that the model as implemented will be successful in any given context;

e) particularly with a partially validated scientific model of instruction, school districts should carefully plan and evaluate their implementation so as to be in a position, in their district, to see how and if propositional knowledge is growing into procedural and conditional knowledge to yield artistic/judicious instructional decision making;

f) at the present time, there are two longitudinal inquiries which are studying the Hunter model, but in terms of strongly validating the model, both studies have different kinds of design problems which weaken their power to validate;[22] and

g) for the Hunter theory/model of instruction to qualify as a scientifically and strongly validated model of instruction many more longitudinal replications in diverse school districts are needed.

However, even when there have been a dozen or more rigorously defined replications in diverse settings and circumstances, teachers and administrators should still appreciate, as Madeline Hunter makes clear, that this clinical theory of instruction is a theory of instruction for a specific type of educational setting. The Hunter model, quintessentially, is a school based, classroom teacher, and school site principal, oriented model. It is a theoretical attempt to fully maximize the resources for learning in schools as they are presently structured and conceptualized. Therefore, if by 1990 it becomes a model which is widely validated by research findings, it will be a "science of instruction" for schools as they are presently organized. No mean achievement --but, teachers and administrators should still be aware that teaching and learning in the 1990's and beyond may increasingly occur in non-traditional

settings. Instructional efficacy in these dimly perceived, technologically driven, settings may well call for a wider ranging model of instruction. However, it should be noted that the Hunter model with its open-ended quality is well structured to incorporate new material.

The modification of "essential" to "critical" relates to a third improvable area, namely the four elements of instruction. I believe this set could be more productively discussed as five key elements, particularly if we're thinking about adapting the Essential Elements of Instruction Staff Development Model to preservice teacher education. In this context, presented in an overview course, the elements would highlight for future teachers the instructional competencies considered crucial to sensitive/effective teaching and learning by the faculty. At present, as previously noted, the elements considered essential to effective instruction are:

"A" Choose an objective at the appropriate level of difficulty;

"B" Teach to the objective;

"C" Monitor (the learning) and adjust (the teaching); and

"D" Use the principles of learning (which in this program concern ideas and tactics related to motivation, active participation, anticipatory set, reinforcement, retention, and closure).

It appears to me that in going from "A" to "B", a major element of instruction, or, if you will, a major step in instructional decision-making, has been left out. This oversight appears to be in keeping with, and follow from, Madeline Hunter's belief that her clinical theory (a) "...suggests the substance but not the form (didactic, interactive, discovery, etc.) of instruction and, consequently, takes into account the teacher's style, the learner's needs, and the contextual milieu in which instruction occurs,"[23] and (b) "... is generalizable to any content, school, organization, pupil-teacher ratio, methodology, and the students regardless of age, socio-economic status, or ethnicity."[24] Because Professor Hunter perceives the four elements in her model as universals which apply across all the above-mentioned variables, the variables themselves and the decisions related to them are left out of the Hunter model, or at least deemphasized. But, in reality, between element "A" and element "B", teachers make a cluster of teaching tactic and strategy decisions (didactic, interactive, discovery, small group, large group,

cooperative group, etc.), and my reading of the research literature as well as the Madeline Hunter literature[25] suggests that this "instructional input" decision is an important one, and a decision which in some cases can also be informed by scientific research.[26]

In addition, while Hunter's theory, in theory, may not suggest the "form" of instruction, in practice in several school districts, the Hunter model has been integrated with the "direct instruction" model[27] so that some teachers are now getting the distorted message that the four elements plus large group instruction, minus individualized instruction, minus learning centers, minus cooperative group learning, minus learning style informed education, etc. is really what effective instruction is all about. One strategy for defending against this narrow interpretation of the Hunter theory/model would be to widely circulate Hunter's 1978 essay, "A Clinical Theory of Instruction." Another approach, and one that would be particularly suitable for pre-service teacher education, would be to add a new element between the "A" and "B" elements listed above. The new element could be phrased to clearly indicate that selecting a teaching strategy appropriate for the objective and student population is an important aspect of instruction. The new element could also carry some additional aspects of Madeline Hunter's philosophy of education into her model. Besides generating her clinical theory of instruction, from which the Essential Elements of Instruction are derived, Hunter has also developed a strategy and rationale for helping students become independent learners, and this strategy, part of her philosophy of education I would say, has not been as widely accepted as her clinical theory.[28]

The new element I have in mind, while a bit lengthier than the other elements, could read:

> *Select teaching and grouping strategies which (a) are appropriate for the instructional objective in light of the student population which is receiving the instruction and (b) enhance the student's ability and proclivity to be autonomous, scholarly learners.*

Of course, the addition of this new element could be conceived as mixing research based "universal" elements (the other four elements) with a complex prescription based on philosophical values. Against this point of view, I

would argue first the instructional decisions embedded in this element deserve special emphasis because:

a) there is research evidence to support the notion that instruction should be different in form and substance for selected cultural groups at certain points in that learning career;[29]

b) the Fifth Element would clearly remind pre- and in-service teachers that there is another level of <u>important</u> instructional decision-making beyond the decisions embedded in the Four Elements;

c) at this level, where the Four Elements confront curriculum, organizational, and cultural "facts" and regularities, form and substance integrate to become one instructional reality and decisions made at this level are also informed by research; and

d) pre-service teacher education and staff development programs, even when their focus is on universal cross-content, cross-cultural group, etc., generalizations, should clearly remind teachers that the <u>form</u> of instruction is ultimately shaped by the universals (the Four Elements) <u>and</u> the particulars of a given context (the content area, the students being taught, etc.).

A fourth and final area of improvement concerns the last element in the Hunter model: "Use the Principles of Learning." According to Madeline Hunter, the principles of learning are principles, "...which research has demonstrated to be pervasively influential in learning at any degree of difficulty."[30] Examples of pervasive learning principles, again according to Madeline Hunter, are:

a) "provide maximum guidance at initial stages of learning;"

b) "reinforcement increases the probability of a response;"

c) "mass practice for rapid learning and distribute practice for long retention."[31]

These pervasive learning principles and others have been categorized according to those that: influence a student's motivation to learn; increase the rate and degree of learning; promote retention of what has been learned; and encourage appropriate transfer of that learning to new situations.

In the Essential Elements of Instruction model employed in my region, the current set of principles of learning are labelled: anticipatory set, active participation, motivation, reinforcement, retention, and closure. Each principle is further divided into sub-topics or variables to illustrate how to make use of the principle. "Motivation," for example, is discussed/illuminated in terms of teacher behaviors which create, or make effective use of: "level of concern" (anxiety), "feeling tone," "interest," "success," "knowledge of results," and "reward." These variables are shared at some length to illustrate that, by and large, these concepts and the principles of learning in the Essential Elements of Instruction model emanate from research in the field commonly known as educational psychology. I make this point in response to selected school district administrators who, as a part of their advocacy of the Hunter model, make strong demands upon my education department to create a required Essential Elements of Instruction course for pre-service teacher candidates. This is done with the support of university colleagues who are also strong advocates for this model of instruction.

Keeping in mind the previously discussed responsibilities of university professors, I want to gently remind my university and school district colleagues that there are other valuable research based models of, and theories about, learning which have emanated from the fields of educational psychology, educational sociology, and educational anthropology. To discuss these models and theories at length is beyond the scope of this paper, but selected models and theories will be briefly mentioned.

Herbert Walberg's theory of educational productivity is a strong case in point.[32] Walberg's theory delineates nine factors which require optimization to increase affective, behavioral, and cognitive learning. The nine factors, to a great degree, incorporate the Essential Elements of Instruction principles of learning, but go beyond them to indicate the significance of environmental variables which are external to the classroom, i.e., the home, the use of out-of-school time, and the peer group outside of school. There are several valuable aspects in Walberg's theory, but the emphasis on the importance of out-of-school factors, most notably the home environment, is particularly timely because it may encourage K-12 educators to "professionally" increase their influence over a competing curriculum and learning environment, namely the student's new home electronic learning environment. In addition, Walberg's

theory also sheds new positive light on the virtues of open education and autonamous learning, and therefore, may help diminish the excessive attention which large group "direct instruction" currently enjoys in the staff development arena.

Rita Dunn's research based learning style model provides yet another perspective on optimal learning which overlaps but extends beyond the Essential Elements of Instruction principles ard the Walbergian Theory.[33] Dunn's theorizing, like Walberg's, and unlike Hunter's, is not tightly linked to the classroom of today, and indeed challenges the status quo. All the more reason for pre-service candidates, and in-service as well, to hear about her principles of learning. Beyond the Dunn theory there are other research based theories and concepts which go beyond all three theories (the Hunter, Walberg, and Dunn theories), and challenge aspects of the theories.

Expectation states theory, and more specifically the process of "status generalization" as described by Elizabeth G. Cohen and Susan J. Rosenholtz[34] is such a theory and process. These investigators present a theory and research based argument which posits that "...a back-to-basics approach to an academically heterogeneous classroom will depress low-achieving minority students' engagement and willingness to learn," and will also, "...reinforce racist conceptions about the intellectual incompetence of black and brown students." As an alternative to a monolithic, reading oriented, back-to-basics, large group oriented curriculum, the authors recommended a multi-ability model of instruction, a model which, parenthetically, integrates nicely with the Hunter, Walberg, and Dunn theories, at least as I understand them.

In addition, the concerns of Cohen and Rosenholtz mesh well with theorizing and concepts emerging from the work of educational anthropologists. In my opinion when one begins to profess about principles of learning to future teachers who will work in a multicultural society such as ours, George Spindler's theory of cultural transmission, and particularly related concepts such as cultural continuity and cultural discontinuity should be alluded to and then discussed and developed in other courses.[35] Knowledge of these concepts, and the theories and cultural facts related to them, place teachers in a better position to perceive whether or not their teaching behaviors, decisions, or tactics are culturally congruent as opposed to culturally insensitive, futile, or worse. Teachers need to be reminded that (a) all teaching takes place in

the medium of culture; (b) that the medium of cultue has the strength or density to bend/refract all other variables; and (c) studies have indicated that culture is a pervasively influential factor in learning.

With this in mind, it is interesting to note that Madeline Hunter's clinical theory of instruction, and its offshoot - the Essential Elements of Instruction, are elaborate constructions which by design stand apart from cultural considerations so they can, ironically, be transported easily, as a theory and a training model to all cultures. But, as I have tried to suggest, no construction or teaching can truly stand apart from culture and cultural considerations. Madeline Hunter's clinical theory was shaped by, and is grounded in, the reality of American public schools where, for example, the notion of the principal as instructional leader fits the organizational pattern of American culture. Similarly, I believe a culture-free Essential Elements of Instruction, a training model which glosses over cultural diversity, fits well into a society which historically has suffered from cultural myopia and worse. But, administrators and teachers who are currently receiving staff development and the novitiates we are educating in our universities and school districts, deserve and indeed need training models which remind them that well designed ethnographic inquiries have demonstrated time and again that "culture" and a host of related concepts are significant variables in the teaching/learning process in American schools.

Furthermore, and finally, I believe that (a) aspects of the Walberg and Dunn models, as well as the cultural concepts alluded to, could be usefully integrated into the Hunter model and (b) that a university course which introduces and discusses principles of learning in the context of an emerging science of instruction for pre-service candidates should draw on all the models previously mentioned, as well as other research based theories with which I am as yet unfamiliar. However, in their graduate programs, and in their in-service training, teachers should be presented with workshops and courses which focus exclusively on one or two models. At that more experienced point in their development, in-service educators are likely to bring a knowledgeable perspective to the claims of other knowledgeable, enthusiastic educators who believe they have discovered the most complete model of instruction for a given time period. And, at that more informed time in their careers, the teachers are more likely to be creative adaptors of models, as opposed to inflexible adoptors.

END NOTES

[1]In the main, I read a series of essays and monographs by Madeline Hunter. Key essays included: "What's Wrong with Madeline Hunter," nondated, unpublished manuscript disseminated by Ed Henderson, Napa County Superintendent of Schools, 4032 Maher Street, Napa, CA. 94558; "A Clinical Theory of Instruction," 1978, unpublished manuscript; "Teacher Competency: Problem, Theory, and Practice;" *Theory into Practice*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 1976; "Diagnostic Teaching," *The Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1979; and "Altering the Alterable Variables," *Educational Forum*, Vol. 45, No. 1, 1980; "Knowing, Teaching, and Supervising," a chapter in the *1984 ASCD Yearbook -- Using What We Know about Teaching*, ed., Philip L. Hosford, Alexandria, Virginia. The set of monographs consisted of: *Motivation Theory for Teachers* (1967); *Teach More-Faster* (1969); *Reinforcement Theory for Teachers* (1967); *Retention Theory for Teachers* (1967); and *Teach for Transfer* (1971) -- all from TIP Publications, P.O. Box 514, El Segundo, CA. 90245.

[2]Those interviewed included Dr. Becca Wachtmann, Staff Development Coordinator, Lucia Mar Unified School District, CA.; Jean Burns, Junior High School Teacher, San Luis Coastal School District, CA.; Dr. Lauren Sanchez, Associate Superintendent, Upland School District, CA.; and Dr. Donald Morris, Professor of Education, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA.

[3]Those interviewed included Dr. Donald Maas, Wayne Brown, and Roxanne Burns.

[4]Dr. Hunter is currently Professor of Education in the School of Education at the University of California, Los Angeles. She consults on an international basis.

[5]In this essay the term "clinical theory of instruction" and the Hunter Model and ITIP (Instructional Theory into Practice) will be used interchangeably. In this theory teaching is defined as a series of decisions which increase the probability of intended learning, and learning is defined as a change in behavior.

[6]Madeline Hunter, "Altering the Alterable Variables," *The Educational Forum*, November 1980, pp. 121-122.

[7]This observation is based on the interview with Dr. Becca Wachtmann, who has had the opportunity to observe at least five different trainers conduct Essential Elements of Instruction cycles for Lucia Mar Unified School District over a period of five years.

[8]The articulated body of knowledge referred to can be found in the set of monographs (programmed learners) cited in reference number 1 above.

[9]In this essay the term "model" replaces the acronym I.T.I.P. (Instructional Theory into Practice) which was used in the original essay, "A Clinical Theory of Instruction."

[10]Madeline Hunter, "A Clinical Theory of Instruction," unpublished manuscript, 1978.

[11]See reference not number 1 for the full citation for this essay.

[12]*op. cit.*, pp. 7-8.

[13]*op. cit.*, pp. 8-9.

[14]*op. cit.*, pp. 11.

[15]Madeline Hunter was the principal of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Lab School for twenty years. During this period, the school maintained grades with an average student population of .

[16]The Stull Bill, which mandated that California administrators and teachers specify goals and objectives at the beginning of each school year became law in 1972, and the Education for All Handicapped Act, Public Law 94-142 was passed by Congress in 1975. This law involved principals and certain teachers in the development of individual education plans (IEPs), and specific instructional objectives for eligible students.

[17]The nature of these studies, as well as selected conceptual and methodological problems in a wide range of school effectiveness studies leads me to conclude that these studies provide partial, but not complete validation for the Hunter model. For further information on the conceptual and methodological problems see, "Research on Effective Schools: A Cautionary Note," by Brian Rowan, et. al., *Educational Research*, April 1983, pp. 24-31.

[18]*op. cit.*, pp. 10.

[19]The "time on task" and "large group" generalizations which stem from the direct instruction model advocated by Barak Rosenshine, and supported by the research findings of Jere Brophy, Jane Stallings, Tom Good, and others, reinforce, and mesh neatly, with the assumptions embedded in Hunter's clinical theory.

[20]The way individual teachers view this program, ultimately, has a lot to do with the quality of, and some very basic decisions about implementation. Was it a mandatory program? Did teachers receive adequate reinforcement of the initial cycle? Were the principals well skilled in clinical supervision, etc.?

[21]More information about these two research projects is available from: Pam Robbins, Director, Special Projects and Research, Napa County Superintendent of Schools, 4032 Maher Street, Napa, CA. 94558 (707 224-3151) and Dick Manett, College of Education, Iowa State University, 230 Curtis Hall, Ames, Iowa 30011 (515 294-5521).

[22]In the Napa County inquiry the first two years of data collection (1982-84) did not involve control (or comparison) schools. At the end of the 1984-85 school year, comparative analyses will be available. In the Manett study, the Hunter model was one of several models studied, and teachers were allowed to choose the model they wanted to work with. Although both studies will ultimately yield thought provoking data, at this time neither study is in a position to provide strong validation for the Hunter model.

[23]Madeline Hunter, "A Clinical Theory of Instruction," pp. 7.

[24]*Ibid.*, p. 7.

[25]In an unpublished 1976 essay, "Planning for Effective Instruction," co-authored with Doug Russell, Professor Hunter discusses seven elements which research has shown to be influential in learning. In this essay, "instructional input," which involves determining what needs to be taught and how it will be taught, is the third element discussed.

[26]The learning style research findings disseminated by Rita Dunn and her colleagues at the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching Styles (St. John's University), and the cooperative learning group research findings disseminated by Robert Slavin (John Hopkins University) are cases in point. See also the Walberg, and Cohen and Rosenholtz essays cited in reference notes numbers 32 and 34 below, and an essay "Achieving Excellence through Outcome-Based Instructional Delivery" by S.E. Rubin and W. E. Spady, *Educational Leadership*, May 1984.

[27]The following characteristics of the direct instructional model, as suggested by C. M. Charles in his book, *Elementary Classroom Management: A Handbook of Excellence in Teaching* (Longman, 1983) elucidate the "form" suggested by the Essential Elements of Instruction/Direct Instruction model. Charles writes that teachers, when preparing for direct teaching, "give heavy emphasis to (a) clear objectives that students understand, (b) clear directions, (c) instructional activities that produce student attention, involvement, and active response, (d) grouping-usually larger groups are preferred, (e) structured methods of teaching, (f) follow-up practice and application, and (g) evaluation" (pp. 120-121).

[28]For more information on this strategy and rationale see Madeline Hunter's "Helping Students Become Independent Learners," 1979, unpublished manuscript.

[29]See, for example, Shirley Brice Heath's chapter, "Questioning at Home and at School: A Comparative Study," and Frederick Erickson and Gerald Monatt's chapter, "Cultural Organization of Participation Structures in Two Classrooms of Indian Students," both in *Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Educational Anthropology in Action*, edited by George Spindler, as well as Jose Macias' 1984

dissertation entitled, "Papago Home-to-School Transition: A Study of School Discontinuity in Early Childhood."

[30]Madeline Hunter, "Teaching Competency: Problem, Theory, and Practice," *Theory into Practice*, April 1976, pp. 164 (Vol. 15, No. 2).

[31]*Ibid.*, pp. 165.

[32]For more information on this theory, see Herbert J. Walberg's essay, "Improving the Productivity of America's Schools," *Educational Leadership*, May 1984, pp. 19-27 (Vol. 41, No. 8).

[33]For more information on Rita Dunn's learning style model see: Rita Dunn, "Learning Style: State of the Science," *Theory into Practice*, Winter 1984 (Vol. 23, No. 1).

[34]For more information on the Cohen/Rosenholtz challenge to back-to-basics oreinted curricula see "Back to Basics and the Desegregated School," by Susan J. Rosenholtz and Elizabeth G. Cohen, in *The Elementary School Journal*, May 1983, pp. 515-527.

[35]For more information on the concepts of cultural continuity and discontinuity and George Spindler's theory of cultural transmission see Chapter 13, "The Transmission of Culture," in *Education and Cultural Process: Toward an Anthropology of Education*, edited by George Spindler (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1974).