**Intellectual Disability**

Name of the Article:

Comparison of Constant Time Delay and Simultaneous Prompting

Population:

Students with an Intellectual Disability and Autism.

Objective:

Teachers will learn how to best teach functional sight words to students with an Intellectual Disability and Autism.

Age/Grade Level:

Students 8-11 years old.

Procedure:

Introduction: In this article they are trying to find the best possible produces for teaching children with moderate to severe disabilities. They compare the efficiency of CTD and SP when the children are being taught their functional sight words. They are testing this out on four students. These students that they are testing have a moderate intellectual disability or they have a dual diagnosis of moderate intellectual disability and autism spectrum disorder. Through this study they are trying to find out what works best for these children to learn more beneficially. Them selecting a new way that works best for certain students with an intellectual disability will then help the teachers to master an individualized education plan and help set better goals and objectives. This article will help teachers find the best possible methods for helping students with intellectual disabilities and/or Autism learn their functional sight words.

Summary: As you know they are trying to figure out the most efficient way to teach children their sight words even with an intellectual disability. To test this, they got one male, Ryan, and three females, Nina and Amy and Carla, with moderate intellectual disability and/or Autism to participate in this study. They were all placed in a general education setting to get the most effective results. They all got basic instruction, which targeted functional sight words. There were two sessions that happened daily; one CTD and one SP. There were two comparisons of CTD and SP that were conducted. These tests were conducted with three target words per procedure per comparison, which is six sight words for the first comparison and then another six sight words for the second comparison. They targeted food and restaurant items as their sight words, they were compared and equally distributed for balance and difficulty and then randomly assigned to instructional procedures and comparisons. CTD and SP were effective when teaching functional sight words to students with moderate intellectual disability and/or Autism. Both of these testing showed minimal differences within each student. The errors and sessions within criterion were lower for CTD as compared to SP for every student. Time within criterion was lower for SP when compared to CTD for every student. This study shows that CTD and SP were both effective to teach functional sight words to students with moderate intellectual disability and/or Autism. Since there were only four students they all showed different results and what worked best for them. However, it did measure overall that CTD was more efficient than SP. Now as teachers we are able to more understand how to help teach our students learn functional sight words.

Possible Adaptations:

This study went well and their testing was well conducted. The only downside to this study is that you really can’t tell what is more efficient, they both showed similar results and they differ between each student. To better improve their results and get a clearer understanding of what is actually more efficient they should have gotten more participants. Instead of just doing four children you could have done ten, or even more. The more participants the clearer the results are for what is more efficient. They could have also tested different ages, they tested only 8-11, while they could have tested younger ages. If you opened up the students age rage, then you could have gotten more participants. The participants had to have moderate intellectual disability and/or Autism, while they could have tested a wide range from mild to severe intellectual disabilities and/or Autism. There are just a few things that could have changed within their testing but other than that the testing was good enough.

Reflection:

I think that is very interesting to read and I really liked reading about finding new ways and more efficient ways to help students learn functioning sight words. I really also didn’t understand what CTD and SP really was. I researched it and tried looking it up and learning more but I was still very confused. Not knowing these terms makes it harder for me to understand how efficient these are to help teach students functioning sight words. Other than not understanding those words, I thought the whole tests were laid out well and actually interesting to read and learn about.

Research:

In the article the author never really mentions any further research they did about their testing. It does not talk about why and how this works. It just states the statistics of why it is proven that CTD is proven more efficient.
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