President's Message

Our last newsletter came out shortly after the September 11 attacks on our country. I was pleased to see that, without planning, the newsletter content was caring and sensitive in ways that we might have planned. That caring is the central nature of school psychologists and is the reason I am thankful for the members of my profession every day. Sometimes, though, it is helpful to seek out information that will help us do our job better, to give teeth to our affective efforts. How do we "operationalize" our caring on a day-to-day basis? One place to start is with our system and personal philosophy, model and mission statement. NASP and APA require programs to describe these and to demonstrate how we implement them in our training and practice. At OSU, we ascribe to our "Science Based Child/Learner Success" model and philosophy. It is a model of caring. But how do we implement that? And how can practitioners consider this caring as they go about their jobs?

The first component to be considered is the scientific basis of our practice and the concept of a scientist-practitioner model. That is, we stand out from other caring professions in our emphasis on empirically supported assessments and interventions. It is always surprising to me to hear people devalue this process as uncaring. For example, I was once involved in a student support program designed to identify students at risk for drug and alcohol abuse. Although the program was well intentioned, I observed on several occasions group sessions in which it was not clear to me that the children were being benefited. The children would share their deepest concerns regarding a sibling or parent who was an abuser, then the briefly trained facilitator would say thanks for sharing, now go back to math. The kids left crying with open wounds and I was not sure they would be able to concentrate on their math after that. I expressed my concern to the program director and asked what evaluation procedures were in place to assess the effectiveness of the program. He said, "Oh, we don't want to evaluate anything. We just want to help kids." Our job, on a daily basis, is to communicate that evaluating the effectiveness of what we do is caring. What prevention programs are be delivered in your system? Are you involved? Are they the programs that have been shown to be the most effective? Get involved!

The second component of caring is a daily consideration of "Who is the client, and what is in their best interest?" For those of us who practice within systems, we too frequently ask, "How can we make this child fit into the system?", rather than , "Is this in the best interest of the child?" We focus on compliance rather than competence. The child/learner success model asks, "What are the long and short term goals for this child and the systems in which the child functions that will lead to an adaptive life-style?" Armed with this question, the battles we pick will be so much more meaningful and we will gain so much more job satisfaction. And our attention will be focused on decision-making relevant to this goal. We can think, not "does the LD teacher have room for this child?", but "have appropriate systematic and consistent interventions been conducted to facilitate the academic, social, emotional and behavioral adjustment of this person? Can this child's needs best be met in this classroom?". And we get the team of caring people around this child to think this way. When this happens, it is very likely that a teacher will decide that the self-worth of a

child with a learning disability in her class, who is being ridiculed by peers for poor academic performance, is more important than her inherent right to have students grade each others' papers and call the scores out in public. And the focus will be on preventing peer ridicule rather than grading practices. And you won't need a lawyer and the case won't be at the U. S. Supreme Court. For each child with whom you work, ask for simple solutions first.

The third component important to the model is that all-important team. With your heavy caseloads it is imperative that you, on a daily basis, assist families, administrators, teacher teams and support professionals to adopt the success model and learn the skills needed to implement a problem-solving model. We talk about giving psychology away. Persons unfamiliar with this model will use for their expectancies the models with which they are familiar. So, they might expect to "hand you" the problem and to have you test or counsel or do whatever it is you do, and then come back with the problem "fixed". If you ask for their direct participation and assistance in solving the problem, they might apply faulty attributions and blame the problem on other participants. Teachers blame the home. The family blames the school. The school psychologist blames the administrator. The administrator blames the system. And everyone blames the child. Therefore, there is "nothing we can do to fix the problem." You, then, can test, and label, and place and go on to the next child not really feeling like you "fixed" the problem. Or you can start with one parent, one teacher who is willing to try. And you can help that caregiver achieve success with one child. Teach them skills. Support their efforts as we expect them to support the child's. And then they can start a rumor that you helped them, and the next referral you get might be for intervention assistance rather than testing. Because, as we discussed in the fall column, these caregivers selected their roles because they do care, and we simply need to revive that caring in a frustrating situation.

Many of you are implementing the model right now. You have building level assistance teams. You are conducting parent training. You are running groups for children with ADHD. You are serving as child and parent advocates in the court system. Every day. In the real world. In Oklahoma. I invite those of you who have encouraging examples of the success model at work to send in descriptions of programs and case examples to the newsletter. These examples can be used as models for other practitioners who wish to advocate for change in their own system, or to simply start with one child. Keep the faith and God Bless.

Judy Oehler-Stinnet

OSPA Membership Statistics

Current Membership: 246

Gender

Female:	86%
Male:	14%

Membership Types

Regular:	65%
Student:	25%
Life:	5%
Associate:	3%
Honorary:	2%

Average Age

All Members:	45
Female:	45
Male:	48
Student:	30
Regular:	49
Student:	30
Life:	64

Certifications

School Psychologist:	54%
School Psychometrist:	18%
School Psychologist/Psychometrist:	28%
Nationally Certified School Psychologist:	21%

Member of National Association of School Psychology: 39%

Regions

Central:	39%
Northeast:	41%
Northwest:	5%
Southeast:	8%
Southwest:	7%

This information was made possible by your diligence in updating membership and directory forms ~ thank you and don't hesitate to write in that birth date! Membership and directory forms are available at OSPAWEB.ORG.

Jami Haywood and Cole Menaker
Membership Chairs

OSPA Welcomes New Members 2001-2002

From Jenks PS, **Sherry Adair** and **Sue Baker**, School Psychologists and **Jan Odom**, Psychometrist; **Patti Bessen**, Special Ed. Teacher and **Keeley Mitchell**, School Psychologist Intern, Oklahoma City PS; **Julia Belmir**, School Psychologist Intern at OK Consultative Services; **Cherry Blaker**, Psychometrist for Owasso PS; **Kim Bohn** and **Dana Witt-Hoover**, School Psychologists for Mid-Del PS; **Terry Bryant**, Psychometrist Cushing RESC; **Misty Burch**, **Tamara Mitchell**, **Maya Rao**, **Olivia Waid** and **Jill Woodard**, Students – UCO; **Joe Chapman**, School Counselor for Empire Public Schools; **Keith Chew**, School Psychologist Practicum and **Sue E. Hoppe**, Special Ed. Teacher for Ada PS; **Lavada Claphan**, School Psychologist Intern Zion Schools; **Stephanie Crawford**, **Kelly Gilbert**, **Marci Gillespie, Jamie Guthrie, Tara Henderson, Yvette N. Lightbourn, Reagan Rinderknecht, Dana S. Tiffany, Michelle Warren**, and **Mika White**, Students – OSU; **Kristie Daniel**, School Counselor Mannford High School; **Jennifer Farrar**, Teacher Enid PS; **Joyce A. Foutch**, NE Diagnostic Education Services; **Kathleen Gilbreath**; **Carol Gruben**, School Psychologist Broken Arrow PS; **Maxwell Harrison,** School Psychologist Muskogee RESC; **Jerry Hill**, Psychometrist Burns Flat RESC; **Margaret Hooks**, School Psychologist and **Karen D. McCoy**, Tulsa PS; **Lynnette Johnson**, School Psychologist Hugo RESC; **Nanci Jones**, Psychometrist Edmond PS; **Monte G. Lawler**, Special Ed. Teacher, Moore PS; **Linda D. Lee**, School Counselor Poteau Schools, **Lara Mattox**, Student - Bartlesville; **Amy Mauk**, School counselor Coalgate PS; **Brenda Mitchell**, School Psychologist Stillwater PS; **Susan Mixon**, School Counselor Panama Schools; **Saundra Smith** Moore, Associate Professor Bacone College; **Laqueta Pardue-Vaughn**, Professor ECU; **Cheryl Roland Roberts**, School Psychologist Norman PS; **Linda Shoemake**, Counselor/Psychometrist Pocola PS; **Jody Simpson, Ph.D.,** School Psychologist Bartlesville PS; **Becky Slothower**, School Psychologist Bethany PS; **Lorraine James Stiggers**, N.D., Executive Director Newstart Health & Education Services; **Phyllis Tarrant**, Student, **Sandra L. Tedder**, Ph.D., Private Practice; **Janice Venable**, School Psychologist Claremore PS; **Janice Walker**, Special Ed. Director and Psychometrist Caddo PS; **Jeannie Wood**, Psychometrist Anadarko RESC

Welcome to Oklahoma School Psychological Association – You make a difference in the lives and education of Oklahoma's children!

EXPANDING OUR ROLE: A REALITY

In a effort to expand school psychological services to all students and not just special education; I have helped initiate a social skills training/counseling program at Edmond's Angie Debo Elementary School this fall. With the help of Debbie Rice, a therapist with the Oklahoma County Health Department and the Edmond Hope Center, Angie Debo's school counselor and myself have implemented a social skills training/counseling group for third graders using the Second Step - Social Skills Counseling Curriculum. Second Step is a structured social skills training format that addresses social issues of impulse-anger control, aggression, and violence prevention. Second Step is designed to reduce impulsive and aggressive behaviors in children, ages 6-9, and increase their level of social competence. It does this by teaching skills in empathy, impulse control and anger management. This curriculum is part of the Second Step series which includes curricula for pre-school/kindergarten, grades 4-5 and grade 6-8. The Angie Debo social skills group consists of 8 third grade students and two facilitators (a school psychologist and a school counselor). The group meets for 40-minute sessions once a week for 9 consecutive weeks each semester. Referrals for inclusion in the social skills group were made by each of the third grade teachers at Angie Debo with consultation with the school psychologist and school counselor. Parent consent was obtained and a parent orientation/brown bag lunch was offered to parents of referred students prior to beginning the program in October. So far the student's response to program has been excellent and they have quickly developed ownership and responsibility for the group's dynamics. This school psychologist will offer a follow-up report in a later issue of OSPA Today to report the progress of this program.

Stephen Crane, NCSP
Edmond School Psychologist

HOW TO CONVINCE YOUR SUPERVISOR
That You Should Attend the 2002 NASP Convention

Points to Make

The NASP Convention is a great opportunity to:

Learn about changes in education policy and law that offer both new challenges to and opportunities for school-based mental health services.

Expand your ability to serve as a resource for your school/district.

Learn creative approaches to improving outcomes for students with even the most difficult learning, emotional, and behavioral issues.

Stay abreast of the latest research and best practices in the field.

Build relationships with other professionals who can be a resource for information and ideas throughout the school year.

Train with leading experts on current issues such as culturally competent assessment, positive behavioral supports, school safety, and crisis prevention/response.

Participate in the world's largest, most comprehensive selection of workshops, presentations, and special sessions regarding school psychology.

Attain needed recertification credits.

Rejuvenate, reenergize, and refocus on the commitment to helping students achieve their best.

Your Board At Work

OSPA's Executive Board met September 27 at the Marriott Hotel the evening before the our fall conference. Those in attendance were Judy Oehler-Stinnett, Jane Sale, Debra Puckett, Angie Love, Andrew Glenn, Stephen Crane, Claire Putnam, Rich Putnam, Nancy Barton, Debby Wheat, Jamie Haywood, Candis Hogan, and Peggy Kerr. The Board welcomed two guests, the current president of NASP, Charlie Deupree, and conference presenter, Jerome Sattler.

Candis Hogan gave a report on the Oklahoma State Improvement Grant Task Force and distributed copies of the plan. The Task Force submitted the plan to the State Blueprint Committee on November 1.

Charlie Deupree discussed the NASP Assistance to States Menu of Activities for State Leadership Teams. Nancy Barton distributed the budget. Jamie Haywood gave a membership report. Steve Crane announced that the OICA forum will be held at the UCO Student Center on October 24 and 25. Candis Hogan moved that OSPA donate $500 to the NASP Children's Fund in honor of Dr. Sattler. The motion passed unanimously.

2001 Fall Conference a Hit!

The OSPA Fall Conference was held September 28 at the Tulsa Marriott. Dr. Jerome Sattler presented "Assessment of Children: Cognitive, Behavioral and Clincial Applications." His presentation was tied to his new books, which were for sale at a reduced rate during the conference. Additional conference happenings included a presentation by Carolyn Crowder, OEA president, who was the luncheon speaker. All attendees were also given a great little canvas bag imprinted with OSPA's logo, "Kids are our only business," for collecting handouts and prizes.

The conference continues to provide an excellent setting, nationally-recognized speakers, and the opportunity to mingle and share with colleagues. Once again the Fall Conference was a big hit with OSPA members. Plan to attend next year!

Learning Styles: Fact or Fiction?

Jamie Guthrie, Tara Henderson,Reagan Rinderknecht, Allison Schneider,Michelle Warren

It has been said that learning styles can contribute to the successful education of many of today's youth. However, can society actually contribute a cause to something that cannot so easily be defined? Dunn and Griggs (1988) attempt to define learning styles by stating, "Learning style is a biologically and developmentally imposed set of characteristics…the way a classroom would be organized…motivation, on-task persistence…" With such a complex definition, it is no wonder that many researchers find it difficult to conduct reliable and valid studies in this area. Dunn and Dunn's Learning Model, Kolb's Learning Theory, and Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences attempt to do this in the educational system, but are they really researching learning styles? This paper is an overview of three commonly used learning styles and research that refutes the models' reliability and validity.

The Dunn and Dunn Learning Style Model is a model, which defines learning styles as "the way each person begins to concentrate on, process, internalize, and retain new and difficult information" (Doolan & Honingsfeld, 2000). Used at over 115 universities worldwide, it has been administered to a wide range of populations, students of various academic abilities, and all grade levels, including college. In Oklahoma, educators may attend a five-day training on the Dunn and Dunn model and districts have available to them software to supplement this training (Read, 2001).

The model itself is based upon 21 elements, which make up an individual's learning style. These 21 elements are then classified into environmental preferences, emotions toward academic productivity, sociological preferences, physiological characteristics, and global versus analytical processing. Evaluating for these elements under the model involves a Learning Style Inventory (LSI) which takes approximately 30 minutes to complete and can be administered individually or in a group (Read, 2001). Identifying an individual's preference within each of these domains can foster academic achievement. In a meta-analysis of 42 studies across the United States, learning style preferences were found to be strengths which allowed students to, "master new and difficult information, regardless of the researcher, the university where the research had been conducted, the student's grade level, or the elements examined" (Dunn, Denig, & Lovelace, 2001).

The implementation of the Dunn and Dunn model within school systems has proven to be an effective method of gaining statistically higher standardized achievement-test and aptitude-test scores (Dunn, Denig, & Lovelace). The model has also been successful in achieving an "improved education climate, and a greater sense of community" (Beglane, 2001). A principal at Brightwood Elementary School in California found that using the model helped move his "poor minority students" from "the 30th percentile to the 83rd percentile on the California Achievement Tests…in three years" (Beglane, 2001). Such improvement in test scores affected further academic achievement within the school and also created a more positive school atmosphere.

Matching teaching style with learning style is an important aspect of the model. The closer the match between teaching style and learning style, the higher the grade point received in the class. This correlation can be found in classrooms in Hutchinson, Kansas at Roosevelt Elementary School. By matching style of teaching with style of learning, "the staff saw improved attitudes, better work habits, and higher test scores" (Doolan & Honingsfeld, 2000). Students took the Iowa Basic Skills Test during the time of day that was related to their preferred learning style. During a three-year period beginning in 1981 students composite scores steadily increased (Doolan & Honingsfeld, 2000).

Educators who rely on learning styles as a method of increasing academic success may help to develop potentially successful programs within a school. Such inventories can assess learning style preferences that are not observable to the most experienced eye (Doolan & Honingsfeld, 2000).

The Dunn and Dunn model makes sense theoretically, however it has not received unequivocal empirical support (Kavale, Hirshoren, & Forness, 1998). In 1987 through a meta-analysis of the Dunn model, Kavale and Forness "found limited empirical support for modality based instruction" (Kavale, et al, 1998). In response to that study, Dunn and Dunn conducted their own study to provide support for their model. They found "individualizing instruction to match learning style preferences improved academic achievement and attitude toward learning" (Kavale, et al, 1998). Again Kavale refuted Dunn's results on the basis that 35 of the 36 studies included were dissertations, half of which were developed at St. John's University Center for the Study of Learning and Teaching Styles, home base for Dunn and Dunn. "With such a heavy influence of dissertations from your 'home court' the potential for bias is obviously present" (Kavale, et al, 1998). In his most recent analysis, Kavale found "plain, old, good instruction will produce essentially the same results" as Dunn and Dunn's model claims to generate (Kavale, et al, 1998). To validate their model, Dunn and Dunn must provide empirically based research and published literature, and avoid self-cited articles in order to receive acceptance by peers.

Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory also involves inventories to assist in teaching to the learning styles of students. David Kolb developed the Experiential Learning Theory in the 1970's. His learning model consists of four stages and four distinct learning styles. The four stages of Kolb's theory are: Stage I, Concrete Experience (CE), Stage II, Reflective Observation (RO), Stage III, Abstract Conceptualization (AC), and Stage IV, Active Experimentation (AE). According to Kolb, the learning circle should be approached as a continuous cycle, but can begin at any one of the four points (Kolb & Fry, 1975). It is suggested that the learning process normally begin with a concrete experience, a person carrying out an action and then examining the effect of that action. In the Reflective Observation stage, the person attempts to understand and generalize to other situations the effects of an action. The Abstract Conceptualization stage explains the relationship between the action and the effects of that action. The last stage of the circle, Active Experimentation, is to apply the action to new circumstances within the range of generalized situations.

The Learning Style Inventory-1985, a 12-item questionnaire, is designed to measure learning styles using Kolb's theory. "All the items begin with the same few phrases, such as 'When I learn… ' or 'I learn best from …' and the respondents are to rank the sentence completions to describe how they learn" (Atkinson, 1989). The answers are arranged in four columns; each corresponding to a different stage in the learning circle. Column one is the CE scale, column two is the RO scale, column three is the AC scale, and column four is the AE scale. The respondent is asked to number rank each stage according to the relevance of the stage in the proposed situation. The totals of the columns represent the relative emphasis the respondent places on each stage of the learning circle. These scores are combined to determine if an individual is more abstract or concrete and reflective or active (Atkinson, 1989).

Using the learning style inventory, Kolb developed four learning styles. A learning style, according to Kolb, describes the way in which information is acquired, learned, and used solve problems. In Kolb's theory, there are four distinct learning styles: converger, diverger, assimilator, and accommodator. On the Learning Style Inventory, a converger has high scores in the abstract conceptualization stage and the active experimentation stage. A converger is a problem solver. On the Learning Style Inventory, a diverger has high scores in the concrete experience stage and the reflective observation stage. A diverger has the ability to view concrete situations from many different perspectives and are better at recognizing problems. Assimilators have high scores in the abstract conceptualization stage and the reflective observation stage. Assimilators are good at defining and formulating theories. Lastly, an accommodator has high scores in the concrete experience stage and the active experimentation stage. An accommodator can adapt to specific immediate circumstances. They are good at implementing plans, acting in new experiences, and taking risks (Holoviak, 1990).

The Learning Style Inventory (LSI) is "based on a conceptualization by Kolb of how learning style theory could be used to understand, predict, and eventually plan for individual differences involving the pedagogical requirements of managers and of business school students" (Cornwell & Manfredo, 1994). Kolb posits that the Learning Style Inventory should be used to determine one's learning style. Using the LSI a teacher can teach to each student's learning style. However, there are a few problems with Kolb's instrument. "Results indicated that the test-retest measurements for the LSI did not reliably assess the learning styles of any learners" (Garner, 2000). Again, the research does not show that the theory and instrument have any empirical base or construct validity. "Ultimately, the question of an appropriate measure of reliability cannot be addressed properly because the actual nature of what is being measured is constantly shifting from 'flexible' to 'stable'. The theoretical contradictions around the nature of learning styles prevent any conclusions from being reached" (Garner, 2000). Kolb's theory of learning styles sounds good but cannot hold up under empirical testing of the theory.

Howard Gardner defines intelligence as "a biopsychological potential to process information that can be activated in a cultural setting to solve problems or create products that are of value in a culture" (Gardner, 1999). In simpler terms intelligence, to Gardner, is

biological and psychological potential that may be "activated" depending on the environment to which an individual is exposed.

In his latest book, Intelligence Reframed, Gardner proposes seven different intelligences. Linguistic intelligence is defined as knowledge and awareness of spoken and written language. This includes the "ability to learn languages and the capacity to use language to accomplish certain goals" (Gardner, 1999). Individuals with high linguistic abilities include writers, poets, and speakers. Logical-mathematical intelligence is described as the ability to analyze and solve problems and complete mathematical operations (Gardner, 1999). Clearly, mathematicians and scientists are thought to have high logical-mathematical intelligence. Musical intelligence includes competencies in "performance, composition, and appreciation of musical patterns" (1999). Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence consists of using the body to "solve problems or fashion products" (1999). Actors, dancers, and athletes demonstrate bodily-kinesthetic intelligence. Spatial intelligence is composed of the "potential to recognize and manipulate the patterns of wide space as well as the patterns of more confined areas" (1999). People who demonstrate spatial intelligence, according to Gardner, include pilots, sculptors, surgeons, and architects. Interpersonal intelligence is one's capability to comprehend the "intentions, motivations, and desires of other people and, consequently, to work effectively with others" (1999). Individuals with high interpersonal intelligence include salespeople, teachers, and political leaders. Finally, Gardner defines intrapersonal intelligence as the ability to "understand oneself, including one's own desires, fears, and capacities- and to use such information effectively in regulating one's own life" (Gardner, 1999).

In Intelligence Reframed, Gardner acknowledges and responds to frequent questions and myths regarding his theory. One such myth is " an intelligence is the same as a learning style, a cognitive style, or a working style" (1999). In response to this statement Gardner attempts to differentiate a learning style from an intelligence. He describes a learning style as a concept that "designates a general approach that an individual can apply equally to an indefinite range of content" (1999). Gardner goes on to explain that an intelligence " is a capacity… that is geared to a specific content in the world" (1999). In other words, a learning style, to Gardner, is a learning method that an individual can apply to an array of abilities, while an intelligence is an ability in a certain area of knowledge.

A second myth addressed by Gardner is "there is a single 'approved' educational approach based on multiple intelligence theory" (1999). Gardner responds to this statement by emphasizing that "Multiple intelligence theory is in no way an educational prescription… educators are in the best position to determine whether and to what extent multiple intelligence theory should guide their practice" (1999). Gardner does not condemn practical use of his theory in the classroom, however he does state that his theory is not prescriptive.

Gardner's theory was received with mixed emotions. "Because Gardner presented no new research designed specifically to test his theory, the theory was viewed as rather speculative, and hence the criticisms of the theory were necessarily speculative as well"

(Sternberg, 1994). Since the proposal of his theory Gardner has not conducted empirical testing of his theory. "As Gardner says in his own book, his own attention turned to educational interventions, and apparently other people's did as well, because the number of educational interventions is indeed impressive…" (Sternberg, 1994). Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences is used by many people as a way of prescriptive teaching, although that was not his intention. People let the theory guide their styles of teaching and consequently what is being taught. Sternberg made a profound statement in saying, "I am concerned that yet another theory without direct supporting evidence is being avidly sought by educators as the 'new panacea,' as was Bloom's taxonomy some years back." Gardner himself has said that his theory is just a theory and is not to be used for prescriptive teaching, yet, time and time again there are classrooms, schools, and teachers that adopt his theory to teach their class and teach to each students "intelligences".

Although learning styles and in some cases, multiple intelligences, are used by educators or entire school systems, there are those that contend these concepts are not valid and in no way affect the academic performance of students. It has been said that teachers that manage their classrooms around learning style instruction are engaging in a practice of debatable value (Stellwagen, 2001). There are many explanations about why learning styles are not good predictors of academic success. Three general problems were confusion in definitions, weakness in reliability and validity of measurements, and identification of relevant characteristics in learners and instructional settings (Curry, 1990). In addition, Stellwagen (2001) stated that substantive issues exist, such as lack of supportive research, questionable reliability and validity, and misunderstandings about the theoretical basis and use of learning styles.

The confusion about definitions has been illustrated by the three "learning styles" discussed earlier. This is confounded when other examples are included such as the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory (MBTI), Solomon & Felder's Index of Learning Styles (ILS) and Honey-Mumford Learning Styles Questionnaire (LSQ). It appears that depending on the instrument and how it is used determines the learning style definition.
With such inconsistency on defining a learning style, it should not be hard to see problems with reliability and validity measures. Curry (1990) suggests that learning style researchers do not follow an iterative pattern but tend to rush prematurely into print and marketing with information based on a single set of data. Zwanenberg described problems with reliability and validity of criterion data in his assessment of the ILS and LSQ (Zwanenberg, 2000). In Garner's critique of Kolb's learning styles, it was stated that "an appropriate reliability measurement cannot be addressed because the nature of what is being measured changes from fixed to flexible." (Garner, 2000). Garner (2000) went on to say that the results indicated by test/retest measurements for the LSI did not reliably assess learning styles of any learners. Garner even suggests Kolb's work is not able to reliably describe individual learning styles. Blixt and Jones, in 1995, contended that many of the subscales of the Dunn, Dunn, and Price Learning Style Inventory have low reliability and questionable validity (Stellwagen, 2001). Learning style test developers have provided some information about relevant reliabilities, but it is rare (Curry, 1990).

Although there is a mountain of literature for teachers and educators promoting the use of learning styles in their classrooms, the research shows that this "learning style fever" has no empirical basis. There simply isn't research to prove that any of the instruments used to measure learning styles are valid and reliable. Article after article has been written to help educators understand how to apply these learning style theories in their classrooms. The learning style literature fails to mention that when the instruments are put to the test they come up short.

"People are different. It is good practice to recognize and accommodate individual differences and present information in a variety of ways through more than one modality. It is not wise to categorize learners and prescribe methods solely on the basis of tests with questionable technical qualities." (Snider, 1990) Therefore, if learning style instruments do not consistently measure learning and it has not been determined what they are measuring, how can learning styles predict successful academic performance?

References

Atkinson, G.,Jr. (1989). Kolb's Learning Style Inventory-1985: Test-retest déjà vu. Psychological Reports, 64, 991-995.

Beglane, Edward T. (2001), Principals who faced obstacles to learning style instruction. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 85(627), 79-81.

Cornwell, John M. & Manfredo, Pamela (1994)., Kolb's Learning Style Theory Revisited. Educational & Psychological Measurement, 54(2), 317.

Curry, L. (1990). A critique of the research on learning styles. Educational Leadership, 48(2), 50-57.

Doolan, Laura S. and Honigsfeld, Andrea (2000). Illuminating the new standards with learning style: Striking a perfect match. The Clearing House, 73(5), 274-278.
Dunn, Rita, Denig, Stephen, and Lovelace, Maryann K. (2001). Two sides of the same coin or different strokes for different folks? Teacher Librarian, 28(3), 9-15.

Gardner, H. (1999). Intelligence reframed. New York: Basic Books

Garner, I. (2000). Problems and inconsistencies with Kolb's learning styles. Educational Psychology, 20(3), 341-349.

Holoviak, S. J., Ulrich, T.A., and Cole, G.S. (1990). Training Entrepreneurs. Performance and Instruction, 20(10), 27-37.

Kavale, K. A.; Hirshoren, A.; and Forness, S. R. (1998). Meta-analytic validation of the Dunn and Dunn model of learning-style preferences: a critique of what was Dunn. Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 13(2), 75-80.

Kolb, D.A. and Fry, R.(1975). 'Toward an applied theory of experiential learning;, in C.Copper (ed). Theories of Group Process, London: John Wiley.

Snider, V.E. (1990). What we know about learning styles from research in special education. Educational Leadership, 48(2), 53.

Stellwagen, J.B. (2001). A challenge to the learning style advocates. Clearing House, 74(5), 265-269.

Sternberg, Robert J (1994)., Commentary: Reforming School Reform: Comments on 'Multiple Intelligences: The Theory In Practice'. Teachers College Record, 95(4), 561.

Zwanenberg, N. (2000). Felder and Silverman's index of learning styles and Honey and Mumford's learning styles questionnaire: how do they compare and do they predict academic performance? Educational Psychology, 20(3), 365-389.

Correction Notice for Purchasers of Sattler's Cognitive Applications

The Psychological Corporation recently announced that tables A-4 and A-5 on pages 745 and 746 of Sattler's Cognitive Applications book are incorrect. These tables show the WISC-III base rates for scale and index discrepancies. The corrected tables can be downloaded from the website: http://www.sattlerpublisher.com/
The links to the pages to be downloaded are shown on the Home page.

MARK YOUR CALENDAR

NASP 2002

Annual Convention

Hyatt Regency Chicago

February 26 – March 2, 2002

Looking Ahead to NASP Conventions:

2003 April 8-12	Sheraton Centre, Toronto, ON, Canada
2004 March 23-27	Adams Mark, Dallas
2005 March 29-April 2	Marriott Marquis, Atlanta