Assessing the Effectiveness of a Start-to-Finish Instructional Model in Preparing Human Services and Extension Educators

Victor William Harris
Tiffany Morrow
University of Florida

Daniel Moen
Minnesota State University Mankato

Boyd Teemant
Wichita State University

Muthusami Kumaran
University of Florida

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this study was to expand existing research on the Attention, Interact, Apply, and Invite – Fact, Think, Feel, Do (AIAI-FTFD) Start-to-Finish Teaching Model to assess its effectiveness as an instructional tool for preparing Human Service and Extension (HSE) educators across instructional contexts to teach effectively. The study used qualitative data collection methods to assess and evaluate survey responses of 109 undergraduate and 16 graduate participants from two different western universities and one southern university who were exposed to the AIAI-FTFD teaching model in Human Service and Extension (HSE)-related academic courses. Participants generally indicated that the AIAI-FTFD teaching model provided multiple instructor and audience benefits such as (a) increased instructor preparation, (b) increased confidence in teaching, (c) increased teaching ability, and (d) increased learner engagement. The findings suggest that the AIAI-FTFD teaching model may be a valid/effective teaching model for HSE educators.

Keywords: effective teaching, human services education, Extension education

---

Direct correspondence to Dr. Victor Harris at victorharris@ufl.edu.

Family Science Review, Volume 19, Issue 1, 2014

Assessing the Effectiveness of a Start-to-Finish Instructional Model in Preparing Human Services and Extension Educators

In this study, the authors propose that the Attention, Interact, Apply, and Invite (AIAI) – Fact, Think, Feel, Do (FTFD) Start-to-Finish Teaching Model (Figure 1; Appendix) is an instructional tool that can be used across a diverse set of topics and contexts in Human Service and Extension (HSE) disciplines to improve instruction and learning outcomes. The model conceptualizes principles of effective teaching in a systematic, step-by-step, start-to-finish format outlining specific preparation and delivery procedures (Harris, Chartier, & Davis, 2010; Harris & Lee, 2006).

The primary foci of the AIAI-FTFD teaching model include initially assessing learners' needs and then targeting learning outcomes as measured by cognitive, emotional (e.g., confidence, attitudes), and/or behavioral skills that the instructor identified as important to the learning process. The AIAI-FTFD teaching model solicits instructors to begin the instructional process by successfully "catching the attention" of learners. This first step in the model, *Attention*, is designed specifically to engage learners and then move them quickly to the second step in the teaching process: *Interaction*. The interaction step allows the instructor to engage learners with pertinent information and concepts. Information is communicated via different sensory modalities (i.e., visual, auditory, hands-on), primarily through facilitating discussion rather than lecture, except in certain contexts when lecture (or playing the expert role) is required. The instructor may also use the consultation role when learners are engaged individually or in groups with problem-based learning exercises that require the instructor to provide input and expertise when asked (Powell & Cassidy, 2007; Teemant, Moen, & Harris, 2013).

Discussion facilitation is driven by asking learners four kinds of specific, goal-directed questions (i.e., Fact, Think, Feel, Do) about the given topic and then guiding the learners to interact with the information, the instructor, and each other. Specifically, the Fact, Think, Feel, Do (FTFD) component of the teaching model includes a systematic series of questions instructors may pose to the learners to engage their minds, encourage higher level critical thinking, and facilitate meaningful discussion. Research shows that effective questioning promotes higher levels of thinking and improves overall retention of information learned (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001).

Application, or applying the information learned, is the third step in the AIAI-FTFD teaching process. There is direct positive association between the amount of time spent on this step and positive learning outcomes (Harris & Lee, 2006; Harris et al., 2010). Application consists of encouraging and allowing learners to make practical applications of the principles and materials the presentation covers. Application also allows for learners to achieve new cognitive,

emotional, and behavioral target skills (i.e., learning outcomes) pertaining to the material taught. The AIAI-FTFD teaching model emphasizes the importance of taking intentional time to allow learners to practice these target skills during the presentation and then introduces a strategy in the *Invitation* step for learners to be able to continue to practice and track these skills at home. The invitation is often introduced in the form of homework and/or through the use of a tracking chart to evaluate ongoing progress for achieving the identified target skills.

The purpose of the current study is to assess this research question: "Can the AIAI-FTFD teaching model be an effective instructional tool to prepare Human Service and Extension (HSE) educators across instructional contexts to teach effectively?" While there has been previous development and testing of the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model (Harris, 2009; Harris & Lee, 2006; Harris et al., 2010; Harris, Moen, & Teemant, 2011), this study expands on the previous research on the model by evaluating its effectiveness at three different universities across various HSE topics and academic career disciplines.

Although there are various methods of teaching, the central component of all pedagogy is to assist the learner in the learning process (Badger, 2008; Harris, 2009). This section provides a brief general-to-specific foundational review of underlying research that can be cited to support the AIAI-FTFD teaching model.

General Research Support for the AIAI-FTFD Teaching Model

Effective teaching occurs when the learner gains knowledge and related skills associated with the content being presented (Badger, 2008). Previous research demonstrates that effective teaching methods must include the following, at minimum: (a) assessing learner needs and addressing these specific needs in the teaching environment; (b) founding teaching practices on theory-based and empirically-informed methodologies; (c) understanding, negotiating, and managing learners and group processes successfully; and (d) realistically evaluating the teaching experience (Latham, 2002; Powell & Cassidy, 2007).

According to Wiggins and McTighe (2005), the goals of effective "curriculum and instruction [are] designed to engage learners in inquiry, promote transfer of learning, provide a conceptual framework for helping learners make sense of discrete facts and skills, and uncover the big ideas of content" (p. 4). In considering what learners will need to accomplish these goals, it is critical to identify specific cognitive, emotional, and behavioral target skills (i.e., learning outcomes). Evaluating and measuring these learning outcomes is impossible if they are not intentionally identified before teaching. Therefore, as identified above, effective teaching plans begin with assessing learners' needs (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Knowing learners and their felt, ascribed, and future needs at the outset (Powell & Cassidy, 2007) allows the instructional plan or outline to be specifically tailored to learners' unique needs, thus maximizing potential for positive learning outcomes.

After assessment of learners' needs, determination of associated content, and identification of specific learning outcomes, establishing clear learner-centered objectives and

goals is essential to guiding the teaching preparation and delivery process (Bennett & Rockwell, 1995). Clarifying and determining instructor and learner objectives and goals informs best practice instructional designs for content mastery, understanding, and application (Harris, 2006; Harris et al., 2010). This also allows instructors to clearly define what shall be done to achieve identified learning outcomes.

Ultimately, effectiveness of a particular teaching pedagogy is determined by whether or not identified learning outcomes have been achieved. The overall aim of a teaching outline, then, should be to shape content and instructional techniques into an intentional lesson plan for how to engage learners in order to maximize identified learning outcomes (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

The *Preparation* section of the AIAI-FTFD teaching model requires that instructors create lesson plans by (a) assessing learners' needs; (b) deciding on associated content; (c) determining cognitive, emotional, and behavioral target skills; (d) listing instructional objectives and overall learning goals; (e) identifying what the instructor and the learner will do to accomplish identified learning outcomes (i.e., target skills); and (f) determining the type of content, the mental processes that will be engaged, the method of delivery, and the general teaching roles instructors will play in executing this plan (e.g., expert, facilitator, or consultant) (Figure 1; see Harris et al., 2010, for a more complete description of the *Preparation* section of the model). The model also provides a specific method of instructional *Delivery* to implement this plan (Figure 1). Many methods of instruction available, but few are organized into a start-to-finish, step-by-step model for preparing Human Service and Extension (HSE) professionals and other instructors to teach effectively.

"Best Practice" Methods of Instructional Design and Change

Supported by reliable, empirically informed instructional design methods (Allington & Cropper, 2000; Merrill, 2002; Rickford, 2005), the AIAI-FTFD teaching model was created as a comprehensive principle-based, step-by-step, start-to-finish instructional model to help instructors prepare and deliver presentations effectively (Figure 1; Appendix). The AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model reflects many concepts and principles found to be integral to effective teaching. These include learner engagement, facilitation of group process and discussion, critical thinking skill development, and practice of identified cognitive, emotional, and behavioral target skills (Latham, 2002; Merrill, 2002; Powell & Cassidy, 2007; Rickford, 2005).

The AIAI-FTFD model also assumes the need for effective instructors to employ and engage multiple mental processes (e.g., apply, analyze, evaluate, create) and intelligences (e.g., interpersonal, intrapersonal, linguistic, visual-spatial) to achieve success in various teaching roles (Bloom, 1956; Gardner 1993a, 1993b). For example, effective instructors can use multiple mental processes to create effective FTFD questions that help learners (a) assess previous knowledge, (b) analyze and evaluate the information introduced, (c) apply this information to their lives, and (d) commit to practicing target skills within and outside the teaching environment. Similarly, effective instructors can use multiple intelligences (such as interpersonal

and intrapersonal intelligence) in the AIAI teaching process to consistently assess engagement of learners, communicate effectively, facilitate meaningful interaction and discussion, apply information through praxis and stories, and incorporate target skills into their lives and practices.

Two specific empirically-informed instructional models that support the AIAI-FTFD teaching model are in studies by Rickford (2005) and by Merrill (2002). Rickford's (2005) six deep teaching principles include (a) learner engagement, (b) learner participation, (c) repetition and reinforcement, (d) high expectations, (e) sound teaching pedagogy, and (d) conceptual understanding. Merrill's (2002) four-phase model of instruction (Allington & Cropper, 1994; Cropper, 2000; Gagne & Briggs, 1979) consists of these principles: (a) activation, engaging learners; (b) demonstration, modeling what is taught and promoting interaction of information between learners and instructors; (c) application, applying information to create and develop new skills; and (d) integration, using skills in "real-world" settings.

The AIAI-FTFD teaching model (Figure 1) incorporates learner engagement and participation, demonstration, repetition and reinforcement, application, and integration into a sound, easy-to-learn, and principle-based, start-to-finish instructional methodology. What separates the AIAI-FTFD model from other conceptually-based instructional models is the comprehensive, systematic, start-to-finish, step-by-step nature of what is needed to *prepare* and *deliver* programs and presentations effectively. The AIAI-FTFD instructional model has been tested conceptually and experientially in the field for more than 25 years.

The AIAI-FTFD model also incorporates the model of change David Mace (1981) introduced to promote healthy change through knowledge and skill development (see Harris & Lee, 2006). Mace believed effective teaching of information would eventually cause learners to experience a psychosocial crisis that could lead to insight and the motivation to gain skills needed for improving well-being. Providing a way to identify and practice these needed skills is

The AIAI–FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model

Preparation: **Topic**

Target Audience: **Student Need(s):** **Content *2-3 Concepts/Principles* I will teach:** **1.** **2.** **3.**	**Overall Goal:**
Target Skills-Cognitive (*knowledge*), Emotional (*confidence - attitude change*), and Behavioral (*skills*) Processes: **1. Cognitive (C) –** **2. Emotional (E) –** **3. Behavioral (B) –**	**Objectives (*mapped to target skills*):** **1. (C) –** **2. (E) –** **3. (B) –**

AIAI-FTFD Variety:
Role: Expert, Facilitator, or Consultant (Circle One)

Unit/Section	Instructor Will Do (List Items)	Learner Will Do (List Items)	Content (Circle Items)	Mental Processes (Circle Items)	Method (Circle Items)
	1. Cognitive →	1. Cognitive	*This lesson will use:* 1. Facts 2. Concepts 3. Principles	*This lesson will engage:* 1. Remember 2. Understand 3. Apply 4. Analyze 5. Evaluate 6. Solve 7. Create 8. Design	*This lesson will use:* 1. Audio 2. Visual 3. Praxis
	2. Emotional →	2. Emotional			
	3. Behavioral →	3. Behavioral			

Delivery: **Lesson Outline**

Attention:

Interaction:

Question Types:
-Fact
-Think
-Feel
-Do

Apply:

Practice *Target Skills: Cognitive, Emotional, Behavioral* (5-10 minutes)

Invite:

Figure 1. The AIAI-FTFD Conceptual Instructional Model

needed for improving well-being. Providing a way to identify and practice these needed skills is integral to the AIAI-FTFD model to help learners change, grow, develop, and improve well-being.

AIAI-FTFD Research Studies

To date, three specific published studies have begun to verify and validate the AIAI-FTFD teaching model as an effective instructional tool. Using anecdotal evidence, the first study (Harris & Lee, 2006) introduced the *Delivery* portion of the model as a promising theoretical instructional method. The second study (Harris et al., 2010) introduced the *Preparation* portion of the model and evaluated related qualitative data to explore major themes associated with using the model. This study provided initial baseline support for using the model as an effective instructional tool. The third study (Harris et al., 2011) evaluated a marriage education training program delivered according to the AIAI-FTFD instructional model to assess the model's effectiveness for use in program development.

Several other related studies are noteworthy. A recent theoretical study (Teemant et al., , 2013) assessing effectiveness of problem-based learning is related indirectly to the AIAI-FTFD instructional model as a tool for helping students solve real-world issues. Two additional studies have been conducted and are in the process of analysis. The first was conducted to assess effectiveness of using the AIAI-FTFD model to teach "less" better by targeting specific cognitive, emotional, and behavioral target skills, and then assessing learner responses (N=226) associated with how well these target skills were achieved. The second study represents the first quantitative measure to assess how well using the AIAI-FTFD teaching method promotes critical thinking and engaging multiple mental processes.

Methods

This study represents an expansion of previous research related to the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model (Harris, 2006; Harris et al., 2010; Harris, Moen, & Teemant, 2011). The authors used qualitative data collection methods (Berg, 1998; Matthews, 2005) to assess and evaluate survey responses of participants exposed to the AIAI-FTFD teaching model in Human Service and Extension (HSE)-related academic courses. Discussion of the sample, data collection, and analysis appears below.

Sample

The sample was drawn from four diverse collegiate classroom settings. Due to the intentional nature of collecting data from specific participants exposed to the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model across various contexts and disciplines, this is a convenience sample (Patton, 2002). Study participation was voluntary and results remained confidential. The sample

included 109 undergraduate and 16 graduate student participants from two different Western universities and one Southern university in the United States.

The four different sub-samples studied are described below. At the outset, it should be noted that the instructor of record for sub-samples 2-4 was the same and that course expectations, teaching methods, and requirements were very similar when compared with those encountered by sub-sample 1 participants, who were purposefully exposed to a different course, a different instructor, and a different dosage of the model.

Each sample included only the specific demographic information that researchers determined would be pertinent to the research question. While there were some group diversity differences reported between the three sub-samples in the West when compared to the sub-sample in the Southeast (e.g., the sub-sample in the Southeast was more multiethnic) a careful thematic and summative review of the data showed that differences such as race or ethnicity and income level were not relevant to the general findings reported in this study. Average age and gender were considered relevant by the researchers and, as a result, were included in the sub-sample descriptions below.

Sub-sample 1. Sub-sample 1 consisted of 31 undergraduate participants who attended a Psychology of Personality course taught at a western university. This face-to-face course met three times per week for 50 minutes each class period. Participants were college juniors or seniors with these declared majors: psychology (23 participants), university studies (3 participants), sociology (2 participants), family studies (1 participant), social work major (1 participant), and undeclared (1 participant). This Psychology of Personality class consisted of 13 males and 18 females; the average participant age was 28 years. All 31 students decided voluntarily to participate in the study; no students opted to abstain from participation.

The Psychology of Personality class was exposed to the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model during a 16-week semester. This course was designed to prepare learners to give presentations at the end of the semester. Learners were divided into groups of three or four people. Each group chose a topic of interest. The purpose of the group project was to research an issue or topic in psychology, review relevant literature, and find an evidence-based practice used for intervention in that topic area. Groups also had to compare two theories of personality to show how each theory might be used for interpretation or treatment in the topic area. Groups were required to present information on how they might plan and implement the agreed-upon intervention or program using the theories and evidence-based practice they researched.

The instructor used the AIAI-FTFD teaching model throughout the 16-week course for guiding his teaching methods. As learners approached the deadline for their presentations, they received instruction on the AIAI-FTFD teaching model in one class period as the primary method required for teaching their presentations. When groups presented their projects, they were asked to evaluate how well the AIAI-FTFD teaching model helped them prepare and

deliver their presentations using the survey question discussed below in the data collection and analysis section.

Sub-sample 2. The second sub-sample included 37 undergraduate participants from a different western university than sub-sample 1 who attended a Methods of Family Life Education course for 16 weeks. This face-to-face course met three times per week for 50 minutes each class period; it was a senior-level course with all participants majoring in Family, Consumer, and Human Development (FCHD). The sub-sample was composed of 2 males and 35 females, with an average participant age range of 23 years. All 37 students participated voluntarily in the study; no students opted to abstain from participation.

This sub-sample was taught the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model for the entire 16-week course. Participants were instructed carefully and consistently on elements that make up the AIAI-FTFD teaching model. A major course requirement was to prepare and revise AIAI-FTFD teaching outlines throughout the semester, culminating in a community teaching application of the model. The instructor was active in assessing how well participants understood the AIAI-FTFD teaching methodology, carefully reviewing and providing feedback on all teaching preparation outlines and practice teaching experiences. The instructor also responded to all questions participants in the study asked about the AIAI-FTFD teaching model.

Participants in the Methods of Family Life Education course were consistently required to practice targeted components of the AIAI-FTFD teaching methodology in small groups during class time. Working with each other and the instructor, participants frequently processed information about specific components of the AIAI-FTFD teaching model and about how components were incorporated into participants' practice teaching experiences.

The major course assignment required participants to choose topics of interest, research them, and prepare presentations on the topics using the AIAI-FTFD teaching model. After multiple revisions of their teaching outlines and several individual and small group practice teaching experiences, participants had to present their topics to groups of four or five other students. Following careful review of their group members' evaluations of their teaching presentations with consultation from the instructor, participants revised their teaching outlines and presentations and delivered revised versions of their teaching topics as an outreach experience in the community. Participants were required to set up their own teaching venues at schools, community organizations, or businesses with instructor approval. Using two separate evaluation forms, the community supervisor and the teachers evaluated their community teaching presentations.

Sub-sample 3. The third sub-sample included 41 undergraduate participants from a southern university who attended a Family, Youth, and Community Sciences teaching methods course. This face-to-face course met three times a week for 50 minutes each class period. It was an undergraduate senior-level course and participants majored in Family, Youth and Community

Sciences (FYCS). The sub-sample was composed of 5 males and 36 females with an average participant age of 21 years. Two students from the overall sample (*N*=43) opted to abstain voluntarily from study participation.

This sub-sample was taught the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model for the entire 16-week course. Participants were instructed in a manner identical to the teaching of sub-sample 2 (details outlined above). In this teaching methods course, participants also were required to complete the same assignments that sub-sample 2 received and to deliver their teaching presentation as an outreach project in the community. Community evaluation results were also calculated as part of their final grade.

Sub-sample 4. The fourth sub-sample included 16 graduate participants who attended a graduate-level teaching methods course taught during a 16-week semester at the same western university where sub-sample 2 received instruction. This course was offered via satellite television and met for weekly 2.5 hour sessions. The graduate course format was similar to that of the undergraduate Methods of Family Life Education course for sub-sample 2, with additional graduate level requirements.

All 16 participants were Masters in Family Studies and Human Development (MFSHD) majors with the following occupations: 7 professional secondary education instructors, 3 human service professionals, 2 armed services pastors, 2 university instructors, 1 university academic advisor, and 1 early Head Start instructor. Graduate participants consisted of 7 males and 9 females; average age of participants was 33 years. Each graduate student participated in the study voluntarily; no one abstaining from participation.

This sample was required to use the AIAI-FTFD teaching model to present their topics to the entire class in one 50 minute session via satellite television and then revise their presentations based on the instructor's and classmates' evaluations to prepare for teaching their topics as outreach in the community. This graduate sample employed the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model in a wide variety of community locations using diverse topics for their instruction. Topics included preschool instruction, visual arts, interior design, weight control/eating behaviors, religion, abuse, marriage, family, leadership, literacy, and life balance. Community evaluation results were also calculated as part of their final grade.

Data Collection and Analysis

The universities' Institutional Review Boards (IRB) Human Subjects Committee approved this study. At the conclusion of the course, participants from all four samples received an extra credit opportunity for answering the survey question, "Describe how you feel about the AIAI and FTFD teaching methodologies. Were they helpful? Why or why not?" Participants also received Letters of Information that introduced the purpose of the study, outlined relevant procedures and listed potential risks and benefits of participation. The letters also included the message that study participation was strictly voluntary, that participants could withdraw at any

time, and that their responses would be kept anonymous. Since responding to the qualitative question identified above was voluntary, all participants were instructed that they would receive the extra credit points regardless of whether or not they participated. Therefore, no names would be collected or associated with their survey responses. This IRB-approved protocol was maintained so students would feel free to express honest opinions about the AIAI-FTFD teaching model.

After collection of participant responses, four independent researchers used an inductive approach to content analysis to analyze the data (Weber, 1990). This process involved identifying, topical coding, thematic categorizing, classifying, and labeling patterns that emerged from the original data (Patton, 2002). Key ideas and phrases that recurred throughout the responses became themes of the data. A systematic reading of the participants' survey responses revealed emergent themes and relationships between themes, allowing for comparison and contrasting of relevant themes across sub-samples (Elliot & Gillie, 1998). The analysts judged themes by internal homogeneity and external heterogeneity and tested themes for integratability, consistency, inclusivity, and possessing qualities of reproducibility (Patton, 2002).

The research analysts tested for integratability by seeking to discover an overall picture of what the themes indicated and how themes were integrated with each other. Themes were judged for consistency by including each emergent theme in the analysis if it was generated more than five times in each sub-sample (three times for sub-sample 4, due to the decreased sample size). Inclusivity was established by inviting all four sets of sample participants to participate in the study and by awarding extra credit to all participants regardless of whether they chose to participate. The researchers gained increased confidence that the data could be reproduced, given the similar themes that arose from each sample (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Thomas, 2003).

Each research analyst for each class conducted the data analysis separately to observe whether emerging differences occurred due to course level (undergraduate and graduate), course subject material, and exposure (i.e., dosage) to the AIAI-FTFD teaching model. Upon completion of individual sub-sample analyses, each analyst also conducted a combined analysis of the four sub-samples to identify overall themes across courses and study participants.

Several discrepancies occurred among the analysts with regard to how to categorize and code the emergent themes. For example, two analysts felt that the qualitative question that was asked of participants (i.e., "Describe how you feel about the AIAI and FTFD teaching methodologies. Were they helpful? Why or why not?") led the analysts to categorize everything under the terms "Helpful" or "Unhelpful." However, the other two analysts indicated that an overwhelming majority of the students found the AIAI-FTFD teaching model to be helpful; therefore, themes and sub-themes ought to be categorized under the main themes of "Instructor Benefits" and "Audience Benefits." After several discussions, consensus was reached to be more descriptive of how the AIAI-FTFD model was "helpful" by categorizing the themes and subthemes generally under "Instructor Benefits" and "Audience Benefits."

However, this agreed-upon approach did not overlook the divergent responses from participants who considered the model "unhelpful." Divergence was examined by exploring the cases that produced responses very different from those of the majority. Examining these outlying cases allowed for deeper understanding of aspects of the AIAI-FTFD teaching model that could have been excluded from the study unintentionally. The results of probing and including these divergent cases are included below to enhance the study's external validity (Mays & Pope, 1995; Ostland, Kidd, Wengstrom, & Rowa-Dewar, 2010; Patton, 2002).

In sum, four independent analyses were conducted to establish internal and external validity (Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson, & Spiers, 2002; Thomas, 2003; Yin, 2009). Furthermore, the use of four independent researchers provided increased inter-rater reliability of data results through cross-analyses in an attempt to validate trustworthiness of the research findings (Thomas, 2003). The next section includes agreed-upon results based on the researchers' findings.

Results

General Themes across Samples and Disciplines

General themes that study participants indicated across samples and disciplines revealed that AIAI-FTFD methodology was generally helpful as an instructional tool because it benefited instructors and audience in multiple ways. Articulated benefits to instructors included helping instructors prepare and organize effective lesson plans and gain confidence in their teaching effectiveness and their abilities in various instructional settings. Articulated audience benefits generally included helping learners stay engaged in the learning process, especially throughout the *Attention* step in the AIAI part of the model and through use of the Fact, Think, Feel, Do (FTFD) questioning techniques the instructor employed. In sum, sample participants found the AIAI-FTFD teaching methodology helpful in these ways: (a) increased instructor preparation, (b) increased confidence in teaching, (c) increased teaching ability, and (d) increased learner engagement.

Undergraduate Psychology of Personality Course (Sub-sample 1)

The majority of participants from the Psychology of Personality class indicated the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish teaching method was "helpful." Analysis revealed that participants who identified the AIAI-FTFD teaching model as helpful referred to instructor benefits for using the AIAI-FTFD methodology and/or to audience benefits for experiencing the AIAI-FTFD methodology. Major subthemes that emerged included improved instructor preparation (i.e., instructor benefits) and increased audience engagement (i.e., audience benefits).

Participants from the Psychology of Personality class noted that when using the AIAI-FTFD teaching model, they were better prepared for teaching their presentations. One participant noted, "It was nice to have a sort of outline to follow and to give ideas on how to teach/present."

Another indicated, "I think that they were helpful in giving good ideas and starting points for our presentations. They helped us see where we wanted the presentations to go." Another noted, "It gave me a pattern to follow to keep me on task." It was precisely this ability to use the AIAI-FTFD methodology to help participants guide their teaching presentations in the ways they wanted that directly or indirectly bred greater confidence in preparing and delivering their presentations. However, it should be noted that none of the participants in this sample used the actual word "confidence" to describe how AIAI-FTFD methodology benefited them.

A majority of participants also mentioned that they were, as learners, more attentive and engaged in learning when the instructor or presenter used the AIAI-FTFD teaching model. Participants also noted that they learned "more" when the AIAI-FTFD teaching method was used. As one participant expressed this theme, "They kept me actually engaged and excited to learn."

In the Psychology of Personality class, five participants reported that the methodology was not very helpful. Specifically, two of these five participants reported that the methodology was "confusing." These outlying responses were investigated within the context of the learning experience and the literary context of learners' responses. It appeared that the majority of the five participants who found the AIAI-FTFD teaching method to be "not helpful" or "confusing" also indicated that more experience with the teaching method and further instruction on how to use it would have improved their perceptions of its helpfulness and thus ameliorated confusion. For example, one participant noted, "What would be helpful is more application" (of the AIAI-FTFD teaching method). Another participant noted they "really didn't get to utilize a lot of the question and discussion strategies (FTFD) due to a lack of time."

Although the instructor implemented the AIAI-FTFD teaching model throughout the course, it was not until the last few weeks of class, before group presentations, that participants received clarification that the instructor was providing examples of how to use the AIAI-FTFD model. For these five participants, expecting presenters to follow the methodology without seeing explicit examples, or without awareness that what they were seeing throughout the semester were examples of the methodology, appeared to detract from perceived helpfulness and usefulness of the AIAI-FTFD teaching model. In sum, lack of exposure to the model (i.e., dosage) appeared to be an issue for these five participants and may have kept them from applying the model successfully.

Undergraduate Methods of Family Life Education Course (Sub-sample 2)

In the Methods of Family Life Education undergraduate course for this sub-sample, all but two participants indicated specifically that the AIAI-FTFD methodology was helpful. Participants defined the meaning of the "helpful" terminology by stating they experienced positive personal improvements (instructor benefits) in the following thematic ways: (a) increased effectiveness in preparation of teaching outlines and organization of presentations; (b) increased abilities to teach more effectively; (c) increased confidence in teaching; (d) increased

abilities to teach in multiple settings among various audiences; and (e) increased abilities to engage audiences through asking appropriate questions, including "keeping the attention" of learners throughout the presentation.

In this sub-sample, the *Preparation* component of the teaching outline proved essential to the instructional experience. Here is how one participant articulated this idea: "AIAI-FTFD helps me to target specific areas that I want to focus on in my teaching. The model helps me to stay on track . . . and keep me organized." Another participant stated,

> I felt like AIAI/FTFD was very helpful in making lesson plans. Before I had learned AIAI/FTFD I would throw something together and hope it made sense. AIAI/FTFD helps give me direction and helps me know the flow makes sense . . . but still allows plenty of freedom to do with it as one pleases. I think AIAI/FTFD is great.

Participant responses also revealed that having a comprehensive start-to-finish outline contributed greatly to improving their confidence in teaching. For example, one participant said, "The AIAI/FTFD teaching methodologies were helpful because before this class I was not confident in putting together a presentation. It helped me become more confident." Another participant articulated the theme of increased confidence in teacher preparation and delivery: "I thought AIAI/FTFD was very helpful, and I feel like I can be more confident in teaching. Also, this was helpful because I am more organized and prepare effectively."

Participant responses from this sample also reinforced the importance of developing effective questioning skills. For example, one participant said, "AIAI-FTFD is a good way to keep yourself organized and [to be] able to ask the right kinds of questions that will help the class learn and apply more effectively." Another participant mentioned that FTFD questions "helped me to keep the audience engaged and it made it easier to keep their attention."

Participants were also able to use the AIAI-FTFD teaching method to teach various topics effectively in a wide range of contexts. For example, one participant stated, "I feel that AIAI/FTFD has been helpful to me as I have had to teach lessons in various settings."

Regardless of setting, audience, or topic, participants noted that since the AIAI-FTFD model focuses on the needs of learners and uses appropriate teaching techniques, they were able to engage and concentrate on the needs of their audience more effectively (i.e., audience benefits) and facilitate change. Here is how one participant emphasized this theme: "They (AIAI-FTFD teaching methods) helped me to focus on the needs of the students rather than the need to present lots of materials. It helped me to understand that teaching less better is more effective for the students." Another stated the theme in this way: "Now I am able to follow this model which helps me keep on track and remind myself that my goal is to help people improve. Now in my lesson plans, everything I do is to help facilitate change within the participants in my programs."

Within this sub-sample, two participants stated they did not find AIAI-FTFD teaching methods to be very helpful. Both participant responses revealed this perception was a personal preference; neither noted that the method was not effective, but rather that it simply was not the preferred methodology they would choose to help them with their particular teaching styles.

Undergraduate Teaching Methods Course (Sub-sample 3)

Every participant in the teaching methods course at the southern university indicated specifically that the AIAI-FTFD methodology was helpful. However, as noted above, there were two individuals who chose not to participate in the study. Generally, participants found the AIAI-FTFD teaching model easy-to-use and expressed the point that they liked the model's simplicity and how it allowed their teaching to flow and remain focused during the presentation. "It was tremendously helpful," one participant stated. "I see it in use every day w/ my favorite teachers meaning they are obviously doing something right. Remembering this simple AIAI-FTFD is helpful by allowing me to have an outline ready for me to put my lesson plan into it." Another participant synthesized her overall perspective on the helpfulness of AIAI-FTFD methods as follows:

> They were very helpful. It is a good way to prepare for a successful presentation and for organizing the lecture. The attention portion is important in order to take the audience's mind off of the outside world so that they can focus on your presentation. The interaction portion allows the audience to be involved in the lecture, which keeps them engaged and allows them to practice new skills. The application portion is important because it makes the audience understand how the information presented is pertinent to their lives. The invitation portion encourages the audience to practice the skills they learned during the lecture. The fact, think, feel, and do questions are effective in keeping the audience engaged during the lecture.

Similar to the sub-samples mentioned above, the sub-sample 3 participants responded that the AIAI-FTFD teaching model increased their confidence in teaching and enabled them to be better prepared for teaching effectively. Specifically, participants stated that the model helped them put together creative, specific, and structured teaching outlines and as a result, allowed them to determine exactly what they would teach before they ever walked into the classroom. For example, as one participant expressed this theme,

> I think the AIAI FTFD methodologies were helpful because they provided a practical step-by-step process to plan a lecture. Before this class, all of my presentations were composed of introduction, middle, conclusion. They were not very effective because there was little interaction and application. AIAI and FTFD is a great way to include discussion and application into a teaching plan. The AIAI outlines also make me feel more confident in teaching because it makes me feel more prepared.

Another participant described the helpfulness of the methodology like this: "It takes the guess work out of teaching," while another shared the view, "It has given me the confidence to feel like I can teach any audience on just about any topic successfully."

The sub-sample 3 participants also found the AIAI-FTFD teaching model easy to use and that it helped keep their teaching "on track" while allowing for flexibility. Generally, participants believed that the AIAI-FTFD methodology, with preparation and delivery components, is comprehensive and well-organized, that it improved their ability and competence greatly, and that they now felt prepared to teach "any audience on any subject," as indicated above. Here is how one participant summed up his perceptions of how the AIAI-FTFD methodology is easy to use: "This format is extremely helpful. If you know the material then you can basically plug in your ideas, come up with some questions, and have an outline in about an hour. I can't think of a better method I've ever seen. Also, having used this method for 2 presentations, I know that it works in the field."

Participants in this sub-sample commented most frequently on the capacity of the AIAI-FTFD teaching methods to help them keep their audience engaged and interacting in applied ways while they present content. Here is how one participant described how the AIAI-FTFD teaching methods helped them as instructors keep their learners engaged: "I really liked the attention grabber the most: I thought it was most important so your audience will be engaged in what you are teaching them." Another participant noted, "It [AIAI-FTFD] makes learning an active process."

Participants also discussed the importance of the FTFD questioning techniques for keeping audiences engaged. For example, one participant declared, "The fact, think, feel, and do questions are effective in keeping the audience engaged during the [entire] lecture." Another participant articulated, "For instance, some may do better at thinking questions because it deals more with logic whereas some may like feel questions because they are able to relate more to their emotions." The participants truly liked these questioning techniques because, as one participant stated, " . . . the discussion and engagement provided ways for learners to learn from each other to collaborate ideas."

Finally, participants identified keeping the focus on target skills as an important way to guide their teaching; as one participant expressed it, "This method was extremely helpful, especially practicing the target skills." Generally, participants noted that the target skills were a direct application of information to their learners' lives, a critical part of effective teaching that some presentations omit.

In sum, the participants in this sample found the AIAI-FTFD teaching model helpful, especially for presentation preparation (instructor benefits) and audience engagement (audience benefits). One participant from this sub-sample summed up the experience with the AIAI-FTFD teaching model this way: "It takes time, but it is worth it." Others stated, "I will continue to

utilize this method in the future" and, "I will use AIAI-FTFD for the rest of my life while trying to perfect it." There was no negative feedback about the AIAI-FTFD teaching model reported from this sub-sample.

Graduate Teaching Methods Course (Sub-sample 4)

Participants from the graduate teaching methods course were unanimous in agreement about the helpfulness of the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model, for them as instructors and for their audience/learners. Subthemes that emerged for instructor benefits were (a) instructor preparation, (b) increased confidence in teaching, (c) improved teaching effectiveness, and (d) better ability to ask questions. The subthemes for audience benefits that emerged included increased audience engagement and increased ability to help learners apply material.

Unique to this sample of career professionals was that they were able to provide real-world feedback about how they were using AIAI-FTFD in their current professions. Several of these real-world themes included helpfulness of AIAI-FTFD in curriculum development, in teaching "with" rather than "at" students, and using the methodology as a model of excellence.

With regard to improved instructor preparation and increased teaching confidence, participants felt the AIAI-FTFD teaching method was helpful in creating and carrying out lesson plans clearly and effectively. One participant stated that AIAI-FTFD was a " . . . very helpful way to organize and prioritize the material in a lesson plan. The AIAI-FTFD format made the material flow in a way that made planning more effective, enhanced my material, and brought cohesiveness to my learning objectives." Another common response from participants was that the AIAI-FTFD teaching model allowed them to organize their lesson plans in a logical order according to their objectives, which enabled them to teach "on track" and to "teach less, better" in a sequential flow that was easy for learners to follow. Here is how one participant articulated this theme:

> The AIAI/FTFD methodologies are very helpful in creating and carrying out effective lesson plans. The simple format of these methods encourage 'teaching less better' while also encouraging attention to detail and thoughtfulness regarding student needs. I believe my skills as a teacher/educator have been improved as well as my confidence in teaching various age groups by having training in these methods.

Another participant responded in this way:

> This tool really fast-tracked my teaching capacity. For my practicum I co-taught an undergraduate, online family policy class, taught a one session seminar in industry, and taught for two sessions of a 4 day, 12 hour class for young teen, summer students. Each venue was successful according to student feedback. I attribute this largely to the AIAI-FTFD model and the skills I acquired preparing many lesson plans according to the model.

Graduate teaching methods course participants also noted additional ways that the AIAI-FTFD model helped them enhance their teaching skills. For example, several participants commented on how the AIAI-FTFD format allowed for "flexibility, variety, and individual personality" to emerge within the lesson plan. Most participants also noted they were able to facilitate "diverse teaching methods to reach learners of diverse learning styles" by anticipating needs of the audience. Participants also found that the AIAI-FTFD teaching methodology allowed them, as one participant stated, to pay careful "attention to detail and thoughtfulness regarding learner needs," which in turn resulted in a more engaged and informed audience, whose members were able to better grasp the material.

Some participants noted particular audience engagement aspects of the AIAI-FTFD teaching method that they found especially helpful. For example, most participants found the "attention-getter" helpful for engaging and preparing the audience to learn. As one participant wrote, "Using the attention activity at the beginning of the method helped to get people hooked into the subject matter." Another participant reported the "Interact" component of AIAI was helpful in "engaging the groups in meaningful and related activities to make sure they are understanding the concepts" being presented and that it provided "a way to thoughtfully interact with the material so as to remember the information." Furthermore, a majority of participants found the "Apply" or "Application" component of AIAI served as an effective method for "engaging the learner's attention and helping them develop personal relevance to the principles." The personal application of the material was believed to improve learners' attention, participation, and overall learning.

The "Invite" component of AIAI-FTFD teaching method provided instructors with the ability to effectively teach ways so that learners could put the information into action immediately. Participants commented on how the "Invite" component of AIAI challenged learners and provided "them with a tool to track the changes they are making, so they can see their improvements," as this participant noted:

> The AIAI FTFD teaching model is one that has helped me in looking at what I am offering when I am teaching and how I am expecting to get those ideas across. I teach for an agency that is funded through the Department of Workforce Services . . . The methodologies that are presented in the AIAI FTFD models have provided great insight into the idea of giving the participants a challenge and a way to track their behavior changes . . . the idea of inviting them to make these changes has been very valuable. When you are talking to a provider about how to apply what they are learning it is important to give them ways to do that and provide them with a tool to track the changes they are making so that they can see the improvements.

Participants in this study particularly emphasized how the questioning techniques improved their teaching abilities, as this participant articulated: "The FTFD questioning technique help[ed] move the lesson from simply being an information session to an engaging

learning experience." Similarly, another participant said, "I liked how it allowed me to approach the lesson plan in a conversational way and the delivery did not feel mechanical or forced; AIAI-FTFD was a way to facilitate learner input in a comfortable and natural way."

The way in which this particular sample of career professionals specifically incorporated the AIAI-FTFD instructional model into their current job tasks provided insightful results. For example, one participant shared this observation:

> The AIAI/FTFD methodology was very helpful to me as a professor at a major university in Utah. I teach nearly every day in an academic context so it was relevant to me professionally. I teach in the Education department and realize the fundamental responsibility teachers have in presenting material/tests/assignments/lectures in a manner that models excellence in teaching since these students are training to become future teachers. We can present information in an academic format, but pedagogy requires more than acquiring knowledge or disseminating information; at its core, teachers must teach in a way that motivates students to be active participants in the learning process.

Another educator also shared her insights about the model and how she has been able to incorporate it into her job,

> I have used AIAI/FTFD in the following courses: Art 1010, An Introduction to Visual Art; HFST 2130, Interior Design, an Introduction; HFST 1260, Weight Control/Eating Behaviors. I don't want to exaggerate, but this method is quite revolutionary as far as integrating discussion in what was previously a lecture-based atmosphere. Instead of teaching at the students, I am teaching and learning with my students. So yes, this methodology was not only helpful but it completely changed how I perceived my role as a teacher.

Two of the participants were curriculum writers, one for Head Start, and another for the Office of Child Care for the State of Utah. The first expressed, "I never dreamed that I would write curriculum until I took your class . . . I think the AIAI FTFD is what these courses need to make them great for our providers. They will get so much more out of the trainings." The second participant shared,

> I will be writing curriculum for child care providers. I intend to use the AIAI FTFD teaching model for the curriculum. I did a sample curriculum for them and they loved it. I think it will greatly improve the value of the information that is being taught. I wish more people used this model!

This sub-sample reported no negative or divergent feedback about the AIAI-FTFD teaching model. As cited above, the career or emerging professionals who participated in this study generally found the AIAI-FTFD methodology rewarding.

Discussion

The current study's general purpose was to evaluate the effectiveness of the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model as a tool for preparing Human Service and Extension (HSE) educators to increase their instructional effectiveness. The major findings from this study indicated that participants generally reported that as instructors, they and their audiences benefitted from the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model. Participants from the four sub-samples who learned the AIAI-FTFD teaching model generally found the methodology to be helpful and effective across diverse educational levels, career disciplines, and teaching topics.

Specific learning outcomes identified from using the AIAI-FTFD methodology included improved instructor preparation, increased confidence in teaching, improved teaching skills, and ability to engage learners more effectively to facilitate learning. FTFD questioning techniques were highlighted as the major tool used for engaging learners and to facilitate their participation through effective questioning. These findings are supported by Rickford's (2005), Merrill's (2002), and Wiggins and McTighe's (2005) best-practice instructional models, which identified learner engagement, learner participation, and interaction between learners and instructors as major components of effective teaching.

Study participants also indicated that the most helpful instructor preparation components of the AIAI-FTFD teaching model included promoting instructor organization of thoughts and lesson plans, providing an efficient guideline for teaching, and outlining clear teaching plan goals and objectives for different learning styles. The participant responses make it clear that instructor preparation represents a fundamental, foundational part of successful teaching. These findings are supported by Rickford's (2005) sound teaching pedagogy and conceptual understanding principles. In sum, the AIAI-FTFD instructional model is organized in a simple, logical, pedagogical progression that requires the instructor to think through the entire teaching process before entering the classroom.

Correspondingly, this study's findings revealed that participants who learned and used the AIAI-FTFD teaching model felt improvement in their confidence when preparing and delivering presentations. This confidence stemmed from putting the complete AIAI-FTFD outline together from start to finish before doing any teaching, which allowed participants to think carefully about each aspect of their teaching presentation and to carefully construct questions and interactive methods to facilitate the learning process.

Participants largely found the AIAI-FTFD teaching methodology to be a strong method and pedagogical strategy for effective teaching. Specifically, the AIAI-FTFD teaching method allowed participants to focus on needs of their audiences and to incorporate diverse techniques for delivery (Powell & Cassidy, 2007). This permitted flexibility in the classroom without compromising organization and effective instruction of content. The questioning techniques equipped participants with the ability to ask appropriate and probing questions, which generally

resulted in effective discussion, higher order thinking, and improved learning outcomes (Bloom, 1956). Generally, participants also found that using the AIAI-FTFD teaching methods helped them engage and maintain learners' attention throughout the teaching session. Consequently, their audience was more interactive with application of the information. Merrill's (2002) application and integration principles of effective instruction support the findings of this study.

While the models of Rickford (2005) and Merrill (2002), as well as other instructional models (Latham, 2002; Powell and Cassidy, 2007; Wiggins & McTighe, 2005), share some similarities with the AIAI-FTFD instructional model, the difference between these other conceptual- and principle-based models and the AIAI-FTFD model is that the AIAI-FTFD model offers a specific, step-by-step, how-to, start-to-finish approach to effective instruction. One analogy that could highlight major differences between the AIAI-FTFD instructional model and those referred to in this study (including other instructional models not mentioned in this study) is that, whereas most models provide principles of effective instruction, AIAI-FTFD is designed to help instructors apply these principles in a specific minute-by-minute, moment-by-moment approach to teaching. To use a sports analogy, it is one thing to conceptually understand how to dribble, pass, and shoot in basketball; it is quite another thing to execute exact, yet flexible plays in competitive moments during the game that require a calculated, step-by-step approach to scoring.

The authors of this study suggest that "scoring" by using empirically-informed instructional methods requires the instructor to use and eventually master all concepts and principles identified in the AIAI-FTFD instructional model by following its step-by-step, and intentional, yet flexible, approach designed to facilitate and maximize change. The study authors also suggest that while "information transfer" is important (Wiggins and McTighe, 2005), simply transferring information without facilitating change in an intentional, step-by-step, engaging manner does not constitute scoring in an instructional setting. The good news is that many effective teachers across academic and career disciplines intuitively and naturally employ these concepts and principles (Badger, 2008). The even better news from this study is that when teachers learn how to put all the AIAI-FTFD model's concepts and principles of effective instruction together in a start-to-finish outline, they can be successful and score in a classroom setting if given enough time to learn, apply, and even master the teaching techniques.

With this in mind, the authors concede that the AIAI-FTFD model is one among many instructional models. The teacher and audience benefits of using and applying the AIAI-FTFD model offer a beginning baseline only for potential generalizability and usefulness of the model to a wide range of HSE instructors and learners. Reported increases in study participants' abilities to use AIAI-FTFD teaching methods successfully in diverse academic, community, and career settings appears to provide some support for potential external validity of the AIAI-FTFD teaching method as a whole.

However, a few outlying responses indicated that when the AIAI-FTFD teaching methodology is not thoroughly explained or understood, participants are more likely to find the method confusing or unhelpful to the teaching process. Findings from these responses suggest that the learning process would have been benefited if participants had learned and applied the AIAI-FTFD methodology sooner and more often in the classroom. Personal preference also played a role in some participants not wanting to use the AIAI-FTFD teaching model in the future. These outlying responses are important to consider. The section on limitations discusses these in more detail below.

Using the AIAI-FTFD Model as a Best Practice Teaching Tool

Effective teaching requires using effective teaching practices and pedagogy. Given the findings of this study, the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model appears to be a viable, empirically-informed best practice teaching tool that Human Service and Extension (HSE) educators can use for preparing and delivering effective instructional presentations. Employing a start-to-finish teaching model to create lesson outlines that lead to best practice presentations can help develop confidence in educators who teach and deliver multiple HSE-related topics.

Limitations

The amount (i.e., dosage) of exposure to and practice with the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model varied among the four sub-samples, which could be perceived as a limitation of this study. Although participants from the three teaching methods courses (i.e., two undergraduate courses and one graduate course) were exposed to and taught how to use the AIAI-FTFD teaching method over the course of 16 weeks, participants in the undergraduate Psychology of Personality course were taught the AIAI-FTFD teaching method in only one class period and the methodology was used only for one assignment. This led to confusion among several participants who received the lower dosage. For these participants, low dosage indicated an insufficient amount of time to grasp and apply the AIAI-FTFD teaching concepts and principles. Based on these responses, it is evident that the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model requires adequate time, exposure, and application in order for it to yield optimal results in terms of comprehensive understanding and effective administration. While it is addressed as a potential limitation, this finding could also be perceived as a strength of the study because it indicates a need for instructors to be trained adequately in the AIAI-FTFD teaching methodology to be able to use it effectively.

Additional study limitations resulted from the data collection and analysis process. This study used purely qualitative data, which lack components of observational and quantitative data. The study also used a convenience sample, which can lead to under-representation or over-representation of particular groups within the sample. Furthermore, since the sample was not chosen randomly, the inherent bias in convenience sampling indicates the sample was unlikely to represent the overall population being studied.

Conclusions and Implications for the Future

The study's general purpose was to assess whether the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model is relevant for preparing Human Service and Extension (HSE) educators to teach effectively. Results indicate that this sample generally perceived the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model to be an effective tool for preparing HSE educators to teach effectively. This tool also appears to exhibit some relevance to various teaching topics, disciplines, and audiences. However, as mentioned above, the model has limitations with regard to its generalizability.

Within the four sub-samples studied, the AIAI-FTFD teaching model was generally found to be easy-to-use and goal-directed. Learners, instructors, and career professionals in the samples appeared to benefit from using this teaching methodology in at least these ways: (a) increased instructor preparation, (b) increased confidence in teaching, (c) increased teaching ability, and (d) increased learner engagement.

Future research and examination of the AIAI-FTFD Start-to-Finish Teaching Model for relevance in effective instruction could include the following: (a) Testing the AIAI-FTFD teaching methodologies with randomized samples of learners, instructors, and career professionals across an increasing number of academic and career disciplines to enhance validity and reliability of AIAI-FTFD teaching methodology; (b) Assessing the AIAI-FTFD teaching model from learners' perspectives to see if their needs and desired learning outcomes are being met (e.g., by assessing specific cognitive, emotional, and/or behavioral knowledge and skills learners identified as most helpful, then assessing how well these outcomes mapped to instructor objectives); and (c) Addressing how the AIAI-FTFD teaching model can be used for increasing learners' critical thinking skills.

Victor W. Harris, Ph.D. is in the Department of Family, Youth and Community Sciences at the University of Florida in Gainesville,,FL.

Tiffany Morrow, M.A. is a graduate student in the Department of Family, Youth and Community Sciences at the University of Florida in Gainesville,,FL.

Daniel Moen, Ph.D., LMFT, CFLE is in the Department of Family Consumer Sciences at Minnesota State University Mankato, Mankato, MN.

Boyd Teemant,is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Counseling, Education and School Psychology at Wichita State University, Wichita, KS.

Muthusami Kumaran, Ph.D. is in the Department of Family, Youth and Community Sciences at the University of Florida in Gainesville,,Fl.

References

Allington, D., & Cropper, M. H. (1994). *A new, complete paradigm for instruction: A model for teaching and learning for the 21st century*. Unpublished manuscript, Utah State University, Logan.

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives: Complete edition*. New York: Longman.

Auerbach, C. F., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis.* New York: New York University Press.

Badger, R. I. (Ed.). (2008). *Ideas that work in college teaching.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Bennett, C., & Rockwell, K. (1995). *Targeting outcomes of programs (TOP): An integrated approach to planning and evaluation*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Berg, B. L. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay Co. Inc.

Cropper, M. H. (2000). *A comprehensive instructional model for the new millennium.* Paper presented at the NETg Lecture Series, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland.

Gagne, R. M., & Briggs, L. (1979). *Principles of instructional design*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gardner, H. (1993a). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1993b). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*. New York: Basic Books.

Harris, V. W. (2009). *Ideas that work in college teaching*. Invited book review. *Family Science Review, 14*, 61-66. Retrieved February 3, 2013 from http://www.familyscienceassociation.org/sites/default/files/FSR%20Victor%20Harris%20Book%20Review%20Final.pdf

Harris, V. W., Chartier, K., & Davis, E. (2010, June). AIAI – FTFD: A start-to-finish teaching model for family life education courses. *Family Science Review, 15,* 15-23.

Harris, V. W., & Lee, T. R. (2006). Using empirically based teaching methodologies to teach family life education topics effectively. *Journal of Teaching in Marriage and Family, 6,* 121-139.

Harris, V. W., Moen, D., & Teemant, B. (2011). United Marriage Enhancement Training: A qualitative review. *Family Science Review, 16*. 75-84. Retrieved January 13, 2013 from http://familyscienceassociation.org/archived%20journal%20articles/FSR_16_2_2011/11-50.pdf

Latham, G. I. (2002). Behind the schoolhouse door: Eight skills every instructor should have. In G. I. Latham, *Behind the schoolhouse door: Managing chaos with science, skills, and strategy* (pp. 11-41). North Logan, UT: P & T Ink.

Mace, D. (1981). The long trail from information giving to behavioral change. *Family Relations, 30,* 599-606.

Matthews, S. H. (2005). Crafting qualitative research articles on marriages and families. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67,* 799-808.

Mays, C., & Pope, C. (1995). Rigour and qualitative research. *British Medical Journal, 311,* 109-112.

Merrill, M. (2002). First principles of instruction. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 50,* 43-59.

Merrill, M. (2006). Levels of instructional strategy. *Educational Technology, 46,* 5-10.

Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 1,* 13-22.

Ostland, U., Kidd, L., Wengstrom, Y., & Rowa-Dewar, N. (2010). Combining qualitative and quantitative research within mixed method research designs: A methodological review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 48,* 369-383.

Patton, M. Q. (2002) *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Powell, H., & Cassidy, D. (2007). *Family life education: Working with families across the lifespan*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Rickford, A. (2005). Everything I needed to know about teaching I learned from my children: Six deep teaching principles for today's reading instructors. *Reading Improvement, 42*, 112-128.

Teemant, B., Moen, D., & Harris, V. W. (2013). Problem-based learning in the family sciences: A good fit in theory and practice. *Family Science Review, 17*, 102-117. Online: http://familyscienceassociation.org/sites/default/files/7%20-Teemont_Moen_Harris.pdf

Thomas, D. R. (2003). *A general inductive approach for qualitative data analysis*. University of Auckland, New Zealand: School of Population Health.

Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2nd Expanded Edition). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Appendix

Teaching Techniques

©Victor William Harris, Ph.D.

The success and effectiveness of any instruction will depend upon you as the teacher. A quick review of a two AIAI-FTFD teaching techniques might be helpful. Teachers from many disciplines have used these techniques in one form or another to aid them in their pursuit of successful teaching. Please make sure to be sensitive to the various kinds of participants who are in your classes (i.e., singles, divorcees, distressed couples, etc.) and be sensitive about making inferences, implied or otherwise, to cultural and gender issues.

Technique 1 – *AIAI: Attention, Interact, Apply, Invite*

Attention – Before a teacher can teach effectively, s/he must catch the participants' attention so they are prepared to be taught. Neglecting this technique has been the downfall of many teachers who otherwise could have been successful. A short humorous story, joke, video clip, object lesson, dramatization, question, game, etc., that creates interest in discovering what will be taught in the specific class or workshop can be very effective attention ideas. For the attention idea to be effective, it must be able to take the participants' minds off of the outside distractions/influences they may have entered the classroom with and focus the participants as a unified whole on discovering the information you are about to lead them into. The attention idea need not be lengthy. In fact, it is better if it is not. *Note*: The attention technique may be used to help participants re-focus during any topic transition.

Interact – (**Teaching interactively**) Next, the teacher proceeds with the introduction of the class or workshop information. Effective teachers use interaction methods such as insightful questioning, object lessons, participant sharing, stories, dramatizations, group activities, etc., that center on the participant and not the teacher. In other words, the general mindset that the effective teacher should have is as a facilitator of information and discussion, not as a stand-and-deliver lecturer.

Apply – (**Participants personalize through "hands-on" activity**) After a principle is taught, the teacher must help the participants to make application of the principle to their own lives. A critical key to effective teaching is to spend as much time on helping participants applying the principles and information as possible. This intentional focus can help them access potential new knowledge and skills that can facilitate change in their lives and their relationships.

Invite – Lasting change is less likely to occur unless the participants are invited to choose a principle or a piece of information from each class or workshop they can add to their repertory of relationship skills. Therefore, in each instructional setting a homework assignment will be given and individuals/couples will each be invited to commit to choose at least one skill they would like to work on before the next class or workshop. You are strongly encouraged to invite both individuals and couples to share their progress at the beginning of the following class or workshop.

The AIAI steps may be repeated as needed to enhance the delivery of information to suit each class or workshop. For example, you may repeat the AIAI steps when transitioning to a new topic within the same workshop or you may use another "A" or "I" or "A" or "I" as needed within the AIAI sections.

Technique 2 – FTFD – Effective Questioning Techniques

Effective questioning begins with an understanding of the **FTFD** method of questioning.

- **F is for Fact** – Initial questioning begins with questions that are factual in nature. For example, "What is the current divorce rate in the nation?" or "Name one key to enhancing and maintaining a healthy marriage?"

- **T is for Thinking** – Thinking questions mark the next stage in the process of helping participants conceptualize the principles and to move toward the application of the principles into their individual lives. For example, a teacher might ask, "Why do you think the divorce rate is so high?" or, "Why do you think **C**ommunication, **C**onflict management, and **C**ommitment might be considered three major keys to a successful marriage?"

  This kind of lateral thinking can be used for every kind of attention or interaction idea. For example, a teacher might ask, "Now, why do you think I would show you this video clip, tell you this story, or use this example?" Similarly, the teacher might ask, "What does this object lesson have to do with your marriage?" The participants are then free to move to a deeper level of thinking – a level that prepares them for the next levels of application – feeling and doing.

- **F is for Feeling** – This is the level of questioning where the majority of individual and couple change will take place. For example, a teacher might ask the participants, "How do you feel about this principle or about what we have discussed?" or, "How do you feel about your conflict management style and how it contributes to or detracts from your relationship?"

- **D is for Doing** – As the participants begin to make application of the principles and information being taught, they need to be invited to do something to enact change in their lives. This invitation can be initiated by the teacher, by the participant's individual psyche, or by one or both members of the couple. For example, a teacher might say, "I would invite you to choose one thing you would like to work on as a couple for the next week" or, "I would like you to think about conflict management. Is there something you could do differently that would help you manage conflict more efficiently?" or, "Was there a time during the workshop when you felt there was something you could specifically do that could benefit your relationship? I invite you to choose that one item/skill and to work on it as your homework assignment for the coming week.

Note*:** It is essential to use **Fact, Think, Feel** questions during each part of the AIAI presentation. For example, you might use one or more **Fact** questions during the ***Attention step; one or more **Think** questions during the ***Interaction*** step; one or more **Feel** questions during the ***Application*** step; and one or more **Do** questions during the ***Invite*** step. This will keep participants engaged and able to personalize the information presented. However, the **Fact, Think, Feel, Do** questions may be used wherever needed during the AIAI process – interchangeably.