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Abstract

Writing is a skill with which many students struggle, but especially those identified with special needs. Previous studies have shown that teaching students strategies has been successful; however, using Direct Instruction has been most effective in improving and increasing written expression skills particularly for struggling students (Walker, Shippen, Alberto, Houchins, & Chalk, 2005). An important element of Direct Instruction curricula is that it is scripted. The current study examined the effects of a scripted writing program on the number of correct minus incorrect writing sequences (CIWS) and total words written (TWW) by middle school students.

This study aimed to determine the effectiveness of a scripted program to teach basic writing skills and paragraph writing in three different middle school classrooms. A scripted program developed to improve written expression was used to instruct middle school students in grades 6, 7, and 8. Two dependent variables (CIWS and TWW) were evaluated in this study. Students moved into intervention by class when the majority of the subjects’ baseline data remained stable or decreased. Instruction took place with the entire classroom not with just several students. Three-minute writing prompts were collected weekly throughout the study to measure progress with both variables. Results show the scripted presentation was successful for some students, though not all. Social validity results indicating consumer satisfaction are
discussed, as well as limitations, practical implications, and suggestions for future research.
Dedication

This study is dedicated to my family and friends, whose unending support, encouragement, and humor have made my continuing education possible.
Acknowledgments

I am eternally grateful to my husband, Eric, for his continual support and for my son William’s enduring patience through this entire process. I would also like to thank my parents who did whatever they could to help and encourage me, especially over the last few months. I truly appreciate having my family in my life.

I wish to thank my advisor, Dr. Terri Hessler, for her continued support, understanding, wisdom, and, most of all, her patience throughout the course of this study. Her guidance and willingness to problem-solve have made the completion of this study possible.

I thank the multiple data collectors and teacher participants for their time commitment and support in this study. This study would not have been the same without their contributions.

I thank Dr. Diana Erchick for her time in serving on my thesis committee. I also appreciate all she taught me and cherish the opportunity to learn from her other research methods on differing points of view.

I also wish to thank Mr. Richards, principal, as well as the numerous students and teachers who made the completion of this study possible.
Vita

January 30, 1978.......................... Born Erie, Pennsylvania

May 6, 2000.............................. B.S. Elementary & Special Education, Edinboro University of Pennsylvania

June 1, 2000.............................. 6 Year Instructional Certificate
                                      Elementary (K-6)
                                      Mentally / Physically Handicapped (K-12)

August 2000 – July 2002.............. Intervention Specialist (K-6)
                                      Miami Trace Local School District

February 21, 2001..................... 1 Year Temporary License
                                      Intervention Specialist (K-12)
                                      4 Year Provisional Certificate
                                      Kindergarten – Elementary (K-8)

September 4, 2001..................... 4 Year Provisional Certificate
                                      Education of the Handicapped (K-12)

July 2002 – present................... Intervention Specialist (5-6)
                                      6th Grade Teacher
                                      Newark City Schools

June 10, 2004......................... 5 Year Professional License
                                      Kindergarten – Elementary (K-8)
                                      Education of the Handicapped (K-12)

May 18, 2009......................... 5 Year Professional License
                                      Kindergarten – Elementary (K-8)
                                      Education of the Handicapped (K-12)

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Integrated Teaching and Learning
Table of Contents

Abstract ................................................................................................................................. ii
Dedication ................................................................................................................................. iv
Acknowledgments ...................................................................................................................... v
Vita ............................................................................................................................................... vi
List of Tables ............................................................................................................................ x
List of Figures ................................................................................................................................ xi

Chapters

1 Introduction ............................................................................................................................. 1
   Review of Literature .................................................................................................................. 5
      Special Education .................................................................................................................. 5
      Direct Instruction .................................................................................................................. 6
         Instructional Grouping ......................................................................................................... 7
         Repeated Practice ............................................................................................................... 8
         Teacher Modeling .............................................................................................................. 9
         Corrective Feedback ......................................................................................................... 10
         Teacher Modeling with Corrective Feedback .................................................................. 11
         Praise .................................................................................................................................. 12
         Scripted Lesson Presentation ......................................................................................... 13
         Direct Instruction Studies ............................................................................................. 15
   Purpose .................................................................................................................................. 23
   Research Questions .............................................................................................................. 23

2 Methods .................................................................................................................................. 24
   Institutional Review Board Approval .................................................................................... 24
      IRB Approval ..................................................................................................................... 25
      CITI Training ...................................................................................................................... 25
   Setting ................................................................................................................................... 26
   Participants and Subjects ....................................................................................................... 27
   Experimenter .......................................................................................................................... 30
   Data Collectors ...................................................................................................................... 30
   Dependent Variables ............................................................................................................ 30
      CIWS ................................................................................................................................... 30
      TWW ................................................................................................................................... 31
   Independent Variable ........................................................................................................... 32
      Expressive Writing 2 .......................................................................................................... 32
   Experimental Design ............................................................................................................ 32
   Materials ................................................................................................................................. 38
F: Social Validity Teacher Questionnaire ........................................ 95
G: IOA Table ................................................................................. 97
H: Student Social Validity Surveys Short Answers ....................... 99
I: Teacher Social Validity Survey Results .................................. 101
J: Subjects CIWS Graphs Not Displayed in Results Section .......... 104
K: Subjects TWW Graphs Not Displayed in Results Section ......... 108
List of Tables

Table 2.1. Student Information……………………………………………… 29
Table 3.1. Student Survey Results from Classroom A ....................... 62
Table 3.2. Student Survey Results from Classroom B ....................... 63
Table 3.3. Student Survey Results from Classroom C ....................... 64
Table 3.4. Mean Response from Student Surveys ............................. 65
List of Figures

Figure 1. Sample CIWS graphs for those the intervention had a positive effect…………………………………………………………………50

Figure 2. Sample CIWS graphs for those the intervention had a moderate positive effect…………………………………………………………51

Figure 3. Sample CIWS graphs for those the intervention had a little effect ………………………………………………………………….52

Figure 4. Sample TWW graphs for those the intervention had a positive effect…………………………………………………………………..56

Figure 5. Sample TWW graphs for those the intervention had a moderate positive effect…………………………………………………………57

Figure 6. Sample TWW graphs for those the intervention had a little effect ……………………………………………………………………58
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Writing is a necessity in everyday life (Graham & Perin, 2007). It is often the first impression given in some situations. Written expression skills are not only a predictor of life-long success (Graham & Perin) but also a basic requirement to participate in many adult life activities such as completing a job application, writing checks, and making shopping or to-do lists (Graham & Perin; Alber-Morgan, Hessler, & Konrad, 2007). There is not one movie, magazine article, advertising jingle, or hit song that did not begin with and rely heavily upon effective writing (The College Board, 2003). There are many effective ways to teach written expression, yet the teaching and practice of writing has been increasingly shortchanged throughout the school years (The College Board). The study of written expression has also fallen short when compared with other academic areas (Hooper, Swartz, Wakely, de Kruif, & Montgomery, 2002). The National Commission on Writing in America’s Schools and Colleges was created to help call national attention to the teaching and learning of writing. A recommended writing agenda published for the nation in 2003 includes (a)
a review of current education standards to ensure comprehensive writing policies, (b) a requirement that every school district treat written expression as an essential component at every subject at every grade level, (c) an improvement in the amount of and importance of written expression instruction in higher education curriculum, (d) providing prospective teachers with courses that teach them how to teach writing, and (e) providing state and federal government financial resources to make writing a curriculum centerpiece (The College Board). Twenty-four states now have a direct tie between student promotion and testing, requiring students to pass the state exams before receiving diplomas (Olsen, 2001; Chalk, Hagan-Burke, & Hagan-Burke, 2005), and proficient writing is required in order to score successfully on those exams. Unfortunately, the nation as a whole is performing poorly, with a mere 27% of all assessed students falling within the proficient or advanced categories on their writing tests (U.S. Department of Education, 2003).

Each state currently has academic standards and formal testing that measure and categorize students into one of three levels: Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. According to recent data, only 33% of eighth graders scored at or above the Proficient level (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). Even more alarming, only one student in one hundred is testing Advanced in their written expression abilities (The College Board, 2003). Ohio scores from the 2006-2007 school year show that although 81% of Ohio’s seventh grade students were at or above the Proficient level, there are still schools that do not have enough proficient writers to meet the necessary 75% passing rate in Writing (ODE Report Card, 2006-2007). Of most concern to special education teachers, the 2002 Nation’s Report Card reports a mere 6% of students with identified
disabilities nationwide scored at the Proficient level and 0% at the Advanced level on the eighth grade writing test.

There is now increased accountability for educators (e.g., No Child Left Behind, 2001) that reminds them how critical it is to look at how and what they are teaching and reevaluate whether or not it’s effective (Gansle, Gilbertson, & VanDerHeyden, 2006). Elliot (2007), as well as Bui, Schumaker, & Deshler (2006), explain how the reauthorization of laws such as IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004) and recent legislature surrounding No Child Left Behind (NCLB) have dramatically changed testing requirements and participation in adequate yearly progress (AYP) requirements. Before NCLB, many students, both in general and special education, were regularly excluded from taking state tests (Elliot). It is now required that nearly all students with disabilities be included in state assessments as there is a 1% cap on the number of students who are permitted to take an alternative achievement test (Elliot). He explains this requirement mandates that most students with disabilities, students who have learned English as a second language, and students who are at-risk are given the same assessment and evaluation criteria as students who fall in the typical range.

A review of the Ohio Department of Education’s website achievement testing information revealed that students are asked to demonstrate knowledge and mastery through writing short and extended responses in each academic test, not just the writing test. Many students with learning disabilities face this evaluation despite their deficits in literacy, let alone in the content area being assessed (Wallace & Bott, 2001). IDEA does permit accommodations for special needs’ testing, however. The law
defines *accommodations* as “changes in the materials or procedures that would show the ability of an individual who may otherwise be impaired without accommodations” (Thurlow & Bolt, 2001).

Sadly, there are growing numbers of graduates who are unable to write at the minimum levels that colleges and prospective employers require (Graham & Perin, 2007). Graham and Perin (2007) enlighten readers to the growing chasm between what employers require (e.g., written documentation and electronic and wireless communication) and what they can deliver. Recent reports now reveal that writing proficiency is essential in the workplace and directly affects hiring and promotional decisions (Graham & Perin). Recently, more than 90% of midcareer professionals cited the need to write effectively as a skill of great importance in their daily work (Light, 2001). Furthermore, Light reported that college students named writing, as the skills they needed to strengthen three times more often than all other skills. When asked to reflect on their education and to decide what skills they felt were essential to their current work and endeavors, over 90% of middle-aged college alumni considered the “need to write effectively” a skill “of great importance” in their current work (Light, p. 54). Clearly, writing is a vital skill for career professionals (The College Board) and plays a fundamental role in the academic lives and successes of students as well (Light).

Written expression extends beyond the ability to master grammar and punctuation (The College Board, 2003). According to Ohio’s academic state standards, middle school students should be able to write narratives; respond to novels, poems, and plays; and produce letters (Ohio Content Standards). They should
also be writing informational essays and reports, as well as persuasive essays. In addition, students should learn and use correct capitalization, punctuation, spelling, and grammar. It is also assumed that students will know how to use and apply reference materials in their writing (Ohio Content Standards). Unfortunately, the amount of independent work that is required for producing, editing, and revising writing is difficult for many struggling students, especially those who struggle with written expression. This is probably the strongest argument for direct and explicit instruction of basic skills provided in shorter, concise sessions, allowing for opportunities to practice and review with teacher feedback.

Review of Literature

The review of literature presents research and information on special education settings, written expression instruction for struggling students including direct instruction, teacher modeling, feedback, and praise, as well as curriculum-based measures.

Special Education

In 1975, congress passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142). Since then the law has been reauthorized and amended five times (Heward, 2009). The 1990 reauthorization renamed it as The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). One element of IDEA that has remained essentially unchanged since the original law went into effect is that students with disabilities should be educated with children without disabilities to the maximum extent possible and that separate classes and schools should be used only when students cannot receive the needed services within the general education classroom.
known as the least restrictive environment (LRE) (Heward). The LRE is where the child’s educational needs and services can best be delivered (Heward). IDEA presupposes that the general education classroom is the best placement starting point, and from there the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) will state to what extent, if at all, the child will be removed from the general education curriculum to receive services.

The federal government has defined educational placements for students with disabilities. For many special education students, the regular classroom is the LRE (Heward, 2009). If the LRE for a student is the regular education classroom, he or she receives specialized instruction and related services outside of the classroom for less than 21% of the school day. Fifty-four percent of students were served in this placement in the 2005-2006 school year while 25% of students were placed in resource rooms (Heward). Resource rooms are for students who need more intensive specialized instruction, as defined by placement outside of the general education classroom from 21 to 60% of their day. Essentially, 80% of all students with disabilities receive some of their education in the regular education classroom, often meaning the regular education teacher is partially to wholly responsible for providing appropriate instruction that meets the students’ special needs.

Direct Instruction

While written expression is a challenge for special education students, many regular education students struggle with written expression due to its complex nature (Walker, et al., 2005). Teachers need to understand that written expression for some students can be as difficult as reading is for a beginning reader (Englemann & Silbert,
Several studies conducted have shown specific teaching methods that improve students’ written expression skills (e.g. use of a graphic organizer to plan writing, improved use of correct grammar and mechanics, and improved spelling).

One method for improving written expression skills is a commercial curricula called Direct Instruction, developed by Seigfried “Zig” Englemann. Components of direct instruction programs include the following: (a) fast-paced, highly focused lessons; (b) teacher modeling; (c) repeated practice; (d) direct, explicit questioning; (e) small, purposeful instructional grouping; (f) performance assessment; (g) immediate corrective feedback; and (h) thorough practice and review.

**Instructional Grouping.** With the push for as many students to be placed in regular classrooms as possible while still improving test scores, several researchers wanted to see if there was a difference in the effectiveness of reading instruction based on class size alone. Rashotte, MacPhee, and Torgesen (2001) examined the effectiveness of a small group versus whole-group instruction with struggling readers across various grade levels. Participants included 116 students in first through sixth grades, all of whom had reading skill deficits. Word Attack and Word Identification subtests of the *Woodcock Diagnostic Reading Battery* were used as a pretest to identify which students received the program and intervention. The scores were used to match students, regardless of grade level, by ability in phonetic decoding and word-level reading skills. Group one students received instruction through the *Spell Read* program while group two served as the control and received typical instruction. Instruction in the treatment group lasted for eight weeks with 50 minute daily lessons in groups ranging from only three to five students. After the eight week period,
students in group two received the intervention curriculum while group one returned to typical instruction. The intervention program was fast-paced using highly visual lessons that integrated phonics, reading, written expression, and spelling. Activities were short, skill reinforcing, and required active student participation.

A posttest was given at the end of intervention for group one and for group two after the intervention condition ended. Results showed that subjects made significant gains in phonological and phonetic decoding skills as well as in their reading comprehension, word and text reading accuracy, text fluency, and spelling across all grade levels. These gains were greater than the gains made by students receiving instruction in a larger class setting (Rashotte, et al., 2001).

**Repeated Practice.** Steventon and Frederick (2003) analyzed repeated readings to be used with the direct instruction program, *Corrective Reading Decoding Strategies*, to determine its effectiveness in improving students’ oral fluency. Three middle school students were chosen as subjects for this study. Instruction took place in a small-group setting. Modifications such as timed reading checkouts occurred on current lessons immediately after students practiced once with a peer were made to the curriculum as it was intended to be used because of extreme attendance issues interfering with the study before baseline. After the teacher presentation and group response portions of the lesson read directly from the teacher’s guide, students were directed to work independently while the teacher worked with each student to complete the one-minute reading checkout portion. The total number of words read and errors made were counted and recorded.
During intervention, subjects were instructed to read the passage aloud three times each with the teacher giving corrective feedback and encouragement. Students then read the passage once more, and those scores were the only ones calculated and recorded. Students made anywhere from a 24-35% increase in correct words read per minute from baseline to intervention with practiced passages. The improvement did not carry over to new and unrehearsed passages. The authors felt this study warranted the need for further study regarding repeated practice to improve fluency (Steventon and Frederick, 2003).

**Teacher Modeling.** Hallenbeck (2002) conducted a study to examine if a writing strategy, Cognitive Strategy Instruction in Writing, would be effective with four seventh-grade students with learning disabilities, all of whom struggled with written expression. Cognitive Strategy Instruction has three guiding principles: (1) effective writing is a holistic process involving the writer in each step; (2) immature writers benefit from teacher modeling and “think-alouds”; and (3) the student learn to appreciate writing by writing for real audiences and authentic purposes. Instruction included mini-units taught before the text structure was modeled. Students were actively engaged during the modeling process. After the teacher modeled the entire process, the students were asked to write an essay on their own. Their next writing project had minimal teacher assistance so that progress could be measured. There was an impressive growth between the two samples with three students increasing their total words by 138 to 193%. The holistic writing scores also showed an increase in three of the four subjects, demonstrating the effectiveness of teacher modeling as measure both quantitatively and qualitatively.
Corrective Feedback. Alber, Heward, and Hippler (1999) recognize that the classroom is a busy place and students’ efforts can easily go unnoticed. “Despite its potential power within the learning process, feedback is used infrequently as part of the instructional process” (Kline, Schumaker, & Deshler, 1991, p.192). This study also developed and analyzed appropriate feedback strategies that teachers of students with learning disabilities should use. Teachers put into place a “feedback routine” in which they gave basic feedback after a task and “feedback-plus-acceptance routine,” which involved students in setting future goals based upon received feedback. Teachers reported the feedback routines provided more effective instructional results (Kline, et al.). They also found that the number of student errors significantly declined following teacher feedback.

In a study by Kline et al.(1991), two different feedback routines were investigated. The researchers were interested in whether teachers could easily learn and integrate feedback routines, if it would increase student effectiveness and efficiency, if both teachers and students would accept the feedback, would be accepted by both teachers and students, and whether or not feedback would be maintained over time. Twenty-seven teachers and their students from grades 4-12 participated in this study. The feedback routine was comprised of specific teacher-driven feedback, while the feedback-plus-acceptance routine had the features of the first but also included active student involvement. Teachers quickly learned the feedback routines successfully increased both the effectiveness and efficiency of what students were learning. Results indicated that the more feedback teachers shared with students, the students required fewer trials to mastery. Both teachers and students accepted the
feedback routines, and they were still using them more than a year after the conclusion of the study.

*Teacher Modeling with Corrective Feedback.* Grskovic and Belfiore (1996) studied the effects of error correction on fourth and fifth graders’ spelling while reaching their goal of mastery in as few trials as possible. The five participants in this study all had average full scale IQs, diagnosed emotional disabilities, and several also had learning disabilities. Spelling instruction for all participants took place in a resource room where they received spelling workbooks and completed enrichment activities in order to learn and practice the words.

In the traditional condition, participants were given a list of words and instructions on how to practice learning those words. For example, they were asked to write their words three times each on lined paper at which point they would receive a positive feedback comment upon task completion. In the error correct condition, the participants received one new word at a time. They were given a word orally, and wrote that word on a white board while the teacher wrote the same word on another white board. The boards were then compared so students could fix any letters that were incorrect at which point the next word would was given. The teacher led the students through this entire process three times. Feedback was given after every third response. All student participants were given spelling instruction in both the error correct and the traditional conditions.

Results of this study showed there was a considerable improvement in the number of words learned each week with the error correct method as compared to the traditional condition method. A social validity scale was also administered, and a
majority of the participants reported feeling like better spellers when using the white boards and being a part of the error correct condition (Grskovic and Belfiore, 1996).

Praise. Feedback has been shown to have positive results in some classrooms; however, praise is another form of feedback. Burnett (2002) explains that praise is a positive response that is much more detailed and specific to student behavior than feedback. He argues even adults like receiving praise and knowing they are doing well, and it can improve relationships between individuals. The amount of praise or reinforcement that students receive varies greatly between different educational settings, i.e., resource room versus the regular classroom and then home (Alber-Morgan et al., 2007). Burnett surveyed 747, eight-to twelve-year-olds and found that an overwhelming 91% would like to be praised either often or sometimes while only 9% said they never wanted to be praised.

Alber-Morgan et al. (2007) explain that when acquiring new skills, students should be reinforced on a regular basis, such as after every response, and after a certain level of mastery is achieved, the teacher should gradually deliver praise that is unpredictable. Burnett (2002) argued some teachers might even avoid praise for fear of students becoming dependent on it. He also argued that teachers should practice implementing intermittent and delayed reinforcement into their instruction to better prepare students for an unpredictable world (Alber-Morgan et al). Sutherland, Wehby, and Yoder (2002) explained the necessity for teachers to actively respond to their students and increase the number of praise statements they give while increasing response opportunities in order to be truly effective.
Sutherland et al. (2002) wanted to look at the relationship between teacher praise statements and student response opportunities for those with emotional and behavioral disorders. This study used 216 students in 20 self-contained classrooms. Researchers looked for and recorded data on 6 dependent variables: total praise, opportunities for response, reprimands, academic talk, unrelated talk, and students’ correct responses. Results found that classrooms in which teachers focus on academic talk, allow for opportunities to respond, and use praise had higher rates of students’ correct responses.

Lee and Laspe (2003) examined two different teaching methods to increase students’ writing production. Four students, ages 10 and 11, were given writing prompts and asked to write for 20 minutes. Upon completion, they were given general praise (i.e., good writing today). Students categorized prompts as either highly interesting or uninteresting topics about which to write. The combination that proved to be the most effective, as demonstrated consistently by the most words written, was teacher praise along with high interest prompts.

*Scripted Lesson Presentation.* Darch and Gersten (1986) compared two different approaches for teaching reading comprehension strategies to twenty-four high school students with learning disabilities. The first approach was similar to what most individuals think of when it comes to reading instruction: motivation is given for reading a given piece, and background knowledge is activated. Then new vocabulary and concepts are discussed before students begin reading. The second approach involved using explicit instruction and research-based organizers before reading.
The experimental group, called the advance organizer group, were taught important facts from this outline before they even began reading. The facts were delivered through a script written prior to the lesson. During teacher-led discussions, students were expected to produce an oral choral response. The lesson’s design was brisk and involved all students in the lesson. After approximately fifteen minutes, students read independently. Instruction was based on typical, brief, teacher-student discussions that happen in many reading classrooms. For the control group, this discussion was the introduction to the lesson and was used in place of the explicit questions and use of an organizer used in the other group. After the discussion, students were asked to read independently the same passages as those in the advance organizer group.

Experimenter-created short tests measured student progress. The pretest was given to both groups to ensure they did not have any prior knowledge of the material being presented. After instruction on this three-day unit, a six question unit test followed. The test questions covered student comprehension of the material they had read. Although both groups made improvements from pretest to unit test, subjects in the advance organizer group made the greater improvement. The researchers concluded that explicit teaching and directed questions have a more positive effect on improving the comprehension skills of students when compared to typical discussion questions only (Darch & Gersten, 1986).

Lloyd, Cullinan, Heins, and Epstein (1980) conducted a study to determine whether a program with direct instruction components could improve the oral language and reading comprehension skills of several elementary students with
learning disabilities. Twenty-three students, all of whom were in a self-contained classroom of eight students each, were test subjects. There was one control classroom and two experimental classrooms. The control classroom received typical instruction typical involving chalkboard lessons and worksheet completion. The experimental classroom used applied behavior analysis to monitor student behavior and direct instruction programs to teach academic skills. Language instruction in the two experimental classrooms used *The Corrective Reading Program*, which follows many of the Direct Instruction components (e.g., structured interactions, extensive pupil responding, and corrective teacher feedback).

The *Slosson Intelligence Test* and *Gilmore Oral Reading Test* measured oral language and reading comprehension skills. Results indicated that students in the experimental classrooms all scored similarly to each other. Compared with the control group, however, the students who received the direct instruction actually scored three-quarters of a deviation higher than the students who received “typical” instruction, which clearly supports the use of direct instruction programs with students who have learning disabilities (Lloyd et al., 1980).

*Direct Instruction Studies.* Benner, Kinder, Beaudoin, Stein, and Hirschmann (2005) conducted a study to determine the effectiveness of a direct instruction program on basic reading skills of elementary and middle school students with disabilities. Fifty-one elementary and middle school students were selected to participate in the study, of which twenty-eight students with disabilities were a part of the *Corrective Reading* condition while 23 students were part of the comparison study group. Students in the comparison group received a variety of reading instruction,
focusing on reading comprehension and vocabulary development, in the general education classroom. Students in the experimental group received instruction in the resource room with two to nine other students. Teachers used the *Corrective Reading* program approximately three days a week, breaking each lesson down into four sections including many direct instruction components.

Two tests were used to measure the subjects’ abilities in basic reading skills and reading fluency: The Woodcock-Johnson-3rd edition and the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) Oral Reading Fluency Probe. Results from the Woodcock-Johnson showed a significant increase in scores for students in the *Corrective Reading* group as opposed to the control group specifically the effect size increased by 1.49 for basic reading skills. The same encouraging results appeared with the DIBELS test. The authors argued that these results support the effectiveness of direct instruction components on students with disabilities (Benner et al. 2005).

Anderson and Keel (2002) conducted a study to determine if students with special needs would make significant gains in written language following a six-week Direct Instruction program. Ten students, six with learning disabilities and four with behavior disorders, were selected for this study. The participants were all fourth- or fifth-grade students receiving specialized services in the area of written expression regardless of their placement in a resource room or a general education classroom.

Students were given the Spontaneous Writing Scale of the TOWL-2 as a pretest (Anderson & Keel, 2002). The authors found that only one student achieved a score above the 20th percentile in the pretest while six others scored below the 10th percentile. The Direct Instruction program, *Reasoning and Writing*, was then used on a
daily basis for a minimum of 30 minutes for six weeks. Teachers followed scripted lesson plans while another educator observed two days each week to ensure treatment fidelity. Using a different prompt, the TOWL-2 was given again as the posttest. The results demonstrated there was a significant gain in seven of the ten participants while only three showed loss. Anderson and Keel also report that, after using the Direct Instruction program, told their teachers that they felt they were better writers.

Researchers in another study used, the Direct Instruction program, *Reasoning and Writing*, to see if it would improve the written expression skills of gifted students. Ginn, Keel, and Fredrick (2002) explained that students identified as gifted can also have struggles with written expression. The researchers wanted to see if implementing *Reasoning and Writing* would improve the writing skills of 74 gifted fifth-grade students. The TOWL-3 was used as a pretest assessment as well as the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills (NJTRS).

The experimental group received instruction twice a week for two hours (covering two lessons each time) for ten weeks using the Direct Instruction program. Gifted teachers instruction the comparison group, using no specific content or uniformity of material. Results from the TOWL-3 showed that the experimental group had the lowest scores on the pretest, but ended the study with the highest scores. The NJTRS scores, however, did not show a significant improvement allowing, for the conclusion that *Reasoning and Writing* did improve writing skills of gifted students, but not their reasoning skills.

Martella and Waldron-Soler (2005) evaluated a Direct Instruction program, *Language for Writing*, which was completed in two parts. *Language for Writing* is
comprised of direct instruction lessons designed for students in grades two through five. The authors’ first evaluation took place in January through May of 2003 when the program was implemented in six classrooms. Five of the six classrooms were composed of 101 second graders placed in various general education classrooms. Classroom six was a self-contained, cross-categorical class with 16 third through fifth graders. Students in the general education lessons completed only half of the 140 lessons while classroom six completed all 140 lessons. Evaluation two contained 10 students from a third through fifth grade resource room as well as 17 second- and 57 third-grade students who received writing instruction in general education classrooms. A third grade classroom was the only participant in this evaluation to complete all 140 lessons while the other classes completed about half.

The TOWL-3 was given as a pretest and posttest in both evaluations. Program evaluations also took place on a regular basis, and at the end of every 10 lessons, students took a mastery test. Improvements were noted for each class from pretest to posttest, showing the positive correlation of the program implementation and better writing scores for a wide variety of students. Classroom six, the resource room, took posttest one and posttest two. While they showed initial improvement, it was noted that they did not maintain the increase in the overall scores between the two posttests.

Walker et al. (2005) conducted a study using a Direct Instruction program, Expressive Writing. This program was chosen for its use with children who are significantly behind in written expression (Walker et al). The purpose of this study was to see what effect this program would have on three high school students with learning disabilities in narrative writing. The three students had documented written
expression weaknesses and received special education services in the area of written expression in a special education setting for 90 minutes per day.

As a pretest, the placement test for *Expressive Writing* and Test of Written Language (TOWL-3) were given. Writing samples were collected weekly from students for the duration of the study. The writing samples consisted of giving students a topic sentence and instructing them to write about that topic. During the intervention phase of this study, students were instructed using lessons from *Expressive Writing*. Posttesting consisted of an alternative form of TOWL-3. Researchers saw an improvement in the number of correct writing sequences (CWS) for each student and gains in TOWL-3 scores between pre- and posttesting, thereby attributing improvements to the effective use of *Expressive Writing*.

The subjects felt as if they were better writers after using the *Expressive Writing* program and felt as though they would remember what they had learned next year as shared through social validity measures. Two of the three students also recommended that this program be used in the future.

*Curriculum-Based Measures*

Deno (1985) shares that evaluation is a necessary and important part of an educator’s job, and teachers often rely on evaluations to make instructional decisions. Achievement tests are evaluative tools used to evaluate the performances of individual students, teachers, schools, and school districts. Unfortunately, an achievement test is a complex, time-consuming procedure though it does compare a student to a normed group. This is of little benefit to a teacher wanting to see how the students are responding to their instruction on a frequent versus once yearly basis (Deno).
Standardized tests rarely seem to relate to the tasks found in writing class and the range of scoring possibilities on the rubrics seem unequitable (Gansle, Noell, VanDerHeyden, Naquin, & Slider, 2002). In addition, these tests are not designed to be administered in short cycles (Gansle, et al., 2006), and results are often given after the student has already left the classroom for summer break.

Although these tests are reliable (Gansle, et al., 2006; Deno, 1985), they are not useful when it comes to revealing writing changes that occur on a daily basis (Gansle et al., 2006; Gansle et al. 2002). “Commercially distributed tests” have made educators see the need for “competency tests” (Deno, p. 219). Several researchers at the University of Minnesota developed valid and effective evaluative measures for teachers (Deno). The measures needed to be reliable and valid so that they could be accepted as evidence for making decisions regarding instruction (Deno; Espin, Shin, Deno, Skare, Robinson, & Benner, 2000). They also had to be simple and efficient so that teachers would be able to use them frequently to monitor the progress of each of their students (Deno, 1985; Fewster & MacMillan, 2002). It was also essential that the results be easily understood so as to clearly and effectively communicated to parents, administrators, and others, including the students themselves (Deno; Espin et al., 2000). Finally, these measures needed to be inexpensive as they needed to be administered regularly (Deno; Fewster & MacMillian). Teachers tend to more widely use and accept curriculum-based measures as opposed to norm-referenced or published tests (Gansle et al., 2006; Gansle et al., 2002).

Curriculum-based measurement (CBM) is a measurement method employing multiple instructional probes administered repeatedly, recording data that reflects
student progress (or lack thereof), and using the data to make subsequent educational decisions (McMaster & Espin, 2007; Espin et al., 2000). There are several benefits to using curriculum-based measurement. First, CBM is practical and helpful to use in the classroom because it allows the teacher to conduct assessments on a regular basis, which aids in making daily and weekly instructional decisions (Deno, 1985). Also, data are clearly and simply displayed on a graph in order to quickly communicate results to others (Deno; Hintze, Christ, & Methe, 2006). If the data shows that a student is not making progress, then the current instructional program should be modified (Espin et al.). Graphing curriculum-based measures also allows others to quickly and easily distinguish among different groups of students, a useful strategy for identifying students at-risk. Another beneficial feature of CBM is that it is used to evaluate performance over time, allowing ongoing, informed decision-making rather than quick, one-time assessments (Hintze et al.).

CBM “represents a set of standardized and specific measurement procedures that can be used to quantify student performance in the basic academic skill areas of reading, spelling, mathematics computation, and written expression” (Hintze et al., 2006, p. 51). Deno (1985) argues that curriculum-based measures are effective because they show an individual’s current rate of progress within the curriculum. There is a significant amount of literature regarding CBM in reading (Gansle et al., 2002; Fewster & MacMillan, 2002) and mathematics, but much less in the area of written expression (Gansle et al., 2002). Gansle et al. (2006) recommended that total words written, number of words spelled correctly, correct word sequences, and correct
letter sequences should be curriculum-based measures in written expression for middle and high school students.

Gansle et al. (2002) conducted a predictor-criterion study to see if there was a relationship with CBM scores in written expression that focus on skills such as total words written, parts of speech used correctly, punctuation marks (total number and correct usage), correct capitalization, complete sentences written, number of words in complete sentences, and words in correct sequence to standardized writing skills tests. Two three-minute writing probes were given on two consecutive days (Gansle et al.). When scores from the participants’ three-minute writing prompts were compared with scores from the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, the largest correlations were between writing with correct punctuation marks (.36 and .44) and words written in correct sequence (.36 and .43).

Espin et al. (2000) developed a study to identify the best curriculum-based, quantitative indicators of middle school students’ performance in written expression. There were 112 sixth, seventh, and eighth graders that participated in the study by completing four writing samples. Participants were given a journal prompt, 30 seconds to think about that prompt, and then three or five minutes (depending on the prompt) to write using the journal prompt as the opening sentence. The writing samples were scored for number of words written and correct word sequences (CWS). The researchers found that CWS minus IWS (incorrect word sequences) had the highest reliability of other writing skills assessed. They concluded “that correct minus incorrect word sequences can be used as an indicator of students’ writing proficiency” (Espin et al., 2000, p. 152).
Purpose

The purpose of the current study was to examine the effects of administering a scripted program on the quality and quantity of written expression outcomes as measured by total words written and number of correct minus incorrect writing sequences. Middle school students were provided written expression instruction using a commercial writing program, *Expressive Writing 2*. Weekly writing prompts were delivered and student writing samples then analyzed.

Research Questions

The following were focus questions of this study:

1. What are the effects of a scripted presentation program on the total number of correct minus incorrect writing sequences (CIWS) in weekly writing samples produced by middle school students?

2. What are the effects of a scripted presentation program on the total number of words written in weekly writing samples produced by middle school students?

3. What are the students’ opinions about a scripted presentation program for writing and their perceptions of their own writing after using a scripted program?

4. What are the teachers’ opinions about a scripted program for writing?
CHAPTER 2

Methods

This chapter describes the institutional review board approval and their required forms, participants, subjects, setting, and researchers in the study. There is also a definition of the variables and how they were measured along with procedures for data collection. Materials, the experimental design, and interobserver agreements as well as treatment integrity and social validity specific to this study are also discussed.

Institutional Review Board

The Ohio State University has several procedures that must be put into place before any research can take place. The Office of Responsible Research Practices (ORRP), which provides administrative help, makes sure that all ethical procedures are followed, looks for research compliance, and oversees all research projects. This office is comprised of smaller boards that guide various projects. For this study, we worked with the Institutional Review Board. A description of the process follows.
IRB Approval. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviews research proposals that involve human subjects to ensure sufficient protection from harm as well as the potential for benefit are in place before humans are able to participate in research of any kind. They also ensure that all participants are fully aware of potential risks and benefits and that they have given their permission for the researchers to use and publish any of their results. The researchers had to wait for the IRB review and approval before moving forward. The IRB then explained that all investigators and key personnel who would participate in the study must be appropriately trained in the protection of human subjects. This is done through CITI training (see below). Research proposals were submitted, reviewed, modified, and resubmitted. After everything was approved, and researchers were cleared after training, we were given permission to begin the study. The study was assigned a number, and the researchers made copies of the consent forms. The required forms are included in the materials list and appendix. Finally, the board (IRB) does request that any changes to the study must be submitted to them for approval before applying those changes.

CITI training. After contacting the Office of Responsible Research Practices (ORRP) through The Ohio State University, the researchers had to participate in training sessions. The Ohio State University uses the Collaborative IRB Training Initiative (CITI) to train individuals for research. CITI is a web-based course that is used to satisfy the requirement for OSU researchers for training in human research subjects’ protection. This training is required before any research can commence and must be reviewed and renewed every three years.
Individuals new to the research field begin with a basic human research course. The course has two tracks— a biomedical and a social / behavioral track. Based on the kind of research needed for this study, the researchers selected the social / behavioral track. There were sixteen required modules along with several additional optional modules. Each module took between 10 to 30 minutes to complete with most ending with an assessment quiz. The entire track did not need to be completed in one setting. An individual needed to score a minimum average score of 80% on the modules in order to pass the course.

Setting

The study was conducted in a public middle school in a Midwestern urban school district enrolling approximately 7,000 students in grades K-12. The school in which the study took place had an approximate enrollment of 450 students in grades 6 through 8, and of those students, 21% qualified for special education services. 66% qualified for free or reduced lunches and were classified as economically disadvantaged. 87% percent of the students were Caucasian, 5% African-American, 6% Multi-Racial, and 2% Native American.

According to the state report card, the school was classified under Continuous Improvement status, failing to meet all the standards set forth by the Ohio Department of Education to show students have made adequate yearly progress (AYP) compared to the previous year. There are 10 indicators for middle schools:

- minimum of 75% passage on 6th grade Reading and Math achievement tests,
- minimum of 75% passage rate on 7th grade Reading, Writing, and Math tests,
minimum of 75% passage on 8th grade Reading, Math, Social Studies, and Science, and

- meet minimum 93% state requirement for attendance.

The school met 2 of the possible 10 indicators:

- 77% of 7th graders passed the Mathematics achievement test and
- building had 94% of students in attendance.

The student body did not meet standards in the other 8 areas, including 6th grade Reading and Math, 7th grade Reading and Writing, and 8th grade Reading, Math, Social Studies, and Science.

This study began in September of the 2007-2008 school year. Participants were receiving language arts instruction in one of three classrooms: (1) Classroom A – 6th grade inclusion; (2) Classroom B – 7th/8th grade resource room; and (3) Classroom C – 7th grade inclusion. All of the classrooms teachers taught reading and writing during a ninety-minute language arts period.

Participants and Subjects

The researchers met with the principal before the school year began and explained the purpose of the study. The principal determined what classrooms would be candidates for this study, and each of the three chosen teachers gave consent to participate. There were 29 participants from Classroom A, 25 from Classroom B, and 11 from Classroom C. The participants ranged in age from 11 to 15 years old. All students from the three classrooms participated in the activities of the study. Target students were chosen from each of the three classrooms based on an examination of the data as the study progressed.
Since all of the participants were minors, parents gave written permission for their child’s participation. Parent consent and student assent were needed to include a child as a possible subject in the study. In the case that a parent had requested that he or she did not want his/her child to participate, we honored the parent’s non-consent even if the child assented. If a parent gave consent, and the child did not want to participate, we honored the child’s non-assent. Subjects became those who assented and had parent consent. As the study went on, several students were excluded due to high absenteeism. The participants needed to have at least three data points in the baseline and then the intervention phase. If they had fewer than three data points, they were excluded from being subjects in this study.

There were four subjects from classroom A, five from classroom B, and six from classroom C. They ranged in age from 11 to 15 and were in sixth, seventh, or eighth grade. There was a mixture of males and females selected, although the males outnumbered females. Table 2.1 shows the demographics for these students.
Table 2.1

*Student Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Experimenter**

The teacher-researcher possesses a bachelor’s degree in Elementary and Special Education from Edinboro University of Pennsylvania and a 5-year teaching license in both Elementary (K-8) and Special Education (K-12) in Ohio. She has 8 years of teaching experience at the K-6 levels. The teacher-researcher is currently a graduate student pursuing a master’s degree. This study was part of the thesis requirement for earning the Master of Arts degree in Integrated Teaching and Learning. The teacher-researcher’s faculty advisor was also a researcher in this study.

**Data Collectors**

There were three data collectors for this study. Each data collector was trained by the faculty researcher to score student writing samples. All data collectors met accuracy criteria during training, which was three consecutive scoring sessions in which the trainer and data collector had 90% or better agreement. To reduce scoring bias, the data collectors were not informed of the purpose of the study until after its completion.

**Dependent Variables**

The researchers chose to focus on two dependent variables: the number of correct writing sequences minus incorrect writing sequences (CIWS) and the number of total words written (TWW).

*Correct writing sequences minus incorrect writing sequences (CIWS)*

A correct writing sequence was defined as two adjacent writing units (words and punctuation) that were correct within the context of written material. When scoring using correct writing sequences (CWS), the data collectors examined each pair.
of words. For a pair of words to be marked as correct, each word had to be correctly spelled, capitalized, and punctuated. A sequence containing a correctly spelled word and the appropriate punctuation mark was marked as a correct writing sequence. For example, in the sentence *John_play_well_with_his_cousin_Sue_*., there are seven possible sequences as indicated by the underscores. The first sequence, *John and play*, is incorrect because in no context is that sequence correct (i.e., *plays* or *played* should have been written). The next sequence between *play* and *well* is correct as the data collectors look only at each sequence within the context of what is written. The third sequence, *well and with*, is also correct. The fourth sequence, *with and his*, is correct. The next sequence, *his and cousin*, is incorrect because “cousin” is misspelled. For the same reason, the final sequence that followed, *cousin* and *Sue*, are also incorrect.

When scoring the student samples, the data collectors used a caret to mark correct writing sequences and a minus sign for incorrect writing sequences. Both were tallied, and the number of correct sequences minus the number of incorrect sequences (CIWS) were recorded. In summation, this sentence has 3 CWS and 4 IWS; therefore, the above example CIWS is recorded as -1.

*Number of total words written (TWW)*

A word was defined as a series of letters separated from another series of letters by a space. The total number of words written (TWW) in each sample was counted by a data collector. Abbreviations and initials were counted as a word (e.g., OH for Ohio). An exception to the initial rule was that if the initials were a name, they counted as one word (e.g., A.A. Milne would count as only two words). To ensure
accuracy, TWW was counted twice. If the first two counts were different, the data collector counted a third time. Fourth counts were never necessary.

**Independent Variable**

The independent variable in this study was the use of a scripted curriculum for writing instruction.

*Expressive Writing 2*

*Expressive Writing 2* (Englemann & Silbert, 2005) is a direct instruction method of teaching published by SRA. This program was selected for its focus on the following: writing clearly (including the use of pronouns and needed details); writing with a variety of sentences (sentences beginning with a dependent clause, sentences containing a series, and some compound sentences); writing what people say (and appropriately paragraphing their conversations); and editing for clarity, punctuation, paragraphs, and sentence forms (Engleman & Silbert).

This program has several components and requirements which must be fulfilled in order for the program to work to its full potential. The components are: (1) an exact script to follow for teaching of new material as well as reviewing previously learned material; (2) whole group choral responding; (3) individual responses; (4) immediate feedback from the teacher after each group or individual response; and (5) statements of praise (Engleman & Silbert, 2005).

*Experimental Design*

Each experiment is unique and created to find out an unknown (Sidman, 1960). The very first thing to decide upon in an experiment is research methods. Research studies fall into one of five categories: (a) basic research, which is conducted for
developing or refining a theory; (b) applied research, which is carried out for the
purpose of applying a theory to determine its use in solving a problem; (c) evaluation
research, in which the researcher collects and analyzes data about the quality, merit,
and effectiveness of a certain program or practice; (d) research and development,
which is the process of researching consumer needs and developing a product that will
fulfill those needs; and (e) action research, a systematic inquiry that teachers use to
solve everyday problems in their own settings (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006).

In qualitative research, a hypothesis is rarely stated before data is collected to
allow the research problems and methods to evolve as the research deepens (Gay, et
al., 2006; Kazdin, 1982). Qualitative research gives narrative information and relies
heavily on description that defines an individual’s perspective on a given topic (Gay et
al.). The number of participants or sample sizes tend to be extremely small in this type
of research due to the time-intensive data collection procedures (Gay et al.; Kazdin).
An example of this kind of research is teachers’ reactions and thoughts of
implementing a new program (Cook, Tankersley, Cook, & Landrum, 2008); whereas,
quantitative research would empirically demonstrate whether the new program was
making a difference or not (Gay et al.). Cook et al. argued that qualitative studies are
important and offer insights, but they cannot determine if the practice is what caused
the difference in student outcomes.

Gay, et al.(2006) explained that quantitative researchers usually state a
hypothesis before beginning the research and tend to use more participants in order to
provide meaningful statistics. Control within an experiment is clearly shown in
quantitative studies, and the data clearly shows whether or not the practice is what
made the difference in the outcomes of individuals (Cook, et al., 2008; Kazdin, 1982; Sidman, 1960). The single subject design for this study is quantitative, although, it looks different from the above description. There was neither a hypothesis nor a large number of participants in this research.

In experimental research, the researcher manipulates a minimum of one independent variable while observing the effect of the said independent variable on one or more dependent variables, all while controlling any other variables which could interfere with the study (Gay, et al., 2006; Kadzin, 1982). Control within the experiment is shown by (a) comparing the outcomes of a group that uses an assigned practice against those that do not use the practice or (b) by comparing the individuals’ performances before and during the use of the assigned practice (Cook, et al., 2008). Experimental research offers generalizability due to the strong evidence produced and the ability to link variables together (Gay et al.; Sidman, 1960) Therefore, these methods also offer educators, researchers, and parents assurance that the instructional methods were the cause of improved outcomes (Cook, et al. 2008; Tankersley, Harjusola-Webb, & Landrum, 2008). Cook et al. explained that whether or not a practice is effective in improving students’ outcomes can be determined through this type of design as opposed to qualitative research, which would tell a person how the participants felt about the practice.

Single-subject design allows participants to be comparisons for themselves (Tankersley, et al., 2008). They explain this type of research allows two different conditions- baseline and intervention- to be observed. Baseline is observation of the participant in the setting before any intervention begins. These observations occur for
a set period of time until the behavior is stable and predictable (Tankersley, et al.)

There are different designs when it comes to single subject research. Typically, non-treatment phases are symbolized as A and treatment conditions as B (Gay, et al., 2006). Sometimes these are simply designed (e.g., A-B design) or more detailed with multiple baselines and/or treatments (A-B-A-B design).

This study used a multiple baseline across subjects design. In multiple-baseline designs, the effects of intervention are observed as the intervention is applied to different baselines (i.e., subjects) at different points in time (Kazdin, 1982). Kazdin explained that “a clear effect is evident if performance changes when and only when the intervention is applied” (p. 150). If the clear effect is repeated with each subject, the researcher can credit the intervention, rather than extraneous events with the change in behavior (Kazdin), and the generality of the results removes the question of why (Sidman, 1960).

The multiple baseline across subjects design begins with observing the same behaviors of each subject (Horner, Carr, Halle, McGee, Odom, & Wolery, 2005; Kazdin, 1982). Once the behaviors of the individuals reaches a stable or consistent and predictable rate, then the intervention is applied to only one subject (or group), while the others continue under baseline conditions (Horner et al.; Kazdin; Sidman, 1960). The only people’s behaviors expected to change are those of the subjects in intervention; thus, giving credit to the intervention in place. Kazdin continued by explaining that when that subjects’ behaviors again stabilize, then the intervention is extended to another, and this procedure continues until all subjects for whom baseline data is collected have moved into intervention.
A benefit to this design includes the ease of seeing an individual’s change in behavior after intervention has begun since data is graphed as it is collected. “Single subject research designs compare performance during baseline condition, and then contrast this pattern with performance under an intervention condition” (Horner, et al., 2005, p.168). Another major benefit to this design is that once the intervention is implemented, it is unnecessary to withdraw the intervention in order to return to baseline, eliminating ethical concerns raised with withdrawing an effective intervention (Kazdin, 1982). Important to practitioners, multiple-baseline designs can be used in classrooms where the performance of a particular target behavior is a priority for all members (Kazdin). Single-subject research is experimental and relies on empirical data rather than descriptive, and its purpose is to document relationships between the independent and dependent variables (Sidman, 1960).

Single-subject designs look at behavior changes that either an individual or a group possess after intervention is put into place (Tankersley, et al., 2008; Gay, et al., 2006; Horner, et al., 2005; Kazdin, 1982). Some consider single-subject design to be a radical departure from traditional group research (Kazdin). There are some research questions that may look to be best answered in a group design; however, the group design was not right for this study. In fact, Gay et al. explained it is not ethically appropriate as it would result in a control group who would not receive the experimental treatment.

The independent variable, commonly known as “treatment” in educational research, is the characteristic that differentiates experimental research from other research (Gay, et al., 2006) and must be what is used to separate and differentiate
among individuals (Sidman, 1960). The independent variable in single-subject design experiments is most often the practice or intervention that is being monitored (Horner, et al., 2005). Horner et al. explained that the independent variable should be clearly defined so valid results can be figured and exact replication could occur in the future.

The dependent variable is called so because the results of this variable are dependent upon the independent variable (Gay, et al., 2006; Kadzin, 1982). Gay et al. emphasized that the only restriction placed on dependent variables in this design is that it represents a measurable outcome. In most cases, the dependent variable is an observable behavior (Horner, et al., 2005). Single-subject designs may contain more than one dependent variable, which are measured repeatedly to identify how the student is performing prior to an intervention’s implementation and to allow a comparison of that behavior across the different conditions and stages of the experiment. Again, Horner et al. explained that dependent variables, like independent variables, need to be clearly defined.

One educational research project cannot “prove” without a shadow of a doubt that the intervention in the experiment was successful and effective (Cook, et al., 2008) as those results could have been out of the norm. “No single evidence-based practice will be appropriate for each student, and special educators will use their professional expertise to determine which evidence-based practices to use and when to use them” (Cook, et al., p.68). Evidence-based practices should not ultimately change how educators teach, but, instead, it should offer insight into effective programs that can guide educational decisions (Cook, et al.). Single-subject designs can be very helpful to special education teachers since they focus on each child’s individual needs.
(Tankersley, et al., 2008; Gay, et al., 2006; Horner, et al., 2005). This design is a match for special education because it focuses on the individual student, allows analysis of responders versus nonresponders, and it provides a practical methodology for testing and assessing students (Horner et al.)

**Materials**

*Teacher packets*

The packets comprised of a letter explaining the study, the procedures they as teachers would be directly affected by such as the process of completing the weekly prompts. They received a scheduled list of the writing prompts, packages of lined paper, boxes of pencils, and a personal note from the researchers. The prompts were purchased from aimsweb.com.

*Parent permission packets* *(see Appendix B and C)*

Since the participants are minors, parents needed to review all the materials related to the study before giving permission in writing for the researchers to review their child’s writing and to publish it if applicable. Another letter was attached to this required form from the school to aid parents in understanding what all the paperwork was about.

*Training Manual* *(see Appendix D)*

The teacher-researcher created a training manual that was used to train the teachers who would be delivering the scripted curriculum.

*Student Workbooks*

Each student participant used an *Expressive Writing 2* workbook, which are consumable books that the students wrote in each time a lesson was delivered.
Teaching Manual

Each teacher or researcher implementing or observing the intervention used an Expressive Writing teacher’s manual.

Lined paper

Lined paper was required for the weekly three-minute prompts as well as for paragraph writing that took place in each scripted lesson of the Expressive Writing 2 program. The lined paper was wide-ruled and loose-leaf.

Pencils

The pencils were #2 sharpened, lead pencils with erasers.

Manila file folders

The researchers had a supply of manila file jackets used to organize the weekly writing samples.

Timer

A timer was used to start the writing prompt, notify students of remaining time, and to stop writing for all participants at the designated time.

Weekly Prompts

Standard writing assessment story starters were used for this study (see Appendix A). Story starters were randomly assigned a number to match the number of weeks in the study.

Data Collection Procedures

For the students in each of the three classrooms participating in the study, writing samples were collected on a weekly basis using three-minute prompts (See Appendix A) beginning in the baseline condition. The prompts were given on either a
Thursday or a Friday, collected, and given to the teacher-researcher who then
delivered them to the data collector. The data collector first placed the student initials,
date, and class at the bottom of the page, and then ran two copies. Original writing
samples were stored for safekeeping. The data collector cut off the students’ names
from the tops of the writing samples to protect confidentiality. Samples were scored
for total number of words written (TWW) and correct minus incorrect writing
sequences (CIWS). Subjects were moved into intervention when baseline data
stabilized or showed a decreasing trend, and data collection continued in the same
manner during intervention. It should be noted that subjects were moved into
intervention by class, so not every subject’s data may have shown a need for
intervention at the time of placement. The class moved into intervention when the
majority of subjects showed the need.

Procedures

Pre-baseline

Teachers were chosen to participate based on the principal’s recommendations.
Each participating teacher was asked to write a one-page explanation of how he/she
typically teach writing. Teachers received a scheduled list of the writing prompts,
packages of lined paper, boxes of sharpened pencils, and a timer. Notes and small gifts
of appreciation were given throughout the study to encourage and thank them for
continuing in the study.

Parental permission forms went home to all students in the three classrooms.
The form explained the purpose of the study, potential risks and benefits, and stated
the procedures and duration of the study. Parents were informed that choosing to
participate or not in this study would be of no harm to their child, and they could withdraw at any time. The researchers also felt it was important to add letters from the principal and teachers to help explain the wordiness in the required forms from the IRB. In order to encourage as many students as possible to return completed forms, whether giving permission or not, they were promised a full-size candy bar upon the form’s return with a parent signature within three school days.

Students were also asked to give permission to participate in the study. The teacher-researcher went around to each student and asked whether or not they gave permission. In the case that a parent had requested that they did not want their child to participate, we honored the parent’s request. If a parent wanted their child to participate, and the child did not give permission, we honored the child’s request. The students who were subjects in the study gave their own permission while parent permission was also attained.

The teacher participants were told to continue teaching written expression as they always had until receiving further notice. The only difference in their plans was to include time to give a three-minute writing prompt. Students in the inclusion classrooms received instruction from a district-adopted reading anthology including a written expression component. The teachers had the choice to supplement the writing in the anthology with other commercial methods such as Six Traits of Writing or to follow the Literacy Collaborative format taught in younger grades. Students in the resource room received instruction in a reading and writing workshop format.
Baseline

The teacher in Classroom A was one of the researchers in this study. The teacher-researcher typically taught 6th grade Language Arts by beginning class with a journal prompt. Students were given ten to fifteen minutes to write and were graded on completion only, not for content quality. Students were then given approximately fifteen minutes of word study instruction, usually focused on a weekly spelling principle, with a test every Friday. Reading instruction followed for approximately thirty to forty minutes, focusing on skills aligned with several of the state standards. At times, there was a focus on writing within the reading time, i.e., students practicing answering short or extended response questions. Written expression instruction was also based on the state academic standards. A genre was selected, a large writing project was planned, and then students received instruction on how to write in that genre. Mini-lessons were also taught to support students on other skills such as editing, revising, capitalization, and using sentence variation, either as a whole group, in small guided groups, or one-on-one. This classroom consisted of two teachers, the teacher-researcher and an Intervention Specialist; they taught cooperatively, teaching and reteaching, directing, and/or assisting students.

The teacher in Classroom B had a varied curriculum for her students since it was a combined 7th and 8th grade resource room class. There were a wide variety of abilities with students functioning two to three grade levels apart from one another while all of them were at least three levels below that of their same-grade peers, determined by formal testing in multifactored evaluations and/or through informal measurements (e.g., Brigance Inventory of Basic Skills). Some of the students
received instruction in small guided groups using trade books and short chapter books while others received instruction through a commercial program that stressed mnemonic clues to assist them through the grade-level literacy program. This class also had a weekly spelling list of basic sight words and completed reading comprehension worksheets. These worksheets allowed for some written expression practice as they wrote to answer questions or answered creative writing prompts. Most writing instruction centered on a sentence starter and formula writing (e.g., topic sentence, three example sentences, summary sentence) for the capable students.

Language Arts in Classroom C was similar to Classroom A. The seventh grade teacher and Intervention Specialist chose lessons to match state standards and district-adopted anthology. Students completed a DLR (Daily Language Review; e.g., correcting capitalization and punctuation within a sentence, identifying parts of speech, and/or changing word tense) upon entering the classroom and received a completion grade on this activity. A writing project was completed every two to three weeks. Following a writing workshop format, the class progressed through each step of the writing process. Every student conferenced with a teacher during the process before turning in a final paper. Reading instruction focused on building comprehension skills. The classroom teacher attempted to emphasize the interrelatedness of reading and writing by having students answer questions about what they had read.

Each teacher utilized the researcher delivered prompt to collect weekly writing samples during baseline. The data collector calculated and recorded the scores. The researchers reviewed the data and met to discuss what students were remaining stable
or decreasing in the variables being evaluated. When at least 50% of the subjects in a given classroom showed the need for intervention, they were moved into intervention as a class. The other classrooms stayed in baseline until they had data demonstrating the need to be moved intervention just as it was done for Classroom A.

**Intervention**

The intervention phase consisted of delivering a whole group, scripted writing instruction program using the *Expressive Writing 2* curriculum. Students received this instruction during their literacy block. Instruction took place a minimum of three days in a given week with most lessons lasting approximately 50 minutes. The lesson time began with a distribution of workbooks.

Each lesson had two basic parts: a skill part and a passage writing part (Engleman & Silbert, 1983). The skills section included 3-5 exercises designed to teach specific subskills that students needed for writing passages (e.g., using capitals and periods, correcting run-ons, rewriting in past tense, and using pronouns). Each skill lesson involved the teacher stating and explaining the rule, giving an example or two, and then asking for whole-group or individual answers with those practice items. Students then completed several items independently; items related to that skill were checked before moving on to the next. Throughout each of these lessons, the teacher was to follow the script, including giving praise each time the class or a student responded correctly or giving corrective feedback to all incorrect responses.

The passage writing exercise section gave students the opportunity to apply the taught subskills to a paragraph (Engleman & Silbert, 1983). Early in the program, the section contained a lesson called *Preparing to Write a Paragraph*. In it, class members
went through each picture, discussed what they saw, and shared sentences that told about the picture(s). The teacher then shared a sample paragraph story before students began to write their own paragraphs. The teacher would then direct students to touch the words in the vocabulary box as each word was read. Reminders to indent, start each sentence with a capital letter, and begin with the main idea were also given. Students were given paper and pencils and told they would have ten minutes to write their paragraphs. The teacher used the timer to keep time. After the ten minutes were up, several students were asked to share their paragraphs. Their classmates were to find things that were good about the paragraph and things that needed revising. The teacher would then instruct students to place the given number of checkboxes at the bottom of their paragraphs. Each student workbook contained an editing checklist of 3-5 things students should have done in their paragraph (e.g., using capital letters, indenting the paragraph, reporting on what the picture showed). The teacher read through each check, and the student took a moment to review his/her paper and make corrections as needed. After correctly completing the item, the student placed a check in his/her checkbox. At the end of the lesson, the workbooks and paragraphs were then collected.

Once a teacher began instruction using the scripted writing program, she was to stop delivering any other forms of writing instruction until the end of the study. Each classroom participating in the study continued using the weekly three-minute prompts from the schedule.
Social Validity

A social validity questionnaire was delivered at the conclusion of the study. Teachers and student subjects were asked questions about this program as well as their opinions on its level of effectiveness. Teachers gave this to the subjects during a writing class. The participants were also asked if they enjoyed the program. The student questionnaire consisted of seven statements that students rated on a Likert scale of 1 – 4. They were then given two short sentence starters to complete as short answers. The teacher questionnaire consisted of 15 statements which were rated on a 1 – 4 Likert scale. A 1 on the scale was marked disagree and a 4 was agree. Examples of the survey given to teachers and students are attached (see Appendix E and F).

Procedural Integrity

Procedural integrity checks were created and completed throughout the study to ensure that there was no significant threat to integrity. The teacher-researcher made sure that the weekly writing prompts were administered on either Thursday or Friday of each week. Both the primary and secondary researchers used a teacher’s manual to follow the scripted lessons and checked off the required elements in the lessons. Those observations were documented within the teacher manual and later transferred into a chart to show percentages of agreements between the prescribed script and teacher’s delivery.

Interobserver Agreement

The faculty researcher scored several samples each week and compared her results with the data collector. The low and high comparison score was recorded and
charted along with a mean of agreement each week. The data was recorded into a chart (see Appendix G).
CHAPTER 3

Results

This chapter examines the interobserver agreement, procedural integrity, results of each participant in the study, and social validity.

*Interobserver agreement*

The faculty researcher scored a minimum of 20% of the weekly writing samples. Results were compared to those of a second data collector. An item-by-item comparison was conducted to determine IOA on Correct minus Incorrect Writing Sequences (CIWS).

*CIWS*

Agreements and disagreements for each sequence were noted and recorded. The researchers calculated interobserver agreement (IOA) by dividing agreements plus disagreements multiplied by 100. IOA was conducted on 27.3% of subject samples from the entire study. The IOA for CIWS scoring ranged from 70% to 100% with the weekly mean never falling below 84.5%.
**TWW**

For IOA, the total words written were counted once by the faculty researcher. If there was a match to the data collector that number was recorded. If it was not a match, TWW was counted again to establish a match. Further counts were never necessary.

**Procedural integrity**

An observer witnessed 20 lesson deliveries to ensure the procedural integrity of the study. Each scripted step was marked off as the teacher completed it word for word. There was an 88.6% match to what was said and what should have been. Praise rates averaged 71.2%.

**Dependent variables - CIWS**

Students were moved into intervention by classroom when the majority of the students showed stable or decreasing data. Figures 3.1-3.3 show a sampling of CIWS results. Graphs not shown here can be found in Appendix J.
Figure 3.1: Sample student graphs for those the intervention had a noticeable positive effect.
Figure 3.2: Sample student graphs for those the intervention had some positive effects
Figure 3.3: Sample student graphs for those the intervention had little effect
Positive Effects

Results for CO’s CIWS data can be found in figure 3.1. CO’s baseline data for CIWS consisted of five data points which were stable with the last two points showed an ascending trend. During baseline, CIWS ranged from 6 to 21 with a mean of 13.4. Immediately upon the intervention being implemented, there was an increase in CIWS; however, the data did not remain on an ascending trend. The data during intervention was variable ranging from 6 to 42 with a mean of 29.28.

Results for KP’s CIWS data can be found in figure 3.1. KP’s baseline data for CIWS consisted of twelve data points. The first nine data points showed a decreasing trend with little variability; however, the last three points in baseline showed a definite ascending trend. During baseline, the range of CIWS was –27 to 10 with a mean of -11.8. During intervention, the data was relatively stable for four non-contiguous sessions followed by a one-data-point slight increase then a definite decrease. The range of CIWS during intervention was -10 to 4 with a mean of -1.9.

Results for BD’s CIWS data can be found in figure 3.1. BD’s baseline data for CIWS consisted of thirteen data points in which the data was stable throughout. During baseline, the range of CIWS was -4 to 28 with a mean of 9.2. During intervention, the data was variable with CIWS ranging from 1 to 22. The intervention CIWS mean was a 12.8.

Moderate Positive Effects

Results for CF’s CIWS data can be found in figure 3.2. CF’s baseline data for CIWS consisted of five data points. The last four data points showed a decreasing trend. During baseline, CIWS ranged from -14 to 9 with a mean of -3.2. During
intervention, the data was moderately variable. CIWS during intervention ranged from -8 to 24 with a mean of 4.6.

Results for SN’s CIWS data can be found in figure 3.2. SN’s baseline CIWS data consisted of nine data points. The data remained stable throughout baseline ranging from -11 to 10 with a mean of 0.3. CIWS decreased after the intervention was implemented; however the data then took on an ascending trend. During intervention, CIWS ranged from -11 to 17 with a mean of 6.3.

Results for RE’s CIWS data can be found in figure 3.2. RE’s baseline data for CIWS consisted of ten data points. With one data point excluded, the data remained stable throughout baseline with CIWS ranging from -2 to 28. The baseline mean of CIWS was 16.1. After intervention, the data showed a descending trend. The range of CIWS during intervention was 14 to 19 with a mean of 16.5.

Low Positive Effects

Results for KK’s CIWS data can be found in figure 3.3. KK’s baseline data for CIWS consisted of five data points which were stable. During baseline, CIWS ranged from -9 to 6 with a mean of -3.4. During intervention, CIWS continued to remain stable ranging from -15 to 0. The CIWS mean during intervention was -6.5.

Results for LR’s CIWS data can be found in figure 3.3. LR’s baseline CIWS data consisted of eleven data points. The data throughout baseline was stable with a range of CIWS form -40 to -9 with a mean of -19.9. After the intervention was implemented, there was an increase in CIWS; however, the data was moderately variable for the remainder of intervention. During intervention, the range of CIWS was -32 to 4 with a mean of -17.
Results for EC’s CIWS data can be found in figure 3.3. EC’s baseline data for CIWS consisted of eleven data points. The data would be considered stable if one data point is excluded. During baseline, CIWS ranged from -13 to 46 with a mean of 0.2. There was an increase in CIWS when intervention was implemented; however, a decreasing trend was evident during the intervention phase. The range of CIWS during intervention was -6 to 8 with a mean of 0.5.

*Dependent Variable - TWW*

Figures 3.4-3.6 show a sampling of TWW results. Just as explained previously, students were moved into intervention by classroom when the majority of the students showed the need. Graphs not shown here can be found in Appendix K.
Figure 3.4: Sample student graphs for those the intervention had a noticeable positive effect
Figure 3.5: Sample student graphs for those the intervention had some positive effects
Figure 3.6: Sample student graphs for those the intervention had little effect
Positive Effects

Results for CO’s TWW data can be found in figure 3.4. CO’s baseline data for TWW consisted of five data points. The data was stable throughout the baseline phase. The range of TWW was 34 to 42 with a mean of 36.4. During the intervention phase, the data proved to be variable. The range of TWW during intervention was 26 to 71 with a mean of 47.2.

Results for LR’s TWW data can be found in figure 3.4. LR’s baseline data for TWW consisted of eleven data points showing an ascending trend. During baseline, the range of TWW was 36 to 67 with a mean of 52.7. During intervention, the data was variable. The range of TWW during intervention was 39 to 91 with a mean of 65.1.

Results for TJF’s TWW data can be found in figure 3.4. TJF’s baseline data for TWW consisted of sixteen data points which were highly variable. During baseline, the range of TWW was 4 to 74 with a mean of 51.8. After intervention, the data became stable. The range of TWW during intervention was 62 to 73 with a mean of 69.

Moderate Positive Effects

Results for CF’s TWW data can be found in figure 3.5. CF’s baseline data for TWW consisted of five data points showing an ascending trend. During baseline, the range of TWW was 32 to 47 with a mean of 40.4. During the first four sessions of the intervention phase, the data were variable and the trend was descending. The data pattern was variable for the remainder of intervention. The range of TWW during intervention was 23 to 88 with a mean of 47.8.
Results for MR’s TWW data can be found in figure 3.5. MR’s baseline data for TWW consisted of thirteen data points, with a bifurcation of the data at about the halfway point of baseline sessions. The first 6 data points showed a distinct ascending trend while the remaining seven data points show some variability with a slightly decreasing trend. During baseline, the range of TWW was 22 to 70 with a mean of 42.9. TWW increased as soon as the intervention was implemented and throughout intervention, the data was moderately variable. The mean TWW during intervention was 41.3 with a range of 24 to 53.

Results for BD’s TWW data can be found in figure 3.5. BD’s baseline data for TWW consisted of thirteen data points which were variable but showed an ascending trend. During baseline, the range of TWW was 15 to 49 with a mean of 32.5. During intervention, the data was variable with a range of TWW being 16 to 53. The mean of TWW during intervention was 43.

Low Positive Effects

Results for TH’s TWW data can be found in figure 3.6. TH’s baseline data for TWW consisted of five data points. The first four data points showed a definite ascending trend followed by a descent with the final data point in baseline. The range of TWW during baseline was 19 to 47 with a mean of 29.6. During intervention, the data pattern was stable. The range of TWW during intervention was 16 to 41 with a mean of 31.9.

Results for CM’s TWW data can be found in figure 3.6. CM’s baseline data for TWW consisted of fifteen data points. The data was greatly variable throughout the baseline phase with TWW ranging from 40 to 100. The baseline mean of TWW was
56.2. During intervention, the data although variable showed an ascending trend. The range of TWW during intervention was 34 to 78 with a mean of 52.8.

Results for EC’s TWW data can be found in figure 3.6. EC’s baseline data for TWW consisted of eleven data points. Throughout baseline, the data was variable with the range of TWW being 0 to 56. The 0 was earned on a day when EC refused to write. The baseline mean of TWW was 32.9. During intervention, the data was stable. The range of TWW during intervention was 31 to 41 with a mean of 37.3.

Social Validity

Tables 3.1-3.4 show the survey responses from the students. Student surveys were given to the subjects in the study and told that we would like their honest answers. We kept the survey anonymous so the student would feel comfortable stating what they truly felt. The students circled their response on a Likert scale with 1 meaning “I disagree” with the statement and a 4 meaning “I agree” with the statement. Actual surveys used can be found in Appendix E.
1. The Expressive Writing Program was a good way for me to learn how to write sentences.  

2. The Expressive Writing Program was a good way for me to learn how to write paragraphs.  

3. I think learning how to write paragraphs will help me do better in school.  

4. I think I’m a better writer now than I was at the beginning of the year.  

5. I think I’m a better writer now than I was before my teacher started using the Expressive Writing Program.  

6. I liked using the Expressive Writing Program.  

7. I learned a lot about writing from the Expressive Writing Program.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Student 1</th>
<th>Student 2</th>
<th>Student 3</th>
<th>Student 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Expressive Writing Program was a good way for me to learn how to write sentences.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Expressive Writing Program was a good way for me to learn how to write paragraphs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I think learning how to write paragraphs will help me do better in school.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think I’m a better writer now than I was at the beginning of the year.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I think I’m a better writer now than I was before my teacher started using the Expressive Writing Program.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I liked using the Expressive Writing Program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I learned a lot about writing from the Expressive Writing Program.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Student Survey Results from Classroom A

1- I disagree   4- I agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Student 1</th>
<th>Student 2</th>
<th>Student 3</th>
<th>Student 4</th>
<th>Student 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Expressive Writing Program was a good way for me to learn how to write sentences.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Expressive Writing Program was a good way for me to learn how to write paragraphs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I think learning how to write paragraphs will help me do better in school.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think I’m a better writer now than I was at the beginning of the year.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I think I’m a better writer now than I was before my teacher started using the Expressive Writing Program.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I liked using the Expressive Writing Program.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I learned a lot about writing from the Expressive Writing Program.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Student Survey Results from Classroom B

1- I disagree  
4- I agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Student 1</th>
<th>Student 2</th>
<th>Student 3</th>
<th>Student 4</th>
<th>Student 5</th>
<th>Student 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Expressive Writing Program was a good way for me to learn how to write sentences.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Expressive Writing Program was a good way for me to learn how to write paragraphs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I think learning how to write paragraphs will help me do better in school.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think I’m a better writer now than I was at the beginning of the year.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I think I’m a better writer now than I was before my teacher started using the Expressive Writing Program.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I liked using the Expressive Writing Program.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I learned a lot about writing from the Expressive Writing Program.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Student Survey Results from Classroom C

1- I disagree 4- I agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Expressive Writing Program was a good way for me to learn how to write sentences.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Expressive Writing Program was a good way for me to learn how to write paragraphs.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I think learning how to write paragraphs will help me do better in school.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think I’m a better writer now than I was at the beginning of the year.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I think I’m a better writer now than I was before my teacher started using the Expressive Writing Program.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I liked using the Expressive Writing Program.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I learned a lot about writing from the Expressive Writing Program.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4: Mean Response from Student Surveys

1- I disagree        4- I agree
Student subjects also had an opportunity to complete two sentence starters. The first was to inquire what they liked about the *Expressive Writing Program* while the second hit on what parts of it they disliked. Again students were asked to write an honest answer and knew their name was not going to go on this. Responses from the student surveys are shown in Appendix H.

Teachers participating in the study were also given a chance to evaluate the program and tell the researchers their thoughts. A 15 question survey was created and teachers were asked to select their response on a Likert scale with 1 being “I disagree” and a 4 being “I agree”. The results of the teacher survey are shown in Appendix I.
CHAPTER 4

Discussion

In this chapter, results are discussed. Data is analyzed in response to the six research questions in Chapter 1. In addition, social validity and limitations to the study are explained, as well as implications for future research. This study examined the effects of a scripted writing program on the number of correct minus incorrect writing sequences (CIWS) and the number of total words written (TWW). The results indicate that the use of a scripted program was effective for some students as determined by an increase in CIWS and / or TWW. Since single-subject design was used, so we can easily see how effective the intervention was for each individual student. The students for whom the intervention was successful increased their mean CIWS from their baseline mean. The intervention was not successful for some students who ended up decreasing their CIWS. These results are not consistent with previous studies conducted. However, the researchers did not implement the independent variable with fidelity. Walker, et al., 2005) found that the scripted writing program, Expressive Writing, was an effective intervention for their three subjects as indicated by an
increase in CIWS and scores on the Test of Written Language (TOWL-3). It was the desire of the researchers to replicate and expand upon the study conducted by Walker, et al. The researchers wanted to see if similar results could be achieved in a whole-group (inclusion) classroom, a more realistic setting for students with learning disabilities and those at-risk.

Research Question 1: What are the effects of a scripted presentation program on the total number of correct minus incorrect writing sequences (CIWS) in weekly writing samples produced by middle school students?

Scripted programs have proven to be successful in increasing CIWS (e.g., Walker, et al., 2005), so the experimenter hoped for the same in this study. The results of this study indicate that the intervention was effective in increasing CIWS for 8 of the 15 total subjects. This was examined closely as CIWS is a quality measure of writing growth. The experimenter counted the number of students who made a gain larger than 2 CIWS from their baseline phase to intervention phase. In classroom A, two of the four subjects (CO and CF) made notable gains, a third student (KK) stayed stable with a decrease of only three CIWS. In classroom B, 100% of the students made a gain larger than 2.0 CIWS. MR and KP made the greatest gains with MR going from a baseline of -12.9 to -2.6 and KP growing from a -11.8 to -1.9. In classroom C, only one of the six students increased their CIWS markedly. BD increased from 9.2 CIWS to 12.8 CIWS. The others in classroom C remained stable or slightly decreased except for TJF. TJF dropped more than 10 CIWS from baseline to intervention, possibly due to trouble at home that impacted his academic performance (i.e., parents divorced).
**Research Question 2:** What are the effects of a scripted presentation program on the total number of words written in weekly writing samples produced by middle school students?

Increasing TWW is also important for several reasons. Special education students write much less than that of their peers. In increasing the number of TWW, it is increasing the opportunity for readers to understand what they have written. It also gives the opportunity for teachers to see where written expression deficits lie and how to plan instruction for their students accordingly. The results of the study indicate that the intervention was effective in increasing TWW for 53% of the subjects, or 8 of the 15 subjects. Only four students increased in both the CIWS and TWW variables. Classroom A had 3 of the 4 subjects increase TWW; classroom B had only 1 of 5 students increase, while classroom C had 4 of the 6 participants make gains. It is possible that TWW did not increase as much as the researchers anticipated because if students were making a cognizant effort to apply the newly taught skills they may not have been writing as fluently. Over time, it would be expected that the new skills reach automaticity, and there would be a gradual increase in TWW over time.

**Research Question 3:** What are the students’ opinions about a scripted presentation program for writing and their perceptions of their own writing after using a scripted program?

Based on the results from the student and teacher questionnaires and teacher comments about the program, the scripted intervention was socially valid as supports the results of Walker, et al.(2005) who also found favorable ratings by subjects. The results of the social validity survey demonstrated favorable responses towards the use
of the scripted program. Students expressed that the scripted program helped them to write complete sentences and improve their paragraph writing. They also indicated that better paragraph writing would lead to doing better in school and that this program should be used again for future students.

*Research Question 4: What are the teachers’ opinions about a scripted program for writing?*

Results from the fifteen-question Likert rating scales completed by teachers showed a favorable interest in using a scripted program for writing. A mean score of 3.7 was given when asked whether or not they would use the program again in the future. The teachers felt comfortable teaching the scripted lessons and delivering the material but showed concern in the ability to individualize for certain students.

A perfect 4.0 was acquired for the item asking whether or not this program made a difference in their students’ writing. The teachers unanimously agreed in the importance of regular instruction in written expression and assuring students have basic writing skills learned. They felt that there were moderate gains seen in basic skills and paragraph writing by rating them 3.3 and 3, respectively with a 4 being “I agree”. The teachers were not given any open ended questions on this measure of social validity; however, they shared their thoughts, feelings, and concerns with the experimenter throughout the study.

*Limitations of the Study*

Students were moved into intervention by classes, not by their individual data. Therefore, it was possible that a child could have been moved into intervention before they were in need of it or stayed in baseline condition beyond the point that individual
data would indicate a need to move into intervention. This results in extended baselines for two of the classes. This happened because the researchers waited for at least half of the subjects’ data to stabilize. These baselines were too long, reducing the time available to implement the intervention. Despite this, students were writing every week and being assessed, so it is possible that gains made without intervention could have been due to practice effects.

Another limitation was the fact that Direct Instruction programs are designed to be presented to small groups, as in Walker et al. (2005). When a teacher is working with only a few students as opposed to twenty or more, he or she can much more easily monitor what each student is doing, give student-specific praise more often, and focus on correcting errors immediately. It was very difficult to do these things for each student in a large classroom setting. It is almost certain that lack of robust results was due to the fact that the curriculum was not implemented as intended. In classroom B, there was a long-term sub who took over in the middle of the study. She would only teach the program one or two days a week rather than the recommended three to five.

Another issue was found through the treatment fidelity scores. Teachers were not issuing praise statements every time a student or whole group responded. Sutherland, et al. (2002) found that students would write more when they received specific praise. Praise rates in this study were extremely low at 71.2%. The low praise rates of procedural integrity were most often due to the omission of reminders and praise statements. Throughout every scripted lesson, the teacher is to ask an individual or the class a question (to assess comprehension). A praise statement or corrective feedback should immediately follow this. If corrective feedback is needed, the question should
be asked again. Once a correct answer is received, specific praise should be given. This process continues throughout the entire lesson. Most importantly, praise was to be given after each and every time a student or the class made a response no matter how small. The faculty-researcher stated that because the treatment fidelity rates were so low, the study was not really the implementation of the Direct Instruction program as it was intended to be delivered. Instead, the teachers really delivered a scripted program. To prevent this in future studies, the researchers discussed how essential formal training in Direct Instruction is before a teacher is able to implement a program.

Another limitation in this study was that the researchers did not control for the variable of interest in the weekly prompts. The teacher participants discussed how students seemed much more interested in certain prompts over others, and, therefore, wrote much more on those. This is supported by Lee and Laspe (2003) findings that students wrote more when they identified the prompt as one in which they were interested, and less when it was one in which they were disinterested.

*Future Research*

There have not been many studies to have implemented a Direct Instruction writing program; therefore, it was hoped that this study would add to the existing research base. It was the hope of the researchers that a scripted program would be successful in an inclusive classroom since research supports its use in very small groups. Future research should focus on the middle ground of class size.
**Implications for Teachers**

When the teachers were being trained to use this program, the teacher-researcher identified pages that could be especially useful to teachers. The *Expressive Writing 2* teaching manual included important scope and sequence information, charts to graph student progress after tests, and answer keys. A regular education teacher who delivered the intervention shared how she found the manuals to be very helpful in developing lesson plans centering of specific skills. A special education teacher was very impressed with how helpful the teacher’s manual was for delivering instruction and used the scope and sequence to aid in the development of new goals and objectives for students’ Individualized Education Plans (IEP’s). Another teacher said that the program was very easy to follow, and no major planning was needed since everything was scripted.

Conversely, teachers found the lesson took longer than the approximated 50 minutes—probably due to class size. There were students who took much longer than others to finish certain sections, particularly the paragraph writing at the conclusion of each lesson. The teachers in classrooms of 25 and 29 students felt that there were too many students to effectively implement these lesson sections in such a short time. Perhaps further dividing lessons into shorter segments would counteract the large group size.

**Conclusion**

Literature suggests that Direct Instruction programs have been very successful for students with disabilities in improving basic reading skills (Benner, Kinder, Beaudoin, Stein, and Hirschmann, 2005) and writing skills (Anderson & Keel, 2002;
Ginn, et al., 2002; Martella and Waldron-Soler, 2005; Walker, et al., 2005). Teachers should not be discouraged to implement Direct Instruction curricula based on the results of this study, since the program was not implemented with fidelity. There is much more research to support the successes of Direct Instruction programs (as cited above) in different settings when all the components can be delivered and implemented as they were designed. While this study lacked complete fidelity, it certainly managed to successfully indicate the effectiveness of a Direct Instruction program to improve the written expression skills of students with and without disabilities.
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APPENDIX A: Directions for Implementing Weekly Writing Probe
Directions for Implementing the Weekly WIP Writing Probe

1. Provide each student with a sheet of lined paper and a pencil (if necessary). Provide the following directions to help students format their papers: “Please write your first and last name, date, and grade in the top right-hand corner of your paper. Make sure it is in the white space way above the first line on the paper.” (Please be sure students are writing their names in the white space because their names will later need to be cut off for scoring).

2. Say these specific directions to the students: “You are going to write a story. First, I will read a sentence or a few sentences, and then you will write a story about what happens next. You will have 1 minute to think about what you will write, and 3 minutes to write your story. Remember to do your best work. If you don’t know how to spell a word, you should guess. Are there any questions?” (Pause and/or answer any questions). “Put your pencils down and listen.”

“For the next minute, think about this:” Read the story starter for that week then start the timer.

3. After reading the story starter, allow 1 minute for students to “think.” (Monitor students so that they do not begin writing). A stopwatch has been provided to you for the timing needs.

4. After 30 seconds say: “You should be thinking about this:” Read the story starter.

5. At the end of 1 minute say: “You will now finish this story:” Read the story starter.

Now you may begin writing.” Restart your timer.

6. Monitor students’ participation. If individual students pause for about 10 seconds or say they are done before the test is finished, move close to them and say “Keep writing the best story you can.” This prompt can be repeated to students should they pause again.

7. After about 90 seconds say: “You should be writing about: Reread the weekly story starter.

8. At the end of 3 minutes say: “Please stop. It’s ok if you’re not finished.”

NOTE: If you want to allow students to continue writing, you may. We will only be scoring these first 3 minutes of writing, so it’s totally up to you. If they keep writing, please have the students draw a line where they stopped writing at the 3-minute mark.

9. When students are finished writing, collect their papers and be sure their names, date, and grade are on them before putting them in the manila folder provided.
APPENDIX B: Required IRB Forms
The University Parental Permission
For Child’s Participation in Research

Study Title: Determining the Effectiveness of the *Expressive Writing* Program for Middle School Students with Writing Deficits

Researcher: ________________________________________

This is a parental permission form for research participation. It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you permit your child to participate.

Your child’s participation is voluntary.

Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to discuss the study with your friends and family and to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to permit your child to participate. If you permit your child to participate, you will be asked to sign this form, and you will receive a copy of the form.

Purpose of this study:

To improve the writing skills of middle school students with written expression deficits, including those with learning disabilities, using a structured, research-based Direct Instruction program, *Expressive Writing*.

Procedures/Tasks:

General education students will provide 2-4 writing samples per month for the duration of the school year. Those samples will be compared to writing produced by special education students who are participating in an intervention to improve their writing skills. If the program successfully improves writing performance, it may be implemented in the entire building next year.

Duration:

The general education students will produce writing samples every month for the entire school year. The researchers will collect data (i.e., look at the writing samples) during that time, too. Your child may leave the study at any time. If you or your child decides to stop participation in the study, there will be no penalty and neither you nor your child will lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with The Ohio State University.

Risks and Benefits:

There are no risks involved in this study. The potential benefit is that your child may improve his or her writing skills.
Confidentiality:
Efforts will be made to keep your child’s study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released. For example, personal information regarding your child’s participation in this study may be disclosed if required by state law. Also, your child’s records may be reviewed by the following groups (as applicable to the research):
- Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies;
- The __________ University Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices;
- The sponsor, if any, or agency (including the Food and Drug Administration for FDA-regulated research) supporting the study.

Incentives:
Students will not be paid to participate in the study.

Participant Rights:
You or your child may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you or your child is a student or employee at __________, your decision will not affect your grades or employment status.

If you and your child choose to participate in the study, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. By signing this form, you do not give up any personal legal rights your child may have as a participant in this study.

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at __________ University reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

Contacts and Questions:
For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study you may contact __________ or your child’s teacher.

For questions about your child’s rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact __________ at _____________.
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CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled
Determining the Effectiveness of the Expressive Writing Program for Middle School Students with Writing Deficits.

__________, Principal Investigator has explained the purpose of the study (through the attached letter), the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Furthermore, I understand that I am (and my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (or to my child).

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Signed: ________________________________________
(Participant - Student)

Signed: ________________________________________
(Parent or Guardian)

Date: ________________________________________
APPENDIX C: Letter to Parents from Principal
Dear ______________ Middle School Parent/Guardian:

Your child has the opportunity to participate in a study under the direction of ___________________________. They are working with us to try to improve the writing skills of students here at ________________ Middle School.

We would like your permission to allow ________________ to study what your child writes during the year. Your child’s name would be blacked out from their papers so that the persons looking at the writing would not know whose paper it is. In the future, if the data is used in any presentations or publications, they would not be associated with any names either. Essentially, your child’s confidentiality would be protected.

If you have any questions about the study that you would like to ask before giving consent, you are free to call ____________, a teacher at the school, or ____________. Her number is ____________. Or you can email ________________.

You do not have to give permission for your child to participate if you do not want to. In addition, if you give permission and at any time in the future you want to withdraw that permission, you may do so without any penalty to your or your child.

The letter from _____________ that accompanies this letter is required by ________________’s Internal Review Board to be sure that subjects of any study are protected. I want you to know that I approve of the study. If you have any questions about that letter, however, please call or email ________________

Please sign the last page of the _________________ letter (the brightly colored one) and have your child return it to his/her teacher.

Thanks!

____________________, Principal
APPENDIX D: Scripted Writing Program Training Manual
Teaching Manual for
Scripted Writing Program

__________ Middle School
2007-2008
Why are we here?

We know that we are here to teach, but today we also here to learn! One of my largest frustrations when teaching and grading is seeing how many students struggle with so many concepts in Writing. One of my favorite quotes is “If you always do what you always did, you’ll always get what you always got.” And then it came to me. I needed a completely different way to teach Writing so that I could best help the students.

Why do so many students struggle with Writing?

That is a question I often ask myself. But think about it this way, babies need to learn to walk before they can run. Or that we wouldn’t ask a first grader to read fifth grade material. It’s the same with Writing. There are many, many skills or “small steps” that need to be focused on before asking students to write a large piece of writing or even a paragraph for that matter.

What is considered “good” Writing?

These criteria are not going to be anything new or surprising to you. We all know that good writing is clear and it expresses exactly what the writer wishes to express. Good writing is efficient and not highly redundant and it follows basic rules of grammar as well as the rules for modern-writing styles.

How can we best reach our struggling students?

It is time to try a different method of daily instruction! We need to use model for teaching that emphasizes well-developed and carefully planned lessons designed around small learning increments and has clearly defined and prescribed teaching tasks. The theory of this method is that clear instruction eliminates misinterpretations can greatly improve and accelerate learning. What is it? Direct instruction! Direct instruction has been proven to be very successful with all students and now more than ever we need to try something new to raise our students’ ability, self-esteem, and test scores. We have the unique opportunity and blessing to have offered the chance to try a new Writing program, Expressive Writing, with our classes free of charge. _______ of ________ is currently working on compiling research to support the benefits of a direct instruction approach in Writing and has asked for the opportunity to work with the school who needs the most help. That’s us!

What is Expressive Writing?

Expressive Writing is a SRA program that is different from any other programs we have used as:
- The material is well-organized so that certain skills are taught together in manageable chunks and adequate practice is offered. The skills are then repeated throughout and practiced again while also focusing on the new material.
- The teacher is provided with explicit strategies for teaching on a daily basis.
- *Expressive Writing* builds writing skills around pictures and picture sequences so that students are more comfortable with passage writing. The pictures control and limit the vocabulary that students will need as well as providing a source for evidence as opposed to inferring from their imagination.
- Editing is an integral part of this program and systematically teaches students how to write a variety of sentence types.
- *Expressive Writing* emphasizes writing in the simple past tense and reduces confusion by not using grammatical terms.
- The teacher has opportunities to give immediate feedback and correct student errors before it is too late.

**Why am I here doing this?**

I am here to "sell" this program because I have seen it work first hand! I used it for about a month in my inclusion classroom and was more than impressed with the results I was receiving. At the beginning of the year, we had numerous students who would not write or turn in their paper, because they simply did not know where to start. This program gives them the beginning sentence! The students are given a word bank to follow so they have a guide as to not only what needs to be in the paragraph but also how to spell it. Students learned things that they never knew before even in the prelessons. It really opened up a whole new way of thinking and Writing in my classroom. The other thing I loved (and some people actually complain about) is the fact that EVERYTHING is written out word for word, sentence by sentence on how to present the material to the class. Students have many opportunities to respond and practice the skills with the teacher closely monitoring. The thing I loved most was getting an eight sentence paragraph from a student who never gave me more than two sentences the entire year. His sentences were complete, words were spelled correctly, and it all made sense. This was a major feat.

**How do you get started?**

You will be given a teacher's manual. It will be beneficial for you to look over and rehearse the lesson the day before. As time goes on you will become very comfortable with the format and will have little to no preparation. Students
will have their workbooks. All you need to supply or make sure they have is lined paper and a pencil.

How exactly does a lesson look?
Let’s get started. You’ll be my class of students and I’ll be the teacher. First I need to tell you that there is a way we respond when asked a question. If I need to ask an individual I will use their name. If I’m asking a question of the entire class, I will address the entire class by saying, “Class” and using a hand gesture to signal that it is time for a response. Note: This needs to be rehearsed with your students in order for it to be successful.

Walk them through prelesson 1 using the teachers’ guide just as if they are my class of students. Share that in a few more lessons students will be asked to write a paragraph and the procedure will be done just as it was for the placement test. They will preview the pictures, vocabulary, and get the students started. Continue to reinforce that EVERYTHING they need to know and say is included in the teachers’ manual.

Other important tidbits:
- Keep ALL students actively involved. They may not work ahead.
- Reinforce good sentences.
- If a sentence has a problem, correct it quickly.
- After presenting words in the vocabulary box, prompt important details.
- As students are writing, read their passages.
- Make frequent comments and consistent reminders to the group as well as individual, specific feedback.
- Allow adequate time (but not too much).
- Praise! Praise! Praise! Praise even the smallest improvement.

In conclusion, change is not always easy, but it is necessary. I would ask that you would try this with an open mind and follow it as closely as possible. It can’t hurt to try something completely different at this point. We can only go up from here. Please feel free to contact me at any time with questions or comments. I would love to help in any way I can.
APPENDIX E: Social Validity Student Questionnaire
Student Questionnaire

1. The Expressive Writing Program was a good way for me to learn how to write sentences.  
   1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   I disagree - I agree

2. The Expressive Writing Program was a good way for me to learn how to write paragraphs.  
   1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   I disagree - I agree

3. I think learning how to write paragraphs will help me do better in school.  
   1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   I disagree - I agree

4. I think I’m a better writer now than I was at the beginning of the year.  
   1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   I disagree - I agree

5. I think I’m a better writer now than I was before my teacher started using the Expressive Writing program.  
   1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   I disagree - I agree

6. I liked using the Expressive Writing Program.  
   1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   I disagree - I agree

7. I learned a lot about writing from the Expressive Writing Program.  
   1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   I disagree - I agree

8. What I liked about the Expressive Writing Program was

9. What I didn’t like about the Expressive Writing Program was
APPENDIX F: Social Validity Teacher Questionnaire
Teacher Satisfaction with the Expressive Writing Program

Part I: Acceptability of Intervention Goals

1. It is important for students to be able to write at grade level.  
   disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   agree

2. It is important for students to learn basic writing skills.  
   disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   agree

3. It is important to have a program that helps teachers teach writing skills.  
   disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   agree

4. It is important to have kids working on writing skills most days of the week.  
   disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   agree

Part II: Acceptability of Procedures

5. The lessons were clear.  
   disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   agree

6. The lessons were easy to deliver.  
   disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   agree

7. I was comfortable using a scripted program.  
   disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   agree

8. I was comfortable delivering the lessons in a whole-class setting.  
   disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   agree

9. I was able to monitor each student’s progress on the lessons.  
   disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
   agree

10. I was able to individualize for students who needed more assistance/attention.  
    disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
    agree

Part III: Acceptability of Outcomes

11. The Expressive Writing program helped my students learn to write paragraphs.  
    disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
    agree

12. The Expressive Writing program helped my students improve their basic writing skills.  
    disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
    agree

13. The Expressive Writing program helped my students write better.  
    disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
    agree

14. Overall, I think the Expressive Writing program was helpful.  
    disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
    agree

15. I would use the Expressive Writing program again.  
    disagree \  1 - 2 - 3 - 4  
    agree
APPENDIX G: IOA Table
### Weekly IOA Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>%IOA</th>
<th>% of samples scored</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H: Student Social Validity Surveys Short Answers
What I liked about the Expressive Writing Program was | What I didn’t like about the Expressive Writing Program was
---|---
Classroom A  
I liked the stories we had to do. | I hated the whole thing.  
I liked the way you had to write a story about one picture. | What I didn’t like was when we had to say everything like the teacher.  
I liked that I can write better now. | I didn’t like writing in it almost every day.  
that I can write better. | I don’t like to write little sentences.  
Classroom B  
help me write better in school. | (no response)  
that we didn’t have to do hard stuff. | the whole thing.  
what I liked was the little picture box things. | was how much writing we had to do.  
it was fun and good and I liked it. | the reading was not good.  
it helped me learn to write better. | (no response)  
Classroom C  
how to write paragraphs. | (no response)  
it made the work easy. | that it was like first grade sentences and words.  
being able to imagine and create what I was talking about. | only having a few minutes to write because now I like to write about a topic that’s interesting to me.  
nothing. | everything. It wasn’t fun at all.  
it was easy. | it was too easy.  
nothing it was boring. | everything.
APPENDIX I: Teacher Social Validity Survey Results
## Part I: Acceptability of Intervention Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is important for students to be able to write at grade level.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is important for students to learn basic writing skills.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is important to have a program that helps teachers teach writing skills.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is important to have kids working on writing skills most days of the week.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Part II: Acceptability of Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. The lessons were clear.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The lessons were easy to deliver.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I was comfortable using a scripted program.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I was comfortable delivering the lessons in a whole-class setting.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I was able to monitor each student’s progress on the lessons.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I was able to individualize for students who needed more assistance / attention.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Part III: Acceptability of Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. The Expressive Writing program helped my students learn to write paragraphs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The Expressive Writing program helped my students improve their basic writing skills.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The Expressive Writing program helped my students write better.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Overall, I think the Expressive Writing program was helpful.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I would use the Expressive Writing program again.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Satisfaction Survey Results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is important for students to be able to write at grade level.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is important for students to learn basic writing skills.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is important to have a program that helps teachers teach writing skills.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is important to have kids working on writing skills most days of the week.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The lessons were clear.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The lessons were easy to deliver.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I was comfortable using a scripted program.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I was comfortable delivering the lessons in a whole-class setting.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I was able to monitor each student’s progress on the lessons.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I was able to individualize for students who needed more assistance / attention.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The Expressive Writing program helped my students learn to write paragraphs.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The Expressive Writing program helped my students improve their basic writing skills.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The Expressive Writing program helped my students write better.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Overall, I think the Expressive Writing program was helpful.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I would use the Expressive Writing program again.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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