



July 2016

## **Development of Strategic and Interactive Writing Instruction (SIWI) for deaf and hard of hearing students: Year 3 Pilot Study**

Kimberly A. Wolbers  
*University of Tennessee, Knoxville, kwolbers@utk.edu*

Hannah M. Dostal  
*University of Connecticut - Storrs*

Steve Graham  
*Arizona State University, steve.graham@asu.edu*

Lee Branum-Martin  
*Georgia State University, branummartin@gsu.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_theopubs](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_theopubs)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Wolbers, K., Dostal, H., Graham, S., & Branum-Martin, L. (2016). [Data from IES Goal 2 pilot study.]  
Unpublished raw data.

This Data is brought to you for free and open access by the Theory and Practice in Teacher Education at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theory and Practice in Teacher Education Publications and Other Works by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact [trace@utk.edu](mailto:trace@utk.edu).

## Development of Strategic and Interactive Writing Instruction (SIWI) for deaf and hard of hearing students: Year 3 Pilot Study

### Purpose

This study, funded by US Institute of Education Sciences under Grant R324A120085, is an examination of the impact of Strategic and Interaction Writing Instruction (SIWI) implemented with deaf and hard of hearing (d/hh) 3-5th graders.

### Method

This study was a randomized controlled trial. Teachers (N=15) and their respective d/hh students (N=78) were randomly assigned to groups. Comparison group teachers proceeded with their regular instruction, while experimental group teachers implemented SIWI approximately two-hours/ week. SIWI teachers attended a week-long summer workshop, and periodic online meetings during the academic year. Diverse educational settings (i.e., public school self-contained or pull-out, and schools for the deaf) were represented in each group, as well as varying communication philosophies (i.e., ASL-English bilingual, Listening and Spoken Language, Total Communication).

Research questions included:

#### *Writing*

1. To what extent does SIWI lead to improved student outcomes in recount writing, information report, and persuasive writing skills over a 9-week period?
2. To what extent do writing skills (recount and information report) maintain 9 weeks after the removal of SIWI instruction for the genre of writing?

#### *Language*

3. To what extent does SIWI lead to improved student outcomes in clarity of language in recount writing, information report writing, and persuasive writing over a 9-week period?
4. To what extent does SIWI lead to improved student outcomes in complexity of language in recount writing, informational report writing, and persuasive writing over a 9-week period?

#### *Length*

5. To what extent does SIWI lead to improved student outcomes in length of recount writing, information report writing, and persuasive writing over a 9-week period?

Data collection included: writing samples for personal narrative, informational report and persuasive writing, and Woodcock Johnson III broad written language. Samples were scored for writing traits using modified NAEP rubrics, and scored for language accuracy and complexity using the *Structural Analysis of Written Language* (SAWL). Writing variables (e.g., Recount, Information Report and Persuasive Genre Composite) and language variables (e.g., WER I, II & III, TWC, WPT, and Complete Sentences) are further described in Table 1.

Table 1

Variable	Description
Recount Genre Composite	Composite of scores for three writing traits associated with Recount writing: orientation, events, and organization.
Recount Complete	Percentage of complete sentences in Recount writing.

Sentences	
Recount WERI	Word Efficiency Ratio I for Recount writing as scored using the SAWL. Indicates ratio of perfect T-units.
Recount WERII	Word Efficiency Ratio II for Recount writing as scored using the SAWL. Indicates perfect and flawed T-units.
Recount WERIII	Word Efficiency Ratio III for Recount writing as scored using the SAWL. Indicates word strings, and perfect and flawed T-units.
Recount TWC	Total word count in Recount writing.
Recount WPT Flawed	Words per flawed and perfect T-unit in Recount writing.
Info Genre Composite	Composite of scores for three writing traits associated with Information Report writing: topic, facts, and organization.
Info Complete Sentences	Percentage of complete sentences in Information Report writing.
Info WERI	Word Efficiency Ratio I for Information Report writing as scored using the <i>Structured Analysis of Written Language</i> (SAWL). Indicates ratio of perfect T-units.
Info WERII	Word Efficiency Ratio II for Information Report writing as scored using the SAWL. Indicates perfect and flawed T-units.
Info WERIII	Word Efficiency Ratio III for Information Report writing as scored using the SAWL. Indicates word strings, and perfect and flawed T-units.
Info TWC	Total word count in Information Report writing.
Info WPT Flawed	Words per flawed and perfect T-unit in Information Report writing.
Persuasive Genre Composite	Composite of scores for three writing traits associated with Persuasive writing: reasons, examples, and organization.
Persuasive Complete Sentences	Percentage of complete sentences in Persuasive writing.
Persuasive WERI	Word Efficiency Ratio I for Persuasive writing as scored using the <i>Structured Analysis of Written Language</i> (SAWL). Indicates ratio of perfect T-units.
Persuasive WERII	Word Efficiency Ratio II for Persuasive writing as scored using the SAWL. Indicates perfect and flawed T-units.
Persuasive WERIII	Word Efficiency Ratio III for Persuasive writing as scored using the SAWL. Indicates word strings, and perfect and flawed T-units.
Persuasive TWC	Total word count in Persuasive writing.
Persuasive WPT Flawed	Words per flawed and perfect T-unit in Persuasive writing.
Spelling SS	Standard score on the Spelling Subtest of the Woodcock Johnson III Tests of Achievement.
Fluency SS	Standard score on the Writing Fluency Subtest of the Woodcock Johnson III Tests of Achievement.
Sample SS	Standard score on the Writing Sample Subtest of the Woodcock Johnson III Tests of Achievement.
Broad Written Language SS	Standard score for Broad Written Language as measured by the Woodcock Johnson III Tests of Achievement.

## Data Analysis

For developing basic estimates of treatment effects, there are two designs: three-wave and two-wave. For the three wave design, we fit an individual growth curve model of wave nested within student within teacher (3 levels: w, s, t, respectively). The general form of the model is:

$$Y_{wst} = \text{Intercept}_{st} + \text{Time}_w + \text{SIWI2}_t + \text{SIWI3}_t + \text{hearing}_{st} + \text{Time} * \text{hearing}_{st} + e_{st}$$

where  $\text{Intercept}_{st}$  represents initial performance for the student on the outcome test (with random variation for student and teacher),  $\text{Time}_w$  represents linear change between waves for students in the control group (with random variation in slope for students, but not for teachers),  $\text{SIWI2}_t$  represents an effect for students in a treatment classroom at time two,  $\text{SIWI3}_t$  represents remaining effect for students in a treatment classroom at time three after treatment was withdrawn (maintenance effect), and the hearing variables represent group difference effects for intercept and slope (Time) for the hearing comparison students.  $e_{st}$  represents random error.

The model therefore is one of linear change over three time points, with a treatment “bump” at times two and three, to measure the displacement from the overall linear trend due to treatment.

The second kind of model is for the outcomes which were only measured twice. The model is a pre-post regression, nested within teachers. For the present analysis, only deaf children were modeled (hearing children were excluded).

$$Y_{st} = \text{Intercept}_t + \text{Pretest}_s + \text{SIWI}_t + \text{SIWI}_t * \text{Pretest}_s + e_{st}$$

where  $\text{Intercept}_{st}$  represents the predicted score for the student on the outcome test (with random variation for teacher),  $\text{Pretest}_s$  represents the effect of student pretest score (centered at the grand mean),  $\text{SIWI}_t$  represents an effect for students in a treatment classroom,  $\text{SIWI}_t * \text{Pretest}_s$  represents an interaction of treatment with pretest, and  $e_{st}$  represents random error.

## Results

Results show the treatment to be effective for recount, information report and persuasive writing composite scores with statistically significant results at post-intervention for all three genres and at the maintenance probe for recount writing. Treatment effects were also substantial for language outcomes associated with all three genres, with recount WER III and information report WER II being statistically significant. Effect sizes range from 0.53 to 0.71. Results also show SIWI to be effective for length of recount writing (1.31) and all writing variables measured by the WJ III: spelling, fluency, samples (1.01-1.82). Broad Written Language, as measured by the WJ III, was statistically significant with an effect size of 1.88.

*The research reported here was supported by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, through Grant R324A120085 to the University of Tennessee. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent views of the Institute or the U.S. Department of Education.*

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Effect</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>t Value</i>	<i>Pr &gt;  t </i>	<i>ES</i>
Recount Genre Composite	Fixed	Intercept	4.59	0.59	16	7.81	<.01	.
		time	0.07	0.22	107	0.34	0.74	.
		SIWI2	3.31	0.38	213	8.61	<.01	2.64
		SIWI3	3.13	0.60	111	5.19	<.01	2.50
		hearing	2.44	1.31	13	1.87	0.09	.
		time*hearing	0.58	0.32	106	1.83	0.07	.
	Random	Teacher	3.68	1.65	.	.	.	.
		Int(stu)	3.37	0.72	.	.	.	.
		cov(Int,Slope)	-0.54	0.38	.	.	.	.
		Slope(stu)	0.93	0.27	.	.	.	.
Residual	1.58	0.22	.	.	.	.		
Recount Complete Sentences	Fixed	Intercept	0.55	0.08	11	7.16	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.34	0.16	64	2.13	0.04	.
		SIWI	0.17	0.10	12	1.65	0.13	0.70
		Pretest*SIWI	0.35	0.22	60	1.60	0.11	.
	Random	Teacher	0.02	0.01	.	.	.	.
		Residual	0.06	0.01	.	.	.	.
Recount WERI	Fixed	Intercept	0.22	0.07	7	2.99	0.02	.
		Pretest	0.27	0.16	60	1.69	0.10	.
		SIWI	0.07	0.10	7	0.70	0.51	0.36
		Pretest*SIWI	0.32	0.25	56	1.29	0.20	.
	Random	Teacher	0.02	0.02	.	.	.	.
		Residual	0.04	0.01	.	.	.	.
Recount WERII	Fixed	Intercept	0.51	0.07	9	6.80	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.28	0.17	57	1.64	0.11	.
		SIWI	0.14	0.10	10	1.44	0.18	0.59
		Pretest*SIWI	0.41	0.25	53	1.67	0.10	.
	Random	Teacher	0.02	0.01	.	.	.	.
		Residual	0.06	0.01	.	.	.	.
Recount WERIII	Fixed	Intercept	0.61	0.06	11	10.28	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.62	0.17	45	3.57	<.01	.
		SIWI	0.16	0.08	12	1.97	0.07	0.71
		Pretest*SIWI	0.21	0.22	44	0.94	0.35	.

	Random	Teacher	0.01	0.01	.	.	.	.
		Residual	0.05	0.01	.	.	.	.
Recount TWC	Fixed	Intercept	50.30	10.80	11	4.66	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.12	0.11	67	1.06	0.29	.
		SIWI	32.30	14.35	11	2.25	0.04	1.31
		Pretest*SIWI	0.61	0.15	68	3.95	<.01	.
	Random	Teacher	536.3	285.1	.	.	.	.
		Residual	608.1	113.4	.	.	.	.
Recount WPT Flawed	Fixed	Intercept	4.61	0.53	9	8.77	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.56	0.17	55	3.26	<.01	.
		SIWI	0.83	0.70	9	1.19	0.26	0.48
		Pretest*SIWI	0.29	0.23	54	1.24	0.22	.
	Random	Teacher	0.95	0.72	.	.	.	.
		Residual	2.94	0.55	.	.	.	.
Info Genre Composite	Fixed	Intercept	4.68	0.67	15	6.98	<.01	.
		time	0.64	0.18	99	3.54	<.01	.
		SIWI2	1.25	0.35	202	3.62	<.01	1.01
		SIWI3	0.66	0.50	99	1.32	0.19	0.53
		hearing	5.69	1.55	13	3.68	<.01	.
		time*hearing	-0.15	0.26	99	-0.59	0.56	.
	Random	Teacher	5.59	2.29	.	.	.	.
		Int(stu)	1.18	0.41	.	.	.	.
		cov(Int,Slope)	0.41	0.22	.	.	.	.
		Slope(stu)	0.29	0.19	.	.	.	.
		Residual	1.52	0.22	.	.	.	
Info Complete Sentences	Fixed	Intercept	0.54	0.05	68	11.21	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.59	0.12	68	4.73	<.01	.
		SIWI	0.12	0.07	68	1.83	0.07	0.44
		Pretest*SIWI	0.08	0.17	68	0.45	0.65	.
	Random	Teacher	0.00	.	.	.	.	.
		Residual	0.08	0.01	.	.	.	
Info WERI	Fixed	Intercept	0.13	0.08	9	1.73	0.12	.
		Pretest	0.19	0.12	66	1.53	0.13	.
		SIWI	0.20	0.10	9	1.97	0.08	1.27
		Pretest*SIWI	0.89	0.25	66	3.50	<.01	.
	Random	Teacher	0.03	0.02	.	.	.	.

		Residual	0.02	0.00	.	.	.	.
Info WERII	Fixed	Intercept	0.44	0.04	68	10.19	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.64	0.12	68	5.25	<.01	.
		SIWI	0.13	0.06	68	2.21	0.03	0.53
		Pretest*SIWI	0.01	0.18	68	0.04	0.97	.
	Random	Teacher	0.00	.	.	.	.	.
		Residual	0.06	0.01	.	.	.	.
Info WERIII	Fixed	Intercept	0.55	0.04	68	13.82	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.80	0.12	68	6.45	<.01	.
		SIWI	0.14	0.05	68	2.63	0.01	0.63
		Pretest*SIWI	-0.20	0.16	68	-1.26	0.21	.
	Random	Teacher	0.00	.	.	.	.	.
		Residual	0.05	0.01	.	.	.	.
Info TWC	Fixed	Intercept	60.77	6.81	5	8.93	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.69	0.21	46	3.24	<.01	.
		SIWI	5.69	9.27	5	0.61	0.57	0.21
		Pretest*SIWI	-0.11	0.24	45	-0.44	0.66	.
	Random	Teacher	104.7	153.6	.	.	.	.
		Residual	737.2	145.1	.	.	.	.
Info WPT Flawed	Fixed	Intercept	4.08	0.45	7	9.15	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.44	0.13	61	3.35	<.01	.
		SIWI	0.76	0.60	8	1.27	0.24	0.44
		Pretest*SIWI	-0.08	0.16	63	-0.51	0.61	.
	Random	Teacher	0.49	0.55	.	.	.	.
		Residual	3.04	0.58	.	.	.	.
Persuasive Genre Composite	Fixed	Intercept	6.23	0.51	8	12.29	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.73	0.13	62	5.62	<.01	.
		SIWI	0.99	0.68	8	1.46	0.18	0.58
		Pretest*SIWI	0.29	0.20	50	1.46	0.15	.
	Random	Teacher	0.81	0.71	.	.	.	.
		Residual	2.95	0.58	.	.	.	.
Persuasive Composite	Fixed	Intercept	0.57	0.07	6	8.65	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.79	0.14	60	5.50	<.01	.
		SIWI	0.04	0.09	7	0.47	0.65	0.17
		Pretest*SIWI	-0.22	0.19	61	-1.17	0.25	.
	Random	Teacher	0.01	0.01	.	.	.	.

		Residual	0.06	0.01	.	.	.	.
Persuasive WERI	Fixed	Intercept	0.14	0.04	5	3.57	0.02	.
		Pretest	0.45	0.13	51	3.40	<.01	.
		SIWI	0.09	0.05	5	1.77	0.13	0.58
		Pretest*SIWI	0.53	0.18	42	2.90	<.01	.
	Random	Teacher	0.00	0.01	.	.	.	.
		Residual	0.03	0.01	.	.	.	.
Persuasive WERII	Fixed	Intercept	0.44	0.04	64	11.53	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.65	0.11	64	5.77	<.01	.
		SIWI	0.09	0.05	64	1.79	0.08	0.44
		Pretest*SIWI	0.15	0.16	64	0.97	0.34	.
	Random	Teacher	0.00	.	.	.	.	.
		Residual	0.04	0.01	.	.	.	.
Persuasive WERIII	Fixed	Intercept	0.59	0.04	64	15.27	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.77	0.12	64	6.33	<.01	.
		SIWI	0.10	0.05	64	1.86	0.07	0.45
		Pretest*SIWI	-0.02	0.16	64	-0.15	0.88	.
	Random	Teacher	0.00	.	.	.	.	.
		Residual	0.05	0.01	.	.	.	.
Persuasive TWC	Fixed	Intercept	53.58	9.12	12	5.87	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.26	0.11	63	2.37	0.02	.
		SIWI	6.55	12.04	12	0.54	0.60	0.29
		Pretest*SIWI	0.31	0.21	64	1.48	0.14	.
	Random	Teacher	350.5	199.3	.	.	.	.
		Residual	512.7	99.74	.	.	.	.
Persuasive WPT Flawed	Fixed	Intercept	4.36	0.53	10	8.25	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.30	0.13	45	2.26	0.03	.
		SIWI	1.07	0.72	10	1.49	0.17	0.51
		Pretest*SIWI	0.34	0.17	54	1.93	0.06	.
	Random	Teacher	0.65	0.68	.	.	.	.
		Residual	4.46	0.85	.	.	.	.
Spelling SS	Fixed	Intercept	67.02	2.90	11	23.13	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.87	0.11	43	8.19	<.01	.
		SIWI	16.85	3.69	11	4.57	<.01	1.82
		Pretest*SIWI	-0.42	0.12	39	-3.48	<.01	.
	Random	Teacher	18.95	16.38	.	.	.	.



		Residual	86.20	16.22	.	.	.	.
Fluency SS	Fixed	Intercept	63.92	2.63	8	24.33	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.72	0.12	33	6.14	<.01	.
		SIWI	9.23	3.51	9	2.63	0.03	1.01
		Pretest*SIWI	0.30	0.17	38	1.84	0.07	.
	Random	Teacher	20.47	18.17	.	.	.	.
		Residual	83.13	15.89	.	.	.	.
Sample SS	Fixed	Intercept	64.06	3.22	9	19.89	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.62	0.11	48	5.75	<.01	.
		SIWI	14.12	4.30	10	3.28	<.01	1.27
		Pretest*SIWI	0.32	0.16	56	1.95	0.06	.
	Random	Teacher	31.79	25.93	.	.	.	.
		Residual	124.2	23.58	.	.	.	.
Broad Written Language SS	Fixed	Intercept	56.75	3.29	11	17.24	<.01	.
		Pretest	0.84	0.10	44	8.19	<.01	.
		SIWI	18.15	4.30	11	4.22	<.01	1.88
		Pretest*SIWI	-0.16	0.13	43	-1.23	0.23	.
	Random	Teacher	35.86	24.76	.	.	.	.
		Residual	93.01	17.62	.	.	.	.