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ABSTRACT

A Randomized Control Trial Examining the Effects of a Multi-Tiered Oral Narrative Language Intervention on Kindergarten Expository Writing

Shaylee Rae Woods
Department of Communication Disorders, BYU
Master of Science

The purpose of the current study was to examine the effects of a multi-tiered oral narrative language intervention on kindergarten students’ written expository discourse. The participants included 270 participants from a larger sample of 686 kindergarten students from four school districts in the upper Midwest geographical region of the United States. Participants received contextualized language intervention using Story Champs narrative intervention procedures. Tier-1 treatment groups received large group instruction from their classroom teacher who followed Story Champs procedures. Students whose oral narrative retell scores did not improve following the initial four weeks of treatment were assigned to receive additional small group intervention (Tier-2). Tier-2 intervention also followed Story Champs procedures but was led by the schools’ speech-language pathologists rather than classroom teachers. Expository writing samples were collected before and after intervention and following the treatment period. These writing samples were analyzed for expository language complexity and text structure. Pretest and posttest writing samples were evaluated on measures of expository language complexity and text structure using the Expository Language Measures (ELM) flow chart. Typical language learning students in the Tier-1 treatment condition were compared with typical language learning students in the control condition and showed statistically greater performance on measures of written expository language complexity, but not on measures of written expository text structure. Additionally, students with weaker language learning ability in the Tier-2 treatment group were compared to students with similar language learning difficulty in the control group. Analyses revealed no significant differences on measures of written expository language complexity nor written expository text structure for these students with weaker language learning ability. This study demonstrates the effectiveness of multi-tiered oral narrative intervention in improving written expository language complexity for typical language learning kindergarten students. Furthermore, this study indicates the need for further investigations of interventions specifically aimed at addressing expository discourse in younger students.
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DESCRIPTION OF THESIS STRUCTURE AND CONTENT

This thesis, *A Randomized Control Trial Examining the Effects of a Multi-Tiered Oral Narrative Language Intervention on Kindergarten Expository Writing*, is written in a hybrid format. The initial pages of this thesis reflect requirements for submission to the university, and the remainder of the thesis report is presented as a journal article format. The annotated bibliography is included in Appendix A. Institutional Review Board Approval is found in Appendix B. Appendix C provides information regarding scoring for written expository discourse samples provided by the participants. Appendix D shows an example of the Pretest Cubed Narrative Language Measures subtest. Appendix E and Appendix F show intervention fidelity checklists for large and small group intervention, respectively. Lastly, Appendix G shows examples of students’ writing samples at pretest and posttest from typical language learning participants in the treatment and control groups.
Introduction

In 2018, McMaster et al. found that only 4% of students with language disorders (LD) were writing at grade level. In addition, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (2011) reported that only 27% of all eighth and twelfth graders were writing proficiently. These statistics demonstrate that students with and without LD are struggling to meet writing expectations. This poor performance in writing indicates that writing ability in the United States is not acceptable and current writing instruction has not been sufficient to help students meet curriculum standards.

Current curriculum standards such as the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) have an explicit focus on narrative and expository written language. In particular, expository writing is emphasized in the curriculum and in high stakes testing more so than any other written language discourse (Hall-Mills & Apel, 2015; National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). Seventy percent of oral and written language standards focus on expository discourse for older students, and in kindergarten, expository written language is given equal emphasis to narrative written language in the curriculum. For example, CCSS kindergarten writing standards expect students to “compose informative/explanatory texts in which they name what they are writing about and supply some information about the topic” (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010, para. 2) and to “narrate a single event or several loosely linked events, tell about the events in the order in which they occurred, and provide a reaction to what happened” (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010, para. 3). In addition to being an educational necessity, narrative and expository language are two types of discourse which involve the use of
complex academic language (Hall-Mills & Apel, 2015). Narration focuses on communicating details from events that happened in the past through the utilization of macrostructure story elements and microstructure syntactic elements (Hall-Mills & Apel, 2015). Expository language incorporates many features similar to narrative discourse, but instead has a focus on conveying information through various forms of exposition, each with their own unique set of macrostructure elements. Syntactic microstructure elements are frequently consistent across narration and exposition; however, expository discourse often includes a greater incidence of technical vocabulary, nominalization, pronominalization, and subordination (Lundine & McCauley, 2016).

**Multi-Tiered System of Support**

Due to the clear focus on narrative and expository writing in education and because of the wide-spread difficulty with writing present in students with and without LD, there is a need to focus on writing for the majority of students. Writing instruction for all students can be facilitated through a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) which aims to provide students with needed supports earlier on and to assess the needs of individual learners (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). MTSS provides between two and four tiers of early intervention, prevention, and identification of disorders using evidence-based treatment for a specific difficulty. Tier assignments are determined through a process of baseline evaluation, intervention, and follow-up assessment of performance. In a standard three-tier MTSS approach, intervention intensity increases as tiers progress. Tier-1 focuses on large, whole group instruction. Individuals whose response to intervention is lower than expected, indicating weaker language learning ability, will be placed in the second tier where intervention is delivered in a small group setting. After further
intervention and progress monitoring, students who continue to have low response to intervention will be placed in Tier-3 for individual intervention (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006).

In addition to implementing writing intervention focused on all students with both typical and weaker language learning ability in an MTSS context, there is clear research indicating that early intervention is the most effective way to prevent writing disorders or future writing difficulties. Therefore, early writing intervention through MTSS may help all students progress towards stronger academic writing ability which has been lacking in the past. In 2018, McMaster et al. conducted a meta-analysis of early writing intervention studies which included students in Grades 1, 2, and 3. After compiling studies that met their inclusion criteria, the authors found that frequently used evidence-based writing interventions focus individually on transcription, text generation, and self-regulation. While the majority of studies implemented only one instructional approach, several early writing intervention studies targeted multiple areas of writing in pairs such as text generation and transcription or text generation and self-regulation. Analysis of the selected studies revealed that regardless of the specific intervention approach, all analyzed early writing interventions had positive effects on writing abilities in young students.

**Writing Transcription and Text Generation**

Although early writing intervention is crucial, kindergarten students’ limited transcription abilities can mask the content they are able to generate (Kim et al., 2015; Puranik & Al Otaiba, 2012) which makes targeting text generation difficult. In 2012, Puranik and Al Otaiba, conducted a study to analyze the relationship between handwriting, spelling abilities, and writing expression in kindergarteners. This study included 242 participants from 21 different kindergarten classrooms who provided writing samples which the researchers then analyzed for total number of words and number of ideas. Spelling was assessed by having the students write real and
nonsense words following a verbal prompt from a trained research assistant. The results of this study showed a wide range of spelling, handwriting, written expression, and idea expression abilities in kindergarten students. Despite this range of skill among students, the authors determined a clear correlation between poor handwriting and poor writing ability and found that poor handwriting appeared to impact students’ ability to express their ideas in writing at that point in time.

While Puranik and Al Otaiba (2012) found immediate effects of poor handwriting on early writing ability, Kim et al. (2015) found that letter writing automaticity at a young age was not related to future writing skills. This study examined kindergarten predictors of future writing ability in third grade. Researchers evaluated kindergarten students who were assessed on measures of letter writing automaticity, spelling, oral language, word reading, and attention. When participants reached the third grade their writing abilities were evaluated again from narrative and expository writing samples. Results indicated a relationship between oral language and narrative writing measures, but no relationship emerged between letter writing automaticity and narrative or expository writing ability (Kim et al., 2015).

Even though early writing interventions that address writing content could improve students’ writing abilities, teachers tend to ignore writing content in younger grades and primarily focus on transcription due to the normally low transcription proficiency in younger students (Cutler & Graham, 2008; Graham et al., 2012; McMaster et al., 2018). In 2012, Graham et al. conducted a meta-analysis of writing instruction used in elementary grades to determine what types of writing interventions teachers used and to evaluate the evidence of those interventions. Researchers analyzed a total of 115 studies focusing on writing interventions for students in Grades 1 through 6. Thirteen overarching categories of writing intervention
approaches were determined such as grammar instruction, text structure instruction, prewriting practices, creativity/imagery instruction, and peer assistance. Results of analyses showed all writing intervention approaches had statistically significant outcomes or outcomes statistically greater than no treatment. From the 13 treatment categories identified, elementary teachers consistently implemented three treatment approaches with younger students in first to third grade: (a) strategy instruction focusing on teaching planning, drafting, and revising during the writing process, (b) comprehensive writing programs which taught a combination of the writing process and writing skills such as word processing and strategy instruction, and (c) teaching transcription skills which targeted handwriting, spelling, or keyboarding (Graham et al., 2012).

Cutler and Graham (2008) conducted a random survey of the writing instruction approaches teachers used in Grades 1 through 3. These surveys assessed teacher demographics such as how long they had been teaching, how much writing instruction preparation they had, and how comfortable they felt teaching writing to their students. Teachers were also asked to describe the types of writing instruction they used in their classrooms and how much time per day was spent on writing instruction. Teacher responses indicated that classroom writing instruction focused on a variety of topics such as basic writing skills, writing processes and strategies, motivation techniques, and organizational structure. Despite the array of possible writing instruction foci, results from the surveys showed that overall, 75% of participants used a combination of process writing and skills instruction. Process writing approaches focused on teaching planning, revising, and editing skills while skills instruction focused on spelling, handwriting, and grammar. Although teachers frequently implemented both writing intervention approaches rather than solely focusing on writing skills instruction, the two approaches were not equally emphasized, and the focus on spelling, capitalization, grammar, punctuation, and
handwriting often outweighs the focus on writing process instruction. Despite the variation in writing intervention approaches in earlier elementary grades, the vast majority of writing instruction continues to center on transcription principles. Having this restricted focus can increase transcription and other writing skills (Graham et al., 2012), but does not target the underlying language skills that students ultimately need to write proficiently.

**Oral Language and Writing**

It is hypothesized that early writing intervention through an MTSS approach can indirectly target the text generation skills and writing quality of younger students with typical and weaker language learning abilities by focusing on oral language in addition to transcription. This hypothesis stems from strong existing evidence which indicates that oral language is significantly correlated with writing (Berninger & Abbott, 2010; Dockrell et al., 2009; Griffin et al., 2004) and is a foundational skill needed to facilitate highly skilled writing (Nippold, 2004; Westby, 1985). In 2004, Griffin et al. conducted a study to determine if oral language at age 5 was predictive of future writing ability at age 8. At age 5, oral narrative language samples were obtained from students’ play narrations and oral expository language samples were collected from a picture description task. At age 8, participants were assessed on literacy measures of reading and writing; writing was measured by having the students write a narrative based on three photographs depicting a story sequence. Results of this study suggest that students with higher level oral narrative discourse at age 5 also had higher performance on written narratives at age 8. The results of this study show that there is a correlation between oral and written language, and that strong oral language at a young age may be related to greater writing skill in later years (Griffin et al., 2004).
Dockrell et al. (2009) conducted a longitudinal study following participants from age 8 to age 16 to observe the effects of LD on writing ability and found a connection between oral and written language. Results of this study indicated that students with LD had consistently low performance on measures of oral language. These students also produced writing samples characterized by shorter texts, fewer words, increased spelling errors, and poorer sentence structure revealing that low oral discourse proficiency cooccurs with low written discourse proficiency. Additionally, path analyses showed that oral language had direct and indirect effects on writing at later ages. Due to the outcomes of this study, the authors posit that addressing poor language skills at a younger age could lead to increased performance on writing measures at a later age.

Berninger and Abbott (2010) conducted a 5-year longitudinal study of students in Grades 1 and 3 and measured students’ listening and reading comprehension and oral and written expression. They found that the four language measures developed interconnectedly and had an impact on one another throughout development. The authors also conclude that based on the language components they observed, oral language precedes written language, but the two constructs continue to develop together in a related manner once students establish foundational writing skills (Berninger & Abbott, 2010).

**Contextualized Language Intervention**

In addition to correlative evidence, there is also emerging evidence of a causal relationship between contextualized oral language intervention, which aims to teach complex, academic language in motivating and meaningful contexts (Ukrainetz, 2007), and written language outcomes (Brough, 2019; Douglas, 2019; Kirby et al., 2021; Lee, 2020; Spencer & Petersen, 2018; Traga Philippakos, 2019). In 2018, Spencer and Petersen conducted a multiple
baseline design study to determine if contextualized oral narrative instruction could improve the quality of first grade students’ written narratives. A contextualized oral narrative intervention program, *Story Champs* (Spencer & Petersen, 2012), was utilized to provide multi-tiered oral language intervention. This program targeted oral narrative language complexity and story grammar within the context of narrative retelling with visual and verbal supports in addition to modeling and explicit instruction. Participants received small group oral narrative intervention from their classroom teacher for two weeks. Narrative writing samples were collected from the participants throughout baseline, intervention, and maintenance periods to determine the effects of oral narrative intervention on their narrative writing samples. Results showed that all but one of the participants increased their use of story grammar elements and complete episodes, as well as produced longer narratives when compared to baseline measures. Furthermore, data were collected after a 3–4-week period without intervention and all participants maintained the narrative writing skills that they developed during the intervention period. This study presented a preliminary causal relationship between oral narrative intervention and written narrative outcomes which supports the use of contextualized oral language intervention as a means of teaching written narrative text generation in younger students (Spencer & Petersen, 2018).

While Spencer and Petersen (2018) looked at the effects of contextualized oral intervention on the writing outcomes of first graders, Kirby et al. (2021) replicated this study but instead looked at the outcomes of students in kindergarten. Participants from a single classroom were selected to receive staggered start oral narrative intervention to determine what the effects would be on the writing quality of students’ written narratives, and to see if maintenance of these skills would occur without continued instruction. Following the intervention period, all students had increased use of story grammar elements in their writing during intervention and improved
writing scores were maintained after a period of no intervention. This study provides further evidence of a causal relationship between oral narrative instruction and written narrative outcomes which supports using narrative intervention to target written text generation and bypass the underdeveloped transcription skills of students in primary grades.

The previously mentioned studies focused on narrative writing as the outcome of contextualized oral language intervention, but there is reason to believe that such contextualized oral language intervention, even when narration is the focus, could improve expository writing as well. In 2019, Brough investigated the effects of contextualized oral narrative intervention using Story Champs procedures to determine the impact of this intervention type on proximal outcomes of oral narrative retell and oral story generation as well as distal measures of narrative writing and oral expository retell. Treatment participants received either Tier-1 instruction or Tier-2 intervention based on their individual needs and ability to learn language. Following intervention, treatment participants were compared to a no-treatment control group. The results of this study found that when compared to the control participants, students who received oral narrative intervention had significantly improved performance on all proximal and distal measures. Additionally, Petersen and Petersen (2016) posit that narration and exposition are more closely linked than they initially appear to be and could even be viewed as two ends of a continuum rather than separate genres of discourse. Noting those similarities between expository language and narrative language such as increased use of complex syntactic structures and causality reveals the link between the two genres. This connection supports the possibility that contextualized narrative language intervention can have impacts on expository writing outcomes, in particular, on language complexity. It was also hypothesized that increases in attention to detail, cohesion within and across utterances, and working memory resulting from oral narrative
language intervention may impact written expository text structure. However, there is no research to date that has examined the causal relationship between tiered contextualized oral language interventions and expository writing outcomes. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to compare the written expository language outcomes from students randomly assigned to a multi-tiered oral contextualized language intervention treatment group to outcomes from a no-treatment control group. Our research questions are as follows:

1. Will the expository writing outcomes of kindergarten students with typical language learning ability who are randomly assigned to a multi-tiered oral contextualized intervention condition be significantly different from the expository writing outcomes of kindergarten students with typical language learning ability who are randomly assigned to a no-treatment control condition?

2. Will the expository writing outcomes of kindergarten students with weaker language learning ability who are randomly assigned to a multi-tiered oral contextualized intervention condition be significantly different from the expository writing outcomes of kindergarten students with weaker language learning ability who are randomly assigned to a no-treatment control condition?

Method

Participants

As this current study involved human participants, Institutional Review Board approval was obtained. This study analyzed a subset of data from a larger study (Brough, 2019) that involved 686 kindergarten students from 28 classrooms from four school districts in the upper Midwest geographic region of the United States. These students were randomly assigned to a multi-tiered treatment or control condition resulting in 14 control classrooms with a total of 349
kindergarteners and 14 treatment classrooms with a total of 337 kindergarteners. Of the original 686 participants, 207 were excluded from this study if they had missing data or belonged to an outlier classroom that had little transcription instruction. The outlier classrooms provided pretest and posttest writing samples which predominantly consisted of minimal transcription with many samples being blank, illegible, and/or had a picture only response.

The current study analyzed a subset ($n=270$) from the remaining 479 participants who were not excluded as defined above. A visual representation of participant selection can be seen in Figure 1. Participant selection began with 32 Tier-2 treatment group participants with weaker language learning ability and 38 control group participants with weaker language learning ability. These treatment and control participants were matched on measures of language impairment/special education services, pretest Narrative Language Measures (NLM) Listening retell scores (CUBED; Petersen & Spencer, 2016), socio-economic status (free/reduced lunch), school, gender, and school district, in that order to the fullest extent possible. Students were mandatorily matched on the first three parameters, and the majority were also matched on the remaining three parameters. Following selection of these 70 participants and exclusion of the previously mentioned participants, a random selection of an additional 100 control and 100 treatment participants from the larger participant group were randomly selected from the remaining 185 treatment participants and 224 control participants. Participant characteristics of gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status (SES) are displayed in Table 1.
Figure 1

*Flow Diagram Showing Participant Selection and Randomization (n=270)*

Measures

All participants were asked to produce one expository writing sample at pretest and one at posttest. The expository writing prompts for all participants were the same, but different prompts were used to elicit pretest and posttest writing samples. Pretest writing prompts asked the participants to write about their mom and posttest prompts had the students write about their...
dad. All students were given the same paper on which to write their stories with space at the top for them to add an illustration. Students were given approximately 15 minutes to write their expository text at pretest and at posttest. Teachers encouraged each student to write as best they could and to illustrate their writing.

**Table 1**

*Descriptive Information for the Tier-1 Treatment, Tier-1 Control, Tier-2 Treatment, and Tier-2 Control Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tier 1 Treatment Group (n = 100)</th>
<th>Tier 1 Control Group (n = 100)</th>
<th>Tier 2 Treatment Group (n = 32)</th>
<th>Tier 2 Control Group (n = 38)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49 (49%)</td>
<td>53 (53%)</td>
<td>13 (41%)</td>
<td>16 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51 (51%)</td>
<td>47 (47%)</td>
<td>19 (59%)</td>
<td>22 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>84 (84%)</td>
<td>91 (91%)</td>
<td>26 (81%)</td>
<td>35 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Pacific Islander/Hawaiian</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SES (Free/Reduced Lunch)</strong></td>
<td>28 (28%)</td>
<td>28 (28%)</td>
<td>14 (44%)</td>
<td>19 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Impairment</strong></td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>6 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Language impairment was determined based on an active Individualized Education Program for language.

The *Expository Language Measures (ELM) Flow Chart* from the CUBED assessment was used to score Language Complexity and Text Structure of the pretest and posttest expository
writing samples. After having read the CUBED manual, research assistants were trained for one hour in a group setting on how to use the ELM Flow Chart to score writing samples. Research assistants then had to complete four hours of individual trainings. Due to limited transcription skills of the participants, some writing samples were illegible which may have affected scoring. In an attempt to standardize the interpretation of kindergarten writing samples, a group of four research assistants produced written interpretations of the writing samples using teacher notes from the students’ dictations or from their interpretation of the students’ writing. When teacher notes are not available, the four research assistants came to a consensus on the best interpretation of the student’s writing and those interpretations were then scored by individual research team members.

**Intervention Procedures**

**Large Group (Tier-1) Narrative Intervention Procedures**

Students in the treatment group received contextualized oral language intervention through a multi-tiered system of language support (MTSLS) framework using *Story Champs* (Spencer & Petersen, 2012). Classroom narrative language instruction took place twice a week for 15-20 minutes each session yielding a total of 28 sessions across a 14-week period. The classroom teachers followed narrative language instruction procedures from the *Story Champs* large group master lesson plans. During the first week of instruction, the speech-language pathologist (SLP) assigned to each school modeled the large group narrative instruction. Following the SLP’s model, classroom teachers lead lessons while using a fidelity checklist to implement the same instruction approach as the SLP. The teachers were observed and coached by the SLPs during their initial *Story Champs* session. Feedback from the SLP observations on teachers’ fidelity implementation was provided an additional three times throughout the study.
The whole-class sessions closely followed the Story Champs procedures; a video of these steps can be viewed at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0M-IKtJVg7s. The classroom teacher modeled a story that included complex academic language using pictures that were displayed and easily visible to the whole class and pointed to the corresponding image as they told the story to the students. Additionally, colorful story grammar icons were attached to the pictures while the story was being told. The students were asked to name each part of the story (e.g., “character, problem, feeling, action, ending”) and use a gesture to represent a specific story grammar element. The teacher then retold the story and the students actively participated in the retell using story grammar gestures. After a second story retell, the students took turns individually answering questions about parts of the story (e.g., “Who was this story about?” and “What did he do to fix his problem?”). Once the students answered the individual questions, the class repeated the answers as a whole. Finally, students were paired up to practice retelling the entire story to a peer. During the peer retelling segment, partners were responsible for monitoring retell accuracy and inclusion of story grammar elements and language complexity as the other student told the story; after their partner finished their retell, students switched roles. Across the intervention period, this instruction method allowed students to practice retelling multiple stories which increased in complexity over time.

**Small Group (Tier-2) Narrative Intervention Procedures**

Students with low scores at pretest and continually low scores following four weeks of Tier-1 instruction were assigned to receive additional Tier-2 intervention in small groups (3-4 students) to support their weaker language learning ability. Tier-2 intervention was led by SLPs who used the Story Champs small group procedures two times per week for approximately 20 minutes per session. The general classroom teachers continued to do large group instruction with
the whole class two times per week at a different time than when the students were receiving Tier-2 intervention. Consequently, students in Tier-2 groups received two 15–20-minute large group narrative instruction sessions in their classrooms and two 20-minute small group narrative instruction sessions per week for a total of 10 weeks totaling approximately 70-80 minutes of explicit, contextualize narrative intervention instruction each week. To best tailor Tier-2 intervention to the students’ needs, weekly NLM narrative retell progress monitoring assessments were implemented outside of their normally scheduled intervention sessions.

Tier-2 intervention procedures followed the small group procedures of Story Champs. A video procedure of similar intervention steps can be viewed at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oeQhZbL9vHY&t=302s. The program includes multiple stories with personal themes and accompanying pictures which were displayed for the students in the small group to see. Brightly colored story grammar icons representing major parts of the story and key language complexity features (e.g., subordinate clauses, adverbs) were used to provide additional visual support. Story games were implemented to allow the students to actively participate as their peers individually retold a story. Games used materials such as small cubes with the story grammar icons on them, small wooden sticks with the story grammar icons on them, and bingo cards with the story grammar icons on them. Games without materials allowed the students to use gestures to represent specific story grammar elements and language complexity features in the stories.

Control Group

The students in the control group participated in classroom activities as planned at the commencement of the school year (business as usual). This group of students in the control condition was implemented to account for threats to internal validity and to provide information
on outcomes of writing abilities over time as a result of currently implemented school curriculum (Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators General Education Leadership Network Early Literacy Task Force, 2016).

**Intervention and Scoring Fidelity**

Classroom teachers and SLPs provided intervention across both tiers. SLPs participated in a 4-hour training on the implementation of MTSLS using the *Story Champs* procedures before intervention began. The classroom teachers were then trained by the SLPs on how to utilize large group instruction procedures. The interventionists, both SLPs and classroom teachers, reviewed the *Story Champs* manual. Interventionists also practiced with non-participant students and received coaching and feedback from the researchers following practice intervention. The SLPs observed the classroom teachers at least five times during the intervention phase during which they completed a fidelity checklist. The results of these fidelity checklists were used to guide the feedback given to the teacher following the session. Small group intervention was self-monitored by the SLPs during each session using a separate fidelity checklist. The average fidelity of intervention implementation ranged from 76% to 100% with an average of 94.8%.

Following the completion of scoring of pretest and posttest writing samples using the *ELM Flow Chart*, 10% of the participants’ writing samples from all assessment times (pretest and posttest) were randomly selected to be re-scored by an independent scorer different from who initially scored the writing sample. Inter-rater reliability was determined using the initial scores as a key for the writing sample. Research assistants who re-scored writing samples scored without viewing the original score first. When both scores were completed, the second scorer compared their scores to the original score. Reliability for Language Complexity and Text Structure were assessed separately with a total of 23 scoring opportunities for Language
Complexity and a range of 16 to 21 total scoring opportunities for Text Structure. Text Structure scoring opportunities ranged depending on the number of Information Units in the child’s writing sample as determined by the first scorer using the *ELM Flow Chart*. When first and second scorers disagreed on a subsection score, 2 points were deducted from the total opportunities to score as there were two areas of the total opportunities to score that did not correspond. For example, if examiner one awarded the child a score of 2 on Main Idea and examiner two awarded the child a score of 1 on Main Idea, the two examiners would have disagreed on the scores of 2 and 1 but agreed that the child did not receive a score of 0 nor 3 therefore agreeing on two of four possible scoring opportunities. Initial point-to-point comparison yielded interrater reliability ranging from 82.6%-100% with an average of 98.4% for Language Complexity. Text Structure reliability ranged from 61.9%-100% with an average of 87.4%. Because of the relatively minor differences between adjacent scores for Text Structure measures, interrater reliability was recalculated considering agreement to be within one scale point. For example, if one scorer rated Main Idea as 3 and the other scorer rated Main Idea as a 2, they were considered to be in agreement based on these within-one procedures (La Paro et al., 2004). With these modifications, Text Structure interrater reliability ranged from 87.5%-100% with an average of 97.5%.

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated to further examine the interrater reliability of the ELM Flow Chart scoring. Interrater reliability correlations were calculated on overall score for pretest and posttest measures of Language Complexity and Text Structure. Correlations were significant and ranged from strong to very strong. Pretest total score for Language Complexity between first and second scorers were found to be very strongly correlated $r(25) = .98$, $p < .001$. Additionally, pretest interrater reliability for Text Structure was
found to be strongly correlated $r(26) = .78$, $p < .001$. Rescoring of posttest measures of Language Complexity and Text Structure were also found to be strongly and very strongly correlated $r(26) = .77$, $p < .001$ and $r(25) = .84$, $p < .001$, respectively.

Results

Data Analysis

In order to determine whether the expository writing outcomes of typical and weaker language learning kindergarten students who were randomly assigned to a multi-tiered oral contextualized intervention condition are significantly different from kindergarten students randomly assigned to a no-treatment control condition, data was collected and analyzed from all 270 participants. Due to the specific participant selection process, no missing data were found. Initial plans for data analysis were to conduct an ANCOVA using the expository writing pretest as the covariate; however, Levene’s test of equality of error variances was significant ($p = .01$); therefore, the data were not analyzed using ANCOVA. Independent samples $t$-tests were instead used to determine differences between the treatment and control groups at pretest and posttest. Typical language learning participants ($n=200$) and weaker language learning participants ($n=70$) were analyzed separately to best answer the research questions of this study.

Tier-1 Treatment and Control Participants

Measures of language complexity and text structure were scored at pretest and posttest and then analyzed for the 200 participants with typical language learning ability who were assigned to treatment group or control groups. Pretest and posttest means and standard deviations are displayed in Table 2. Posttest mean group comparisons are shown in Figures 2 and 3.
Table 2

Means (Standard Deviations) of Pretest and Posttest Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expository Text Structure (TS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLL Expository Pretest TS</td>
<td>((n = 100) M = 2.87 (2.40))</td>
<td>((n = 100) M = 2.48 (2.43))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLL Expository Posttest TS</td>
<td>((n = 100) M = 5.22 (2.49))</td>
<td>((n = 100) M = 4.78 (2.98))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expository Language Complexity (LC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLL Expository Pretest LC</td>
<td>((n = 100) M = 0.21 (0.77))</td>
<td>((n = 100) M = 0.13 (0.46))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLL Expository Posttest LC</td>
<td>((n = 100) M = 0.73 (1.15))</td>
<td>((n = 100) M = 0.43 (0.80))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expository Text Structure (TS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLL Expository Pretest TS</td>
<td>((n = 32) M = 1.11 (1.90))</td>
<td>((n = 38) M = 1.47 (2.19))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLL Expository Posttest TS</td>
<td>((n = 32) M = 3.40 (2.90))</td>
<td>((n = 38) M = 3.34 (0.94))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expository Language Complexity (LC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLL Expository Pretest LC</td>
<td>((n = 32) M = 0.00 (0.00))</td>
<td>((n = 38) M = 0.03 (0.16))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLL Expository Posttest LC</td>
<td>((n = 32) M = 0.34 (0.94))</td>
<td>((n = 38) M = 0.34 (0.78))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. TLL = typical language learners; WLL = weak language learners. Language Complexity (LC) total maximum score = 23. Text Structure (TS) total maximum score = 16 - 21 dependent on sub-score for Information Units.

**Language Complexity**

Language Complexity scores from the treatment group at pretest \((M = 0.21, SD = 0.77)\) were not significantly different from control group pretest Language Complexity scores \((M = 0.13, SD = 0.46)\), \(t = 0.89, p = .19\). Independent samples \(t\)-tests were again conducted on posttest data and revealed that participants who received Tier-1 instruction had higher posttest Language
Complexity scores ($M = 0.73, SD = 1.15$) than participants in the control group ($M = 0.43, SD = 0.80$), $t = 2.15, p = .03$.

**Text Structure**

Pretest Text Structure scores from the treatment group ($M = 2.87, SD = 2.40$) were not significantly different from control group pretest Text Structure scores ($M = 2.48, SD = 2.43$), $t = 1.14, p = .26$. Posttest Text Structure scores from the treatment group ($M = 5.22, SD = 2.49$) were not significantly different from control group posttest Text Structure scores ($M = 4.78, SD = 2.98$), $t = 1.13, p = .26$.

**Tier-2 Treatment and Control Participants**

Measures of Language Complexity and Text Structure were scored at pretest and posttest and then analyzed for the 70 participants with weaker language learning ability who were assigned to either Tier-2 treatment group or no treatment control group. Pretest and posttest means and standard deviations are also displayed in Table 2. Additionally, posttest mean group comparisons of participants with weaker language learning ability are shown in Figures 2 and 3.

**Language Complexity**

Language Complexity scores from the treatment group at pretest ($M = 0.00, SD = 0.00$) were not significantly different from control group pretest Language Complexity scores ($M = 0.03, SD = 0.16$), $t = 0.92, p = .36$. Independent samples $t$-tests were again conducted on posttest data and revealed that posttest Language Complexity scores from the treatment group ($M = 0.34, SD = 0.94$) again were not significantly different from control group posttest Language Complexity scores ($M = 0.34, SD = 0.78$), $t = -0.01, p = .99$. 
**Text Structure**

Pretest Text Structure scores from the treatment group ($M = 1.11$, $SD = 1.90$) were not significantly different from control group pretest Text Structure scores ($M = 1.47$, $SD = 2.19$), $t = 0.74$, $p = .47$. Posttest Text Structure scores from the treatment group ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 2.90$) were not significantly different from control group posttest Text Structure scores ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 0.94$), $t = 0.40$, $p = .69$.

**Figure 2**

Text Structure Posttest Mean Group Comparison

*Note.* Error bars show one standard deviation of error
Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine if participants who received tiered oral narrative language intervention performed greater on measures of written exposition, specifically written language complexity and text structure, when compared to control participants who did not receive intervention. Typical language learners and weaker language learners were compared separately. The results of this study indicated that the dose of oral narrative intervention provided in this study impacted written expository language complexity for students with typical language learning ability but did not appear to have the same impact for students with weaker language learning ability. Additionally, the oral narrative language intervention did not impact written expository text structure elements for students with typical and weaker language learning ability.

Note. Error bars show one standard deviation of error.
As expected, language complexity did appear to transfer to expository writing following oral narrative intervention for the typical language learning participants. These findings align with Petersen and Petersen (2016) who speculated that narration and exposition are more closely related than they initially appear to be. Since narration and exposition both use complex, academic language such as temporal/causal subordination, nominalization, and higher tiered vocabulary, it is reasonable to assume complex language features learned in one discourse will carry over to others. *Story Champs*, the oral narrative intervention used with participants in the treatment groups, addressed oral narrative language complexity using explicit instruction and modeling. The interventionist taught temporal and casual subordination in addition to verb and noun modifiers. First, students were explicitly taught about these complex language features while either the classroom teacher or SLP modeled the language. Subsequently, students took turns including these language features in their narrative retells. These instructional procedures improved participants’ knowledge and use of complex language features which then generalized to their written expository language.

Other studies have shown effects on written language following oral intervention and found that students in the treatment groups performed significantly higher on narrative structure and/or language complexity in narrative writing when compared to control groups (Brough, 2019; Kirby et al., 2021; Petersen et al., 2020; Spencer & Petersen, 2018). Further research indicates that for typical language learning students, the effects of oral narrative intervention extend beyond proximal outcomes and can have effects on distal measures in different genres and modalities of language as effects from intervention are seen in both written and oral narration and exposition (Brough, 2019; Petersen et al., 2020). The results from this study, in conjunction with previous research findings, indicate that written language complexity can be
targeted and improved in primary grades including kindergarten even when these students’ transcription skills are still developing. Current research shows that the primary focus in kindergarten and other primary grades has centered on transcription ability rather than language ability (Cutler & Graham, 2008; Graham et al., 2012; McMaster et al., 2018). This early focus on transcription has not sufficiently impacted writing ability as evidenced by the continually low writing performance of students in the United States (National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2011). A focus on oral complex academic language in the early grades, as modeled in this study, could be used to enhance underlying oral language skills which could then transfer to writing and address the poor writing performance which has been so persistent in the nation.

While improvements in written language complexity were observed for typical language learning students, similar effects were not apparent for participants with weaker language learning ability. This result was not expected yet is understandable considering the distal nature of the intended outcomes and the limited language learning ability of these students. Using an MTSS model, all participants initially received Tier-1 instruction; however, the weaker language learning students showed initially low performance on narrative measures and low response to Tier-1 instruction. As such, they received Tier-2 intervention in addition to Tier-1 instruction to support their language learning. Although these students received both Tier-1 instruction and Tier-2 intervention, the duration and/or the intensity of the intervention might not have been sufficient to yield improvements in written expository language. Since the nature of this oral narrative language intervention did not explicitly teach students how to use complex language features within the context of writing nor exposition, the skills these students with weaker language learning ability learned in intervention did not carry over following the 10-weeks of combined Tier-1 instruction and Tier-2 intervention. These students are known to have difficulty
with complex syntax and other features of academic language which adds to the level of
difficulty they encounter when learning complex language features. Teaching these students
features of complex language explicitly within the context of writing and combined with oral
narrative intervention might have improved their ability to apply complex language features to
their expository writing samples. Previously conducted research has shown that for students with
LD, explicit oral expository instruction can improve oral and written language complexity,
including the increased use of Tier-2 and Tier-3 vocabulary and modifiers (Lee, 2020; Westby et
al., 2010; Williams et al., 2005). The findings from these studies indicate that when language
complexity is taught explicitly and within an oral language expository context, students with LD,
who are weak language learners, are able to learn and transfer the instructed language
complexity skills from oral discourse to written discourse.

Results from this study also revealed that there were no significant differences in
expository text structure between treatment and control groups for participants with typical and
weaker language learning ability. Both narrative and expository discourse have specific text
structures, and the organization and way in which content is conveyed is different. The
participants in this study were required to produce descriptive exposition about their parents.
Macrostructure elements of descriptive exposition include main idea, supporting details, and key
words and phrases (e.g., such as, for instance, an example of, to illustrate, etc.; Lundine &
McCaulley, 2016). However, the oral narrative intervention focused on only narrative structure
which taught students how to retell and generate narratives by including story grammar elements
such as character, setting, problem, feeling, attempt, ending, and end feeling (Spencer &
Petersen, 2012). Although it was hypothesized that oral narrative language intervention would
improve working memory and a student’s ability to attend to details which would then in turn
improve a students’ ability to improve text structure in their expository discourse, the results of this study do not confirm that hypothesis. While the contextualized oral narrative language intervention provided in this study was not sufficient to improve written text structure, it is reasonable to predict that addressing expository text structure orally would have effects on expository writing. Previous studies have shown improvements in one language modality following intervention in another (Culatta et al., 2010; Hall-Kenyon et al., 2005; Westby et al., 2010; Williams et al., 2005). If expository text structure could be addressed through multi-tiered oral expository instruction for young students with typical and weaker language learning abilities while their transcription abilities are low, greater expository language skills could be promoted. Bolstering these language skills at a younger age will aid students in achieving the necessary language abilities that are ultimately needed to produce the high-level writing and may begin to address the writing difficulties which are predominant in the education system (Lee, 2020; Williams et al., 2005).

Limitations

The current study had a large sample size of students with typical and weaker language learning ability, but there were missing data for the weaker language learning group which reduced statistical power. This study originally planned to analyze data from 98 participants who were weaker at learning language, but due to missing data only 70 of these participants were ultimately included.

Another limitation of the current study is the relative newness of the ELM Flow Chart which was used to score expository writing samples. There are limited data on the reliability and validity of the ELM Flow Chart. To address this, all research assistants who scored writing samples were trained on how to use this tool and were required to demonstrate reliability in
scoring before they were permitted to score real participant data. Furthermore, interrater reliability was good-strong averaging 97.5% (range 87.5%-100%) when reliability was calculated using within-one procedures and strong to very strong correlations were found between first and second scorers on all pre- and posttest measures.

A final limitation of this study was the limited transcription ability of the kindergarten participants. Since transcription in kindergarten is just emerging, the content these students were attempting to generate may not have been communicated clearly through writing. Attempts to standardize the interpretation of writing samples were taken, such as using teacher notes from student dictation and having a group of research assistants create standardized interpreted transcripts of the participants’ writing. When text was illegible and/or unrecognizable, a best inference was made by the group of research assistants, who then reached a consensus on the interpretation before the writing sample was scored.

Conclusions and Future Research

This study is the first to examine the causal relationship between tiered oral contextualized language intervention and expository writing outcomes in kindergarten students. This randomized control study demonstrates that for students with typical language learning ability, oral narrative intervention that specifically targets language complexity features can generalize to expository writing. This intervention impacts written language complexity for typical language learners, but not for weaker language learners. Written expository text structure for all participants did not improve, possibly due to the distal nature of the outcome, wherein expository text structure was never explicitly taught.

Future research should examine the effects of an explicit oral expository language intervention on the expository writing outcomes of young students, including language
complexity and text structure. Researchers may further investigate if adjustments in the duration
and/or intensity of oral narrative intervention for students with weaker language learning abilities
will have effects on written expository language complexity and if combining explicit writing
instruction with oral narrative intervention will facilitate transfer of the learned complex
language skills in oral narration to written exposition.
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*Objective.* This article explores the relationships between four language systems: listening comprehension, reading comprehension, written expression, and oral expression. The purpose of this study was to investigate the development of these language systems to determine if the systems develop separately or if they develop as a single construct with subsystems.

*Method.* Participants were selected from Grade 1 and Grade 3 to participate in a 5-year longitudinal study and were analyzed in cohorts of either younger (Grade 1) or older (Grade 3) students. The participants were assessed bi-annually on years 1, 3, and 5 of the study using measures of Listening Comprehension, Oral Expression, Reading Comprehension, and Written Expression using subtests from the Wechsler Individual Achievement Test, Second Edition (WIAT II).

*Results.* The results show that scores for all language systems overlapped on assessment measures between older and younger cohorts when grade levels were the same. Multiple regression analysis showed that all regressions were significant and that language elements relate to and influence one another in various ways. Reading comprehension was uniquely related to written expression across all grades and cohorts, and oral expression was uniquely related in higher grades.
Conclusion. Language systems have different characteristics, but all contributed to the overall language profile and development meaning that language is experienced as a single construct when it actually is composed of systems working together in unison.

Relevance to current work. This study shows that oral language precedes written language, but once established oral and written language continue to develop together. Additionally, input and improvements in one language system may have impacts on the other language systems.


Objective. The purpose of this study aimed to investigate the effects of oral narrative intervention on oral narrative language, narrative writing, and oral expository language measures. The participants were analyzed in groups according to their percentile rank on pretest measures.

Method. A sample of 686 students from 28 kindergarten classrooms participated in this study. Students were assigned by classroom to a treatment or control condition. Before the introduction of intervention, participants were assessed on measures of narrative retell, personal story generation, expository retell, and narrative writing. Students in the treatment group received Tier 1 oral narrative intervention which was provided by classroom teachers who were trained by a SLP to provide the instruction using *Story Champs*. Participants with at-risk language or language disorder received
Tier 2, small group instruction from SLPs in addition to classroom Tier 1 instruction. Following the intervention period posttest data was collected from the participants.

Results. At pretest, data analysis of measures for all participants showed no statistical differences between the group means on measures of oral narrative retell, personal story generation, and expository retell. However, there were significant differences at posttest on narrative writing with the treatment group scoring higher than the control group. Students in the Tier 2 group scored significantly lower than their matched peers at pretest. After intervention, the Tier 2 group participants scored higher than the matched set.

Conclusion. This study demonstrates that students with poor language skills can perform as well as their typically developing peers when given adequate intervention to meet their needs. Furthermore, the results show that oral narrative intervention positively effects oral and written narrative language and expository retells.

Relevance to current work. This study discusses the effect of multi-tiered oral contextualized language intervention and narrative and expository outcomes.


Objective. The purpose of this survey was to sample teachers in the United States to understand what writing interventions were used in classrooms. The authors were specifically interested to see if teachers targeted writing instruction, writing skills, or a combination of the two.

Method. Teachers in grades 1 through 3 were sampled from across the nation to respond to a survey about classroom writing instruction. Topics on the survey covered a
variety of topics such as what writing related skills are taught in the classroom, what percentage of instruction time was dedicated to writing instruction, teacher interest in teaching writing, and others.

Results. A total of 174 teachers responded to the survey about the writing instruction approaches they use commonly in their classrooms. All instructions reported were categorized under eight overarching categories of writing instruction. The categories were: supporting student writing, teaching basic writing skills, teaching writing process, general instructional procedures, promoting motivation, assessment, home environment, and extending writing to content areas. The most frequently used intervention strategies were targeted at teaching basic writing skills which focused on spelling, capitalization, grammar, punctuation, and handwriting.

Conclusion. Teachers reported using a combination of writing process and writing skills instruction when teaching children in grades 1 to 3. Most of the instruction focuses on handwriting and spelling skills, but the writing process was still occasionally emphasized.

Relevance to current work. This article discusses writing instruction techniques used by teachers. It also mentions several suggested improvements to writing instruction in the classroom.

Dockrell, J. E., Lindsay, G., & Connelly, V. (2009). The impact of specific language impairment on adolescents’ written text. Exceptional Children, 75(4), 427–446.
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Objective. This longitudinal study followed children with specific language impairment (SLI) through school to determine the relationship of oral language, reading, and handwriting fluency on writing and to track the participants’ writing skills.

Method. Fifty-eight participants were maintained throughout the study. These participants were assessed by a speech language pathologist, school psychologist, and special education coordinators to determine a diagnosis of SLI. Over the course of the study nonverbal ability, receptive vocabulary, grammar, reading decoding, reading comprehension, spelling, written language, and writing fluency were assessed.

Results. Participants with persistent difficulties with oral language had writing samples characterized by shorter lengths, fewer words, increased spelling errors, and poorer sentence structure. Overall, writing performance of the group decreased as age increased. Based on trends of the cohort, spelling and vocabulary were predictors of writing performance at later ages. At the end of the study all students were performing lower than their typically developing, age-matched peers.

Conclusion. Students with persistent language difficulties continue to struggle with measures of language and literacy and may struggle to develop the language and literacy skills needed to support writing development.

Relevance to current work. This study discusses language development in students with SLI and how poor language skills in one domain can lead to persistent difficulties with later developing language.

**Objective.** This study aimed to investigate the outcomes of narrative retells, personal story generations, and expository language skills as a result of either a multi-tiered system of support narrative intervention or shared storybook reading intervention.

**Method.** Participants included 108 preschool students and 133 kindergarten students from 11 different classrooms. Classrooms were randomly assigned to three groups: two treatment groups receiving either Tier 1 and Tier 2 narration intervention using *Story Champs* or an alternate treatment condition receiving shared storybook intervention. The third assigned condition was a no treatment control group. Students in the first treatment group received either Tier 1 instruction or combined Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2 intervention based on performance at pretest and follow-up testing. Tier 1 intervention was led by classroom teachers while Tier 2 intervention was led by SLPs. Shared storybook instruction was facilitated by classroom teachers. Teachers focused instruction on identifying and defining vocabulary words. The control group participated in instruction previously planned by classroom teachers which adhered to the school district guidelines. Measures of narrative retell, personal story generation, and expository retell were assessed before and after intervention.

**Results.** Analysis of the narrative retell outcomes showed that participants in the *Story Champs* intervention condition scored higher on narrative language measures than participants in both shared storybook intervention group and the control group. Personal story generation scores showed no statistically significant differences between the *Story Champs* group and the shared storybook group at posttest, but both groups scored higher than the control group. Data analysis of expository retell performance showed no statistically significant differences between pretest and posttest scores between groups.
**Conclusion.** Oral multi-tiered systems of support are an appropriate tool for strengthening narrative language skills which supports students’ ability to meet school and state academic expectations. Furthermore, oral narrative intervention can strengthen personal story generation skills and may positively impact expository language skills despite the lack of statistically significant differences between treatment and no control conditions in this study.

**Relevance to current work.** This study investigated expository and narrative language outcomes of different treatment conditions, one a multi-tiered system and one shared storybook reading, and a no treatment condition.

https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.41.1.4

**Objective.** This article explains the Response to Intervention (RTI) framework and how it can be implemented. RTI identifies and monitors at-risk students through multiple testing and retesting periods after intervention is received. RTI also provides intervention through a multitiered system of support in which students receive instruction at varying intensities to best suit their needs. RTI’s two main purposes are: to provide early and effective support for struggling students and to provide a tool to assess learner needs.

**Conclusion.** RTI is a tool that can be used to monitor and remediate students’ language difficulties. Frequent testing and retesting allow for continued progress monitoring and intervention adjustments to meet the students’ needs.
Relevance to current work. This article discusses the framework and implementation of RTI to address language difficulties of children with at-risk or disorder language.


Objective. Three reasons exist for conducting the study: 1) to evaluate the quality of current writing instruction, 2) to reinforce the need and validity of earlier intervention to address frequent literacy concerns in education, and 3) because no meta-analysis of writing instruction existed up to that point in time.

Method. The authors analyzed 115 studies which were categorized into treatment focus groups from 13 writing treatment option. Studies were coded for the different measures and features of the study. Then effect size and statistical significance was calculated for writing treatments in the studies.

Results. Writing strategy instruction interventions yielded all positive effects. Text structure instruction was used in Grades 2 through 6 and yielded positive effects. Studies that focused on teaching transcription skills targeted handwriting, spelling, or keyboarding were implements in Grades 1 through 3, and 75% of the studies produced positive results. Comprehensive writing programs were also used in in younger grades (Grade 1) had positive effects in 80% of the studies.

Conclusion. The collected research shows a variety of interventions for different aged students with all but one showing positive outcomes. The main intervention foci for younger grades such as Grade 1 is handwriting and transcription. Teaching text
generation did improve the writing abilities of student, but did it improve writing ability as much as teaching specific writing knowledge.

*Relevance to current work.* This article discusses writing instructions that were being implemented in schools and the effectiveness of these intervention approaches.


*Objective.* This study examined the relationship between oral discourse in preschool and later literacy success.

*Method.* The authors followed 32 preschool students from ages 5 to 8. At age 5, oral language samples were taken from the children’s participation in a play narration and a picture description tasks to assess narrative and expository language ability. At age 8, reading comprehension and writing ability were assessed. Narrative and expository reading comprehension was assessed using the Gray Oral Reading Test, and Narrative writing samples were analyzed to assess writing ability.

*Results.* The results showed a wide range of oral discourse skills in the 5-year-old participants. They found some children could incorporate elements of higher-level language in their narrative retells while others relied on play and reenactment to retell a story. Writing skills at age 8 showed a range of scores similar to the oral discourse score range of children at age 5. Reading comprehension and written narrative skills were not correlated at age 8. There was a correlation between children at age 5 who used narrative plots and conventional expository structure and higher performance on written narrative tasks at age 8.
Conclusion. Strong early oral discourse skills were related to greater proficiency with later writing ability.

Relevance to current work. This study discusses the importance of early oral discourse and oral narrative language skills for later literacy skills including narrative writing and reading comprehension.


Objective. This study examined writing development in typically developing children by analyzing at micro- and macrostructures of narrative and expository writing samples.

Method. Participants included students in Grades 2 through 4. The participants were given 15 minutes to produce a narrative sample and 15 minutes to produce an expository sample. Eighty-nine writing samples were collected and analyzed for specific micro- and macrostructure elements. Measures of receptive language and reading were also collected.

Results. Analyses of the collected data showed that narrative writing productivity improved across all grades, but performance on grammatical complexity, grammatical accuracy, and macrostructure improved between grade 2 and grade 3, but plateaued between grade 3 and grade 4. For expository writing measures, productivity and macrostructure elements improved across all grades while grammatical complexity and grammatical accuracy plateaued between grade 3 and grade 4. Overall, this study shows an increase in total number of words, number of t-units, and number of different words as
grade level increases. Grammatical complexity increases from grade 2 to 3 and 2 to 4 but not from 3 to 4. No differences between grade levels for grammatical accuracy or lexical diversity were found.

Conclusion. The inconsistent improvement of skills across grades provides evidence that students are not mastering the required skills to succeed in later grades and that writing development may be inadequate in schools.

Relevance to current work. Narrative and expository are used frequently in the schools to assess writing discourse. This study provides a description of narrative and expository discourse and how they are linked to academic success.


https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2014.11.009

Objective. The purpose of this study was to analyze transcription, attention, oral language, and reading skills in kindergarten to determine if and to what extent they have an influence on writing in third grade.

Method. Participants were 157 students from the same city who had participated in previous research done by the authors. Baseline functioning for kindergarteners were assessed for measures of letter writing automaticity, spelling, oral language, word reading, and attention. Informal measures were used to assess letter writing automaticity while various subtests from the Woodcock Johnson-III and the Test of Language Development-Primary, third edition were used to assess other language measures. Attention was assessed using the. When participants reached third grade, follow-up
assessments were conducted using one narrative writing sample and two expository writing samples for each participant.

**Results.** The results of this study showed that kindergartener’s oral language ability was statistically correlated to third grade narrative writing, in the form of narrative ideas and narrative organization, but kindergarten levels of attentiveness and letter writing automaticity were not related to narrative skills in third grade. Furthermore, it was found that kindergarten literacy skills were statistically correlated to third grade expository writing with a connection between kindergartener oral language and literacy.

**Conclusion.** Attentiveness and letter writing automaticity did not contribute to third grade narrative or expository writing skills which shows that transcription does not affect the way children in kindergarten or third grade write. Oral language is directly related to narrative writing in third grade and indirectly related to expository writing in third grade. While writing may be difficult to assess in kindergarten, assessing oral language and literacy skills can be a reliable predictor of future writing abilities.

**Relevance to current work.** This study supports the claim that poor transcription ability does not affect later writing skill and that oral language and writing are correlated.


**Objective.** The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of oral narrative language intervention on the quality of students narrative writing. Furthermore, this study investigated the maintenance of narrative writing skills without continued instruction.
Method. Participants were selected from a classroom of students who could consistently produce legible writing samples. Neither the students receiving intervention nor the teachers providing intervention had previous experience with narrative instruction. Across the duration of the study, baseline, intervention, and maintenance data were taken for all participants. Participants were divided into three groups, and groups progressed through baseline, intervention, and maintenance phases which allowed for comparison between groups. *Story Champs* was used to facilitate the oral narrative instruction for participants.

Results. All participants showed a positive increase in narrative writing ability during the treatment period. Writing growth was maintained after a period without intervention, and all data points taken during the maintenance period were greater than baseline scores.

Conclusion. The results show overwhelming positive outcome and maintenance of the writing skills developed during oral instruction. This provides evidence supporting oral instruction as a way to address text generation skills while transcription skills are still developing.

Relevance to current work. This study examined the direct relationship between oral language instruction and writing ability.


Objective. This study examined the effects of combined narrative and expository language intervention on oral language in third graders.
**Method.** Participants were selected from classrooms at two schools in the same geographical region. Control and treatment groups were established to allow for comparison. Both groups participated in large group oral narrative intervention lead by the classroom teacher; however, the treatment group additionally received expository language treatment provided by the researchers. Language measures were assessed pre- and posttreatment for both groups.

**Results.** Narrative retells at pretest and posttest did not differ in a statistically significant manner between treatment and control groups. Pretest expository text structure and language complexity measures showed no statistically significant differences between groups. Posttest expository measures showed the treatment group preformed higher than the control group on both expository text structure and language complexity measures. Narrative retell measures showed no statistically significant differences which was expected since both treatment and control groups received the same narrative intervention. However, expository measures of the treatment group were higher than the control group at posttest.

**Conclusion.** This study suggests that narrative intervention alone is not enough to strengthen expository language skills that students need to succeed in the mainstream education system, but that there is a relationship between the two discourse types.

**Relevance to current work.** This study examines the relationship between narrative and expository language as well as targeting language skills using an oral narrative instruction approach.

**Objective.** This article details the structure, development, and possible disorders relating to expository discourse in children across language modalities of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.

**Method.** Extensive research was conducted to compile information from previously conducted studies from relevant disciplines. Articles were gathered from databases using a combination of key words in multiple searches.

**Results.** Expository discourse is a very complex form of discourse due to intricate micro- and macrostructure components. Microstructure elements of expository discourse include increased use of Tier 2 and 3 vocabularies as well as use of nominalization, pronominalization, pre- and post-modification of nouns, and increased use of subordination. Expository discourse consists of various subtypes such as descriptive, procedural, compare-contrast, and others. Due to the unique purpose of each subtype, macrostructure elements vary. Synthesis of research also showed that kindergarteners are able to distinguish between expository and narrative discourse, and these students can generate simple examples of each genre verbally and in writing.

**Conclusion.** Due to the complexities of expository discourse, mastery of these skills tends to occur at a later age. Despite this, young students are still able to learn about and comprehend the structures of exposition.

**Relevance to current work.** This article discusses the development and structure of expository discourse.

**Objective.** The purpose of the study was to identify the types of early writing instruction that are being used for children in Grades K through 3. The authors hypothesized treatment would target the three different components of written language: planning, translating, and revising with the focus of translating instruction focusing on students’ transcription, self-regulation, and text generation skills.

**Method.** The authors gathered studies from previous syntheses done on the same topic and searched electric journal databases using key words for studies relating to writing intervention for primary aged school children. Research studies were then analyzed and discussed in groups based on what intervention specifically targeted and the outcomes of the intervention.

**Results.** The majority of studies focused either transcription, text generation, or self-regulation. However, several early writing intervention studies targeted multiple areas of writing in pairs such as text generation and transcription or text generation and self-regulation. The analyses of studies showed that current evidence-based early writing interventions yield positive results when instruction is focused on self-regulation, text generation, transcription, or a combination of skills.

**Conclusion.** This study shows that highly valid and research-based intervention approaches are available for use to target writing skills in primary grades. Additionally, these findings support the implementation of early intervention for writing skills to assist
in the prevention of long-term negative effects of writing difficulties that manifest in the primary grades.

*Relevance to current work.* This study discusses evidence supporting early writing intervention in primary grades and the positive results this intervention can have on the writing ability of young children.


*Objective.* This study investigated the potential relationship between various language skills and writing expression. The authors base their investigation on the theory of writing as a three-step process including planning, translating, and reviewing which develop simultaneously rather than linearly. They posit that poor transcription skills may detract attention from the higher order skills needed to create complex writing.

*Method.* Participants were kindergartener children from 21 different classrooms. Written samples were elicited using a scripted prompt asking the child to write about something they learned in school. Writing samples were analyzed for total number of words and number of ideas in the sample. Spelling was assessed by having the children write real and nonsense words after a research assistant gave a verbal prompt. Handwriting fluency, cognitive measures, oral language, phonological awareness, and reading measures were also assessed. Oral language was measured using the Picture Vocabulary subtest of the Woodcock Johnson and two subtests of the Test of Language Development Third Edition (TOLD-3): sentence imitation and grammatic completion.
Results. The analyses between the measures showed a wide amount of variance in kindergartener’s spelling, handwriting, written expression, and idea expression. Despite the wide range of scores, the results showed that there is a high correlation between many of the aspects of language addressed in this study. Further analysis showed that spelling and handwriting performance accounted for a significant amount of variance in writing expression outcomes.

Conclusion. According to the authors, the observed wide range of ability for spelling, handwriting, written expression, and idea expression in kindergarteners shows that written language develops early and differently for children. This study showed that handwriting and spelling abilities were correlated to written expression ability. Lastly the authors state there was a moderate correlation between oral language and written expression, but this relationship becomes increasingly apparent as children age and their transcription abilities are more developed and more complex writing is expected of the students.

Relevance to current work. This study analyzes the relationship between written expression and transcription and the effects of limited transcription ability on written expression.


Objective. The purpose of this study was to determine if oral narrative intervention has positive effects on writing ability of first grade children and if these improvements are maintained without continued instruction. Due to the abundance of
evidence showing a link between oral and written language, this study posits that narrative intervention can improve writing to aid with writing instruction in schools.

Methods. Participants were selected from a mixed classroom of kindergarteners and first graders. Students had no previous experience with Story Champs and neither did the teacher that provided their oral narrative intervention. Small group narrative intervention occurred three times a week for two weeks for 20-30 minutes per session. Narrative writing performance was measured across baseline, treatment, and maintenance periods.

Results. Results showed that for all but two students, writing scores improved from pre-treatment. Improved writing was characterized by increased inclusion of story grammar elements and some mild increases in language complexity. Furthermore, maintenance data showed that for all but one participant writing improvements persisted 3-4 weeks after the conclusion of intervention as evidenced by the production of narratives with a score above baseline performance.

Conclusion. These results provide preliminary evidence of a causal relationship between oral narrative intervention and written narrative outcomes. This study additionally supports the claim that oral narrative instruction leads to positive outcomes on writing ability for first grade students.

Relevance to current work. This study shows evidence of a causal relationship between oral narrative intervention and written narrative outcomes. It also provides evidence that through oral language intervention can be used to address the writing skills of first graders while proficient transcription skills emerge.

**Objective.** The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of a combined writing intervention which focused on self-regulation and writing strategy instruction emphasizing oral language. A secondary purpose was to examine teacher outcomes as participating teachers learned more about writing instruction.

**Method.** Participants consisted of 121 first graders from a rural, Title I school on the east coast who randomly assigned to experimental or control groups. Both groups received procedural writing instruction, and students in both groups produced two pretest writings and two posttest writings which were analyzed and compared. Treatment writing instruction involved student participation and self-monitoring during the instruction. Students were taught important elements of writing, how to take the next step in their writing, and many other strategies to aid in their production of procedural narratives. Writing was targeted through oral instruction of writing strategies to develop written samples. Writing was not used as practice, but rather the students and teacher talked about the writing process and acted out procedural scenarios.

**Results.** Both participant groups improved produced procedural writing of higher quality than at pretest, but students in the experimental group composed higher quality posttest samples than the control groups posttest samples. Additionally, students in the experimental group were better capable of explaining the writing process and skills that allowed them to produce better writing.
Conclusion. Orally delivered writing instruction can facilitate the development of language skills needed to understand and implement the writing process while transcription is still developing.

Relevance to current work. This study investigates the relationship between oral instruction and writing outcomes.
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Expository Language Measures Flow Chart
# Passage Structure

## Main Idea

2 + complete and clear main ideas directly related to the picture/topic or from model passage (e.g., Cephalopods are mollusks that have a head compared to crustaceans.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Information Units

Refer to the Scoring Manual for detailed instructions for scoring information units.

- **Factual Unit**: a clause, containing a subject and a verb, that conveys one piece of factual information or is presented like it is factual, whether or not it is accurate.
  - e.g., French food is delicious (F). French food is delicious (F).
  - F 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
  - F 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- **Picture Description Unit**: a clause, containing a subject and a verb, that explicitly describes what is shown in the pictures or directly references the picture.
  - e.g., In the photo, it looks like they dig into the ground (S). Now they are outside (S).
  - S 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
  - S 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- **Narrative Unit**: a clause, containing a subject and a verb, that tells about a specific real or imaginary event in past tense; the subject is often a character.
  - e.g., My grandfather is 100 years old (I). There was a time when there were only 20 (I).
  - I 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
  - I 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Number of Information Units: 2 =

## Definitions & Examples

- Use of at least 1 definition
- Use of at least 1 example
  - e.g., A main idea is stated and all information units support the main idea.
  - A main idea is stated and all information units support the main idea.

## Passage Cohesion

- A main idea is stated and all information units support the main idea.
  - A main idea is stated and all information units support the main idea.
  - A main idea is stated and all information units support the main idea.

## Concluding Statement

Does the passage have a concluding statement?

1. YES
2. NO

## Exposition Type

What type of exposition best fits this sample?

- **How To**
- **Description**
- **Sequence**
- **Comparison**
- **Cause/Effect**
- **Problem/Solution**

Does not count toward Passage Structure Score

PASSAGE STRUCTURE SCORE:
Examiner says, "I'm going to tell you a story. Please listen carefully. When I'm done you are going to tell me the same story. Are you ready?"

The other day, Logan was quietly lying in bed at home because he was ill. Logan's body hurt, but it was his ear that hurt him the most. Logan was sad because he did not like being sick. He thought he should go see a doctor. Logan went to see the doctor. Then he anxiously asked, "Do you have medicine to make my ear better?" The doctor said, "I will give you some medicine, then you need to go to bed." When the nice doctor gave Logan some medicine his earache went away. After Logan took a big long nap he was happy because his ear felt better.

Examiner says, "Thanks for listening. Now you tell me that story."
Acceptable Prompts, "It's OK. Just do your best; "I can't help but you can just tell the parts you remember."
Examiner says, "Are you finished?"

**Test of Personal Generation (TPG) Elicitation**
Examiner says, "Thank you for telling me that story. Has anything like that every happened to you?"
If child says "yes" but does not begin telling a story say, "Tell me a story about it."
Be persistent until the child produces a story.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STORY GRAMMAR (SG)</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>LANGUAGE COMPLEXITY (LC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Logan / any name</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>the boy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>lying in bed at home</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>lying in bed / home</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem (P)</td>
<td>his ear hurt / he felt sick / he was sick / his body hurt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>didn't like being sick / was hurt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>sad / mad / upset / angry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>didn't like it / cried / screamed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>decided / thought</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt (A)</td>
<td>said, &quot;Do you have medicine?&quot; / asked doctor for medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>said to the doctor / asked for help</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence (C)</td>
<td>doctor said &quot;I will give you some medicine.&quot; / told him to go to bed / helped him feel better / gave him some / got medicine / took a nap</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending (E)</td>
<td>earache went away / he felt much better / ear fell better</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>got better / not sick anymore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Emotion</td>
<td>happy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>felt better / liked it / smiled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STORY GRAMMAR (SG) SUBTOTAL =**

**LANGUAGE COMPLEXITY (LC) SUBTOTAL =**

**EPISTHE (Calculated from shaded SG)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P+A</th>
<th>P+C</th>
<th>A+C</th>
<th>P+2C+E</th>
<th>P+2E</th>
<th>P+A+C</th>
<th>P+2A+C+E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EPISTHE (E) SUBTOTAL =**

**NLM TOTAL (SG+LC+E) =**
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Large Group Narrative Intervention Fidelity Checklist

Enhanced Story Structure - Retell

**Target**

**Materials**

- Choose any CLASSIC or BLITZ Level B story from story book
- Illustrations
  - If using illustration cards, select cards from corresponding story (for BLITZ stories, use only cards 1, 2, 3, 7 and 8)
  - If using digital presentation, click on the purple Level B button and select the corresponding story
- Story Grammar Icons (icons are included in the digital presentation)
- Champ Checks Dry Erase Boards and dry erase markers
  - Use purple LEVEL B boards (markers not provided)

1 – Model Story

- Display 5 Illustrations
- Read the story
- Place Story Grammar icons on or near illustrations
- As needed: Name the Story Grammar parts and point to icons
- As needed: Students name the Story Grammar parts

2 – Play Story Gestures

- Reread the story
- As needed: Model the Story Gestures as Story Grammar parts are read
- As needed: Help students play Story Gestures as they listen

3 – Team Retell

- Repeat teaching steps for each question
  - Do not allow students to raise their hands; every student should have a response ready
  - Call on an individual student to answer the question and to retell the part of the story
  - Help the individual student to retell the part if needed
  - Model what all the students need to repeat
  - All students repeat the sentence together
  - “What happened in the first picture?” or “Who was the story about?”
  - “Where was he/she in this story?” or “What was he/she doing?”
  - “What was his/her problem?”
  - “How did he/she feel about his/her problem?”
  - “What did he/she do to fix his/her problem?”
  - “How did the story end?”
  - “How did he/she feel at the end of the story?”

4 – Partner Retell

- Put students into pairs and pass out Champ Checks
- Students take turns retelling the story with a partner
- Help students as needed; praise

**Remember!**

- Use 2-Step Prompting to help students
  1) Ask a question
  2) Model what the student should say
- Make corrections immediately

Consider ADD ON lessons 58-63
## Small Group Narrative Intervention Fidelity Checklist

### Materials
- Choose any CLASSIC or BLITZ Level B story from story book
- Illustrations
  - If using illustration cards, select cards from corresponding story (for BLITZ stories, use only cards 1, 2, 3, 7 and 6)
  - If using digital presentation, click on the purple Level B button and select the corresponding story
- Story Grammar Icons (icons are included in the digital presentation)
- Choose a Story Game
  - Each student should have 1 cube, 1 bingo card, OR 7 sticks (game materials are not needed to play Story Gestures)

### Target
Enhanced Story Structure

### 1 – Model Story
- Display 5 illustrations
- Read the story
- Place Story Grammar icons on or near illustrations
- As needed: Name the Story Grammar parts
- As needed: Students name the Story Grammar parts

### 2 – Team Retell
- Leave illustrations on table
- Pick up icons and give each student 1-2 icons; keep one for yourself if necessary
- Starting with the person who has the Character icon and moving through the parts in order, each person retells the part of the story
- Students place icons on or near illustrations
- Summarize the story quickly and ensure that all parts are included

### 3 – Individual Retell 1
- Leave illustrations and icons on table
- Select one student to retell entire story
- Help the student retell all parts of the story
- Everyone, but the storyteller, plays a Story Game
- Summarize the story quickly and ensure that all parts are included

### 4 – Individual Retell 2
- Remove illustrations and leave icons on table
- Select one student to retell entire story
- Help the student retell all parts of the story
- Everyone, but the storyteller, plays a Story Game
- Summarize the story quickly and ensure that all parts are included

### 5 – Individual Personal Story 1
- Leave icons on table
- Select one student to tell a personal story
- Say, “Has something like that every happened to you?”
- Help the student generate all parts of the student’s personal story
- Everyone, but the storyteller, plays a Story Game
- Summarize the student’s story

### 6 – Individual Personal Story 2
- (skip if fewer than 4 students)
- Remove icons from table
- Select one student to tell a personal story
- Say, “Has something like that every happened to you?”
- Help the student generate all parts of the student’s personal story
- Everyone, but the storyteller, plays a Story Game
- Summarize the student’s story

### Remember!
- Assign students to steps 3-6 so the order in which they retell and tell stories changes frequently
- Use 2-Step Prompting to help students
  1) Ask a question
  2) Model what the student should say
- Make connections immediately
- Differentiate targets for each student
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Writing Samples From Control and Treatment Participants

Note. Control participant pre- and posttest expository writing samples.
Note. Treatment participant pre- and posttest expository writing samples.