

Assessing the Social Acceptability of Brief Experimental Analysis in the Context of a Complete Reading Intervention Program



Greta Fenske, Erin Liffrig, Brandon Lauersdorf, M.S.E.,
Christine Peterson, M.S.E., Allison Adams, B.S., & Michael Axelrod, Ph.D.
Human Development Center, University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire

Introduction

- Brief Experimental Analysis (BEA) of oral reading fluency has been shown to be an effective tool within the problem-solving model (see Burns & Wagner, 2008).
- BEA links academic assessment to an empirically supported intervention strategy by systematically exposing students to treatment conditions and evaluating the effects of that strategy on oral reading fluency.
- Following the BEA, students are exposed to an intervention or series of interventions that produced the greatest increases in oral reading fluency during the BEA.
- The methodology is based on the assumption that changes in instructional variables can have a direct influence on a student's reading performance (Daly, Witt, Martens, & Dool, 1997).
- In addition to effectively linking assessment to intervention, BEA is an evaluation method that involves little time to conduct when compared to more traditional standardized academic assessments (Jones & Wickstrom, 2002).
- Given these strengths, BEA is a potentially valuable evaluation tool for practitioners looking for effective and efficient assessment techniques.
- However, research on the social acceptability of BEA of oral reading fluency has largely been ignored.
- Social acceptability refers to the extent to which a particular procedure (e.g., assessment, intervention) is deemed fitting by consumers (e.g., teachers, students, administrators)
- Social acceptability also describes the satisfaction consumers have regarding outcomes.
- Social acceptability is an important concept in education as procedures with low acceptability are less likely to be utilized (Gresham & Lambros, 1998).
- Commonly cited reasons procedures have poor acceptability with consumers include procedures too difficult or time consuming, limited knowledge about the procedure, and philosophical opposition.
- Understanding consumer satisfaction with BEA is important for several reasons: (1) If the procedure is considered acceptable, then the probability of use is high; (2) the chances the procedures will be implemented correctly by consumers are associated with acceptability; (3) outcomes are often related to acceptability.
- The purpose of the current study was to evaluate the social acceptability of BEA of oral reading fluency and subsequent interventions resulting from the BEA findings.
- Specifically, the study sought to evaluate interventionists' (i.e., individuals implementing the BEA and interventions) satisfaction of a school-based reading intervention program featuring BEA of oral reading fluency.

Results

Interventionists reported :

- BEA
 - BEA procedures were useful in intervention development
 - BEA procedures were easy to conduct
 - BEA results were directly related to selected interventions
- Training
 - Trainings provided adequate preparation for accurately conducting the BEA
 - Trainings provided adequate preparation for implementation of interventions
- Interventions
 - Interventions were easy to implement
 - Sufficient time to conduct interventions during each session
- Final perspective
 - A high likelihood of using the BEA and intervention program with other students who struggle with reading
 - A high likelihood of recommending the reading intervention to teachers/parents whose student/child struggle s with reading fluency
 - A high likelihood that the child's reading will continue to improve as a result of the intervention

BEA Social Acceptability Survey Item	Mean	SD
The assessment was useful in helping develop an intervention plan	4.25	1.035
The assessment's procedures were easy to conduct	4.50	.535
The trainings provided me with adequate knowledge to accurately conduct the assessment	3.63	1.188
The interventions used were directly related to the assessments' findings	4.75	.463
The interventions helped my student(s) improve reading fluency	4.33	.866
The interventions were easy to implement	4.56	.726
I had adequate time to conduct the interventions each session	5.00	.000
The trainings provided me with adequate knowledge to accurately implement the interventions	4.00	1.323
I would use this assessment and intervention program with other students who struggle with reading	4.22	.833
Monitoring student progress each session was helpful to me	4.44	1.014
Monitoring student progress each session was helpful to the teacher	3.67	.516
The progress monitoring procedures were easy to follow	4.00	.707
Monitoring student progress each session was helpful to the student(s)	3.63	.916
My student(s) starts each session prepared to complete the reading intervention tasks	4.22	.667
I would recommend the reading intervention program to a teacher/parents whose student/child was struggling with reading fluency	4.00	.707
My student(s) follows the reading intervention protocol as directed	4.33	.707
I did not feel there were enough intervention sessions to help my student(s) improve their reading fluency	2.33	1.000
There are more effective ways than this reading intervention to improve reading fluency	2.89	.928
The research I assisted in with the reading intervention program is important to improving the education process	4.33	.500
I do not understand why the specific reading intervention(s) for my student(s) were chosen	1.89	.601
I understood what the goals of the intervention were	4.67	.500
The child's reading will continue to improve over time as a result of the intervention	4.00	.866

Method

- Brief Experimental Analysis of Oral Reading Fluency
 - Conditions: Repeated Readings, Listening Passage Preview, Word Supply, Sentence Repeat, Word Attach Hierarchy
 - BEA led to brief individualized interventions for 11 second grade students.
 - 9 of the 11 students showed a significant improvement on CWPM (mean number of intervention sessions: 11.7)
- Participants
 - 9 undergraduate student reading interventionists
 - Interventionists were primarily education and psychology majors
 - All participants were volunteers who had undergone training prior to the BEA
 - Participants had conducted BEAs with individual students and continued interventions based on the results of the BEAs.
- Materials
 - A researcher- developed questionnaire aimed at evaluating the participants' satisfaction with the implemented reading intervention
 - 5-point Likert scale: *Strongly Disagree* (1), *Disagree* (2), *Neither Disagree or Agree* (3), *Agree* (4), *Strongly Agree* (5)
 - Question domains included:
 - Satisfaction with Training
 - Ease of Implementation
 - Effectiveness and Usefulness of BEA
 - Effectiveness of Selected Intervention on Oral Reading Fluency
- Procedure
 - Participants received consent forms and the questionnaires, and researchers asked that those who signed the consent form complete the questionnaire and return the consent form and questionnaire to the Program Coordinator of the Reading Clinic.
 - Participants completed the questionnaires at the end of the intervention.

Discussion

- Results of the current study add to the developing literature suggesting BEA has a high degree of social acceptability
- Interventionists found the BEA procedures to be a useful assessment tool in selecting oral reading fluency interventions
- Interventionists also reported the BEA procedures easy to implement
- Finally, interventionists found the selected interventions to be closely linked to the assessment results and effective at improving oral reading fluency deficits
- The present study is limited in several ways:
 - Small sample size limits generalizability
 - Survey created to measure social acceptability has not been empirically validated
 - Other critical consumers of the BEA/intervention procedures were not included in the study (e.g., teachers, parents, administrators)
- Future research should be directed at targeting a larger sample to include interventionists and other consumers

This poster supported by the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire Differential Tuition Program and the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. Presented at the 2010 Annual Convention of the National Association of School Psychologists, Chicago, IL, March 4, 2010.