

Table 1. Summary of Studies Reviewed

Reference	Study design and level of evidence*	Participant description	Intervention intensity/duration	Outcomes in maintenance phase (for ADHD students only)**	Main findings
Cramer & Mason (2014)	Alternating treatment-multiple baseline (A-B-C-D), Level I	<i>N</i> = 8 (4 ADHD); grade range 7–8	Five 45-minute sessions per week, over approximately 2–3 weeks	Quality: increase 167% to 308% Primary traits: increase 116% to 424% Number of words: two showed increases of 215% and 500%; two showed decreases to ~90% of original length	Improvement was noted in the students' overall writing ability. Two of the students with ADHD nearly doubled the number of words in their writing results following the intervention.
De La Paz (2001)	Multiple-baseline/multiple-probe design across participants, Level II	<i>N</i> = 3 (2 ADHD); age range 13:0–14:8 years	Intervention occurred across six instructional class periods; data only collected during post-instruction and maintenance phases	Plans: average 4 (up from average 0.1) Length: increase 128% to 209% Elements: increase 158% to 342% Quality: increase 174% to 210% Vocabulary: increase 154% to 206%	The students' approach to writing became more advanced and quality, length, and structure of compositions improved. Although limitations in student gains were noted, including in mechanics and word usage, both students sustained post-instruction gains during a 4-week maintenance session probe.
Evmenova, Regan, Boykin, Good, Hughes, MacVittie, Sacco, Ahn, & Chirinos (2016)	Multiple-baseline/multiple-probe design across participants, Level II	<i>N</i> = 10 (4 ADHD); age range 12:7–14:2 years	Four 50-minute instructional sessions; writing probes embedded after lesson four across five data points	Number of words: increase 136% to 196% Number of sentences: increase 104% to 600% Number of transition words: increase 392% to 712% Number of essay parts: increase 150% to 274% Quality: increase 206% to 530%	The four students with ADHD demonstrated improvement in their number of words, sentences, transition words, essay elements, and overall quality when SRSD was used with the CBGO.
Jacobson & Reid (2010)	Multiple-baseline/multiple-probe design across participants, Level II	<i>N</i> = 3 (all ADHD); grade range 11–12	Three 40-minute sessions per week over two weeks (6–8 total sessions)	Planning time: increase to 18–31 minutes (up from 0) Number of essay parts: increase 133% to 257% Number of words: increase 161% to 343% Quality: increase 165% to 300%	SRSD was shown to increase the quality, length, and completeness of persuasive essay writing in high school students with ADHD over a brief number of intervention sessions.

Table 1. Summary of Studies Reviewed (continued)

Reference	Study design and level of evidence*	Participant description	Intervention intensity/duration	Outcomes in maintenance phase (for ADHD students only)**	Main findings
Jacobson & Reid (2012)	Multiple-baseline/multiple-probe design across participants, Level II	<i>N</i> = 4 (all ADHD); grade range 10–11	Three 40-minute sessions per week until criteria met (6–7 total sessions)	Planning time: average 10.6 minutes (up from 0) Writing time: increase 312% to 877% Number of essay elements: increase 347% to 1100% Number of words: increase 236% to 416% Transition words: average 6.1 (up from 0.4) Quality: increase 200% to 350%	Following SRSD instruction, students indicated longer essays as well as increased planning skills and overall higher quality writing using more transitional words and phrases than at baseline.
Kiuhara, O'Neill, Hawken, & Graham (2012)	Multiple-baseline/multiple-probe design across participants, Level II	<i>N</i> = 6 (2 ADHD); age range 15–16 years	Intense instruction over three treatment sessions with fading support over remaining four treatment sessions; duration not provided	Total essential elements: increase 205% and 311% Total functional elements: increase 301% and 394% Total words: increase 227% and 398% Planning time: average 13:55 minutes (up from 0:15) Writing time: average 42:32 minutes (up from 6:19) Total composing time: average 56:23 minutes (up from 6:35) Quality: increase 177% and 266%	The two students with a diagnosis of ADHD spent more time planning and writing and produced more complete and better quality essays following their individualized pull-out SRSD intervention.
Lienemann, Graham, Leader-Janssen, & Reid (2006)	Multiple-baseline/multiple-probe design across participants, Level II	<i>N</i> = 6 (1 ADHD); age range 7:3–8:0 years	Up to eight 30–45 minute sessions; duration not reported	Number of story elements: average 5.8 (up from 2.1) Number of words: 149% to 467% increase; except one student who regressed Quality: 113% to 277% increase. The student with ADHD demonstrated 1–3 story elements at baseline, 5–6 following instruction, and 4–5 during maintenance.	Using SRSD was an effective strategy that improved story completeness and quality.
Lienemann & Reid (2008)	Multiple-baseline/multiple-probe design across participants, Level II	<i>N</i> = 4 (all ADHD); grade range 4–5	Four 20–30 minute sessions, 4 days a week for 2–3 weeks	Number of essay elements: increase 343% to 578% Number of words: increase 315% to 639% Quality: increase 285% to 417%	Following SRSD intervention, students' essays were longer, more complete, and better in overall quality than baseline.

Table 1. Summary of Studies Reviewed (continued)

Reference	Study design and level of evidence*	Participant description	Intervention intensity/duration	Outcomes in maintenance phase (for ADHD students only)**	Main findings
Mason & Shriner (2008)	Multiple-baseline/multiple-probe design across participants, Level II	<i>N</i> = 6 (1 ADHD); age range 8–12 years	Eleven to thirteen 30-minute sessions; duration not reported	Quality: increase to 4.0 average from 0.0 Number of words: increase 450%	Persuasive writing was improved post-instruction for the student with ADHD but not maintained. The effectiveness of SRSD in students with EBD and comorbid ADHD requires further investigation.
Mason, Kubina, Valasa, & Cramer (2010)	Multiple-baseline/multiple-probe design across participants, Level II	<i>N</i> = 5 (1 ADHD); age range 12:10–14:4 years	Five 30-minute sessions and three 10-minute sessions over a 2–3 week period	Quality: increase 175% Parts: increase 104% Word count: increase 112% Fluency: increase 120%	The results of SRSD for POW and TREE indicated that the student with EBD and ADHD improved the quality of a persuasive quick write response. Once a writing strategy has been taught and learned, students with disabilities need extended writing practice. This is especially important when restricting writing time, as was done in this study.
Mason, Kubina, & Hoover (2013)	Multiple-baseline/multiple-probe design across participants, Level II	<i>N</i> = 3 (all ADHD); age 15–17 years	Five to seven 30-minute sessions over a 20–35-day period	Quality: increase 159% to 227% Number of parts: increase 135% to 229% Number of words: increase 151% to 240%	Writing strategies facilitated using the SRSD model bolstered persuasive quick writes for the students in this study with ADHD. Specifically, quality, response parts, and word count improved.
Mason, Kubina, & Taft (2011)	Multiple-baseline/multiple-probe design across participants, Level II	Study 1: <i>N</i> = 6 (2 ADHD) Study 2: <i>N</i> = 10 (1 ADHD) age range across both studies 12:7–13:9 years	Five or six 45-minute sessions; duration not reported	Study 1: (GA-led) Quality: increase 113% to 318% Length: increase 118% to 172%, with one decrease to 90% of original length Study 2: (Teacher-led) Quality: increase 123% to 223% with one decrease to 87% of original quality and one the same as original quality Length: increase 110% to 207%	SRSD instruction using POW and TREE planning strategies were effective for students' quick writing of persuasive narratives. Although the students with ADHD also had either a diagnosis of specific learning disability (SLD) or Other Health Impairment (OHI), their overall writing scores improved.
Reid & Lienemann (2006)	Multiple-baseline/multiple-probe design across participants, Level II	<i>N</i> = 3 (all ADHD); age range 9–10 years	Seven or eight 30-minute sessions; duration not reported	Number of story parts: increase 200% to 215% Number of words: increase 206% to 681% Quality: 186% to 407%	SRSD interventions are well suited for students with ADHD. All students improved in story length, completeness, and quality post-intervention. Long-term maintenance is a concern.

* Levels from Logan, L. R., Hickman, R. R., Harris, S. R., & Heriza, C. B. (2008). Single-subject research design: Recommendations for levels of evidence and quality rating. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 50(2), 99–103. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8749.2007.02005.x

** "Quality" is often rated holistically and based on ideation, organization, sentence structure, word choice and grammar (Graham & Perin, 2007a).

Table 2. Summary of Studies With Strategy Acronym and Strategy Definitions

Study	Strategies used	Strategy definition
Cramer & Mason (2014)	POW + TREE	Guides students' composition of opinion essays. TREE creates a framework during the second step of POW.
De La Paz (2001)	PLAN + WRITE	Prompts students to plan before starting to write and to reflect on qualities of good writing while composing.
Evmenova, Regan, Boykin, Good, Hughes, MacVittie, Saccos, Ahn, & Chirinos (2016)	IDEAS with a computer-based graphic organizer	Prompts students to identify their opinion, identify reasons, and provide examples of or evidence for those reasons in a persuasive essay.
Jacobson & Reid (2010) Jacobson & Reid (2012)	STOP + DARE	STOP aids in the planning for persuasive essay writing. DARE ensures the essay contains all the required elements determined in the planning phase.
Kiuhara, O'Neill, Hawken, & Graham (2012)	STOP + AIMS + DARE	STOP aids in the planning for persuasive essay writing. AIMS helps the student develop an appealing introduction that contextualizes information. DARE ensures the essay contains all the required elements determined in the planning phase.
Lienemann, Graham, Leader-Janssen, & Reid (2006)	POW + WWW, What = 2, How = 2	Helps students generate ideas and notes for each of the seven basic parts of a story.
Mason & Shriner (2008)	POW + TREE	Guides students' composition of opinion essays. TREE creates a framework during the second step of POW.
Mason, Kubina, & Hoover (2013)	POW + TREE	Guides students' composition of opinion essays. TREE creates a framework during the second step of POW.
Mason, Kubina, & Taft (2011)	POW + TREE	Guides students' composition of opinion essays. TREE creates a framework during the second step of POW.
Mason, Kubina, Valasa, & Cramer (2010)	POW + TREE	Guides students' composition of opinion essays. TREE creates a framework during the second step of POW.
Reid & Lienemann (2006)	POW + WWW, What = 2, How = 2	Helps students generate ideas and notes for each of the seven basic parts of a story.

Note. POW = Pick my ideas, Organize my notes, Write and say more; TREE = Topic sentence, Reasons, Ending, Examine; PLAN = Pay attention to the prompt, List main ideas, Add supporting ideas, Number the major points; WRITE = Work from your plan, Remember your goals, Include transition words, Try to use different kinds of sentences, Exciting, interesting, million-dollar words; IDEAS = Identify your opinion, Describe three reasons, Examples of reasons, Add transition words, Summarize; STOP = Suspend judgment, Take a side, Organize your ideas, Plan more as you write; DARE = Develop a topic sentence, Add supporting ideas, Reject the other side, End with conclusion; AIMS = Attract the reader's attention, Identify the problem, Map the context, State the thesis; WWW, What = 2, How=2 = Who, When, Where, What does the main character do? What happens then? How does the story end? How does the main character feel?

Table 3. Levels of Evidence for Single-Subject Research Designs

Evidence	Level	Interpretation
Randomized controlled <i>N</i> -of-1, alternating treatment (ATD), and concurrent or nonconcurrent multiple-baseline designs (MBDs) with clear-cut results; generalizability if the ATD is replicated across three or more subjects and the MBD consists of a minimum of three subjects, behaviors, or settings	I	Causal inferences
Nonrandomized, controlled, concurrent MBD with clear-cut results; generalizability if design consists of a minimum of three subjects, behaviors, or settings	II	Limited causal inferences
Nonrandomized, nonconcurrent, controlled MBD with clear-cut results; generalizability if design consists of a minimum of three subjects, behaviors, or settings	III	Limited causal inferences
Nonrandomized, controlled design with at least three phases (ABA, ABAB, BAB, etc.) with clear-cut results; generalizability if replicated across five or more different subjects	IV	Hints at causal inferences
Nonrandomized controlled AB single-subject research design with clear-cut results; generalizability if replicated across three or more different subjects	V	Suggests causal inferences (testing of ideas)

Adapted from Logan, L. R., Hickman, R. R., Harris, S. R., & Heriza, C. B. (2008). Single-subject research design: Recommendations for levels of evidence and quality rating. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 50(2), 99–103. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8749.2007.02005.x