

# Applying Different Interventions to Teach Writing to Students with Disabilities: A Review Study

Yasaman Rouhani  
Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon Branch, Iran

Asghar Moulavi Nafchi\*  
English Language and Literature Department, Hakim Sabzevari University, Iran

Seyyed Mehdi Ziaee  
English Language and Literature Department, Hakim Sabzevari University, Iran

**Abstract**—This review study explores four methods of teaching writing to students with disabilities. The goal of this review study, therefore, is to investigate writing interventions intended for students with more debilities than learning disabilities (LD) attempting to determine if students' writing developed during the intervention. About 13 studies use self-regulated strategy development (SRSD) instruction and two studies combine SRSD with other instructions. Moreover, this review attempts to determine the possibility of applying journal writing instruction, persuasive writing, and sentence-level skills. Diverse strategies and skills, such as integration of reading and writing, handwriting, sentence construction, and grammar or usage are to be explicated. The results show that handwriting is an effective means to improve writing. Moreover, students are able to change the simple sentences to complex sentences. In addition, limitations and suggestions for further research have been presented.

**Index Terms**—interventions, self-regulated strategy development, students with disabilities, teaching writing, writing skills

## I. INTRODUCTION

Writing is a common mode of communicating and demonstrating knowledge. If disabled learners are not instructed how to cope with writing disability, their weaknesses will influence their academic performance. The difficulty of self-regulating comprises various processes such as monitoring, checking, and reviewing (Swanson, 1987). There are divergent kinds of disabilities: Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD); Speech or language impairment (SLI); Emotional or behavioral disorder (EBD); Asperger syndrome (AS); Autism spectrum disorder (ASD); Mild mental retardation (MMR). It should be noted that self-regulation and behavioral skills difficulty relate to (ADHD) and (EBD) individuals. Their problems include disability of successfully governing their own writing and interaction with other students in the workplace. Organizational skills, including planning and applying activities effectively, refer to (AS) and (ASD) individuals. Vocabulary writing difficulties refer to (SLI) and (ASD) students. Cognitive deficit of (MMR) students proscribe them to use strategies organizationally.

Poor writing skills can have a destructive effect on higher education and employment. In order to promote the quality of writing, more time is required to generate ideas, edit composition, and produce it with less error by practicing repeatedly. According to (Graham & Harris, 2003) to overcome writing difficulties, self-regulation and cognition are significant. Difficulty in self-regulated strategy comprises processes such as how to monitor, check, and revise (Swanson, 1987). In this review different ways of teaching writing to disabled students are considered. These students are taught how to organize, highlight, and underline main ideas and minor details; they are instructed as how to distinguish between minor and major notes in divergent kinds of composition such as report writing, essay writing, and note taking. Disabled students have problem with planning, organization and self-regulation, and some such students have difficulties with sentence level skills.

## II. THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Three goals have been examined in the current review:

- 1- Describing the features of participants, and settings of instruction;
- 2- Examining different writing interventions;
- (3) Summarizing measures and outcome.

---

\* Corresponding author

### III. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature reviewed four types of teaching writing to disable students:

- 1- Journaling;
- 2- Persuasive writing;
- 3- Learning to learn strategies;
- 4- Sentence-Level.

#### A. *Journaling*

Journaling as a tool for personal experiences increases information about various subjects, analyze it, and try to find a solution to obviate the problem encountering difficulties through writing. It is a sophisticated model to implement journaling through designing the plan, activating previous knowledge. Here the relationship between thinking and composing is involved in various activities tending to new ideas. Having involved in divergent activities, students encourage organizing their writing and making decision about the format of it (Armbruster, McCarthy, & Cummins, 2005).

In order to learn journal writing, six standard features should be considered like design, proper format of journal, connection between personal information and external perspectives [verbalization], specific content related to information [choices of words], articulateness, and formality (Spandel, 2005).

Teachers can assess how students understand the content of writing by relating the topics of journal to subject matter of other topic. First, students must determine the format of journal, and then comprehend the content by translating the information of them to their journal while they are writing. Moreover, they extend the topic, employ the visual aids to realize better, and make conclusion in terms of subject.

They are types of journals such as Personal journal refers to students describing their experiences and finding some issues that relates to them. Dialogue journal like personal journal, but teachers and peers can comment on it. Reading logs includes reading books, making charts, writing vocabulary, and recording. Learning logs: They write a section of science or social studies, take notes, and draw diagram. Double-entry journal involves classification of different information on two columns written prediction on the left and reaction on the right. In Stimulated journal, students consider a fictional character to describe and give their viewpoints. Graphic journal includes drawings, charts, and pictures.

#### B. *Persuasive Writing*

Persuasive writing, known as creative writing, is a piece of writing in which the writer uses words to convince the reader that the writer's opinion is correct with regard to an issue, on the other hand it support and offers opinions.

#### C. *Learning to Learn Strategies*

Learning to learn strategies mean that students can highlight, take notes, and organize their writing. Some significant strategies such as cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies are considered (Deshler, Ellis, & Lenz, 1996; B. Y. L. Wong, 1979; Wong & Wilson, 1984). Using background knowledge, guessing ideas, summarizing, asking question, visualizing and monitoring their performance (Chan, 1991; Deshler et al, 1996; Englert & Thomas, 1987; Gersten & Baker, 2001) and planning, choosing, applying proper strategies (Wong, 1979; Wong & Wilson, 1984) are respectively cognitive and met-cognitive strategies. In a study conducted by (Fahsl, McAndrews, & Stephanie 2012), they point out to a method designed by (Graham & Harris, 2003) providing disable students the self-regulated strategy to improve their writing. Self-regulated strategy contains specific features such as instructing writing strategies obviously, learning collaboratively, instructing them in terms of their needs, and providing relationship between sophisticated and decrepit strategies. Cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies have effect as said by (Deshler et al, 1996). According to various cognitive strategies, learners can use background knowledge to conjecture ideas, and summarize them (Chan, 1991). However, students with difficulty cannot use cognitive strategies to write and comprehend.

On the other hand, Meta-cognitive strategies enable learners to plan, choose, apply proper strategies, and to regulate their performance of composition themselves (Wong, 1979). Although students are able to integrate and write ideas explanatory, they are unable to comprehend ideas in their composition. In explanatory writing, the meanings can be constructed at both local and global levels. Learners must find main and relevant ideas to support them.

#### D. *Sentence Level Writing*

Sentence level consists of different skills such as improvement of handwriting, sentence construction, and grammar and usage. Moreover, they are able to transfer their skills to advance sentence writing. Hence, sentence level skills, letters, words, and sentences will promote. The way of writing expression explained by (Berninger et al., 1992) depends on three levels of writing improvement: (1) Neurodevelopment: The physical and neurological maturation for visual motor tasks of handwriting and spelling, (2) Linguistics: Sentence-level skills needed for producing letters, words, and sentences of proper syntax, and (3) Cognitive: The skill of writing that heightens text and strategies. For an instance, visual-motor difficulty restricts written expression to a low frequency and causes more trouble in learning handwriting and spelling. On the other hand, neurodevelopment constrains written expression to a high frequency tending to improvement in learning of handwriting.

#### IV. METHOD

##### A. *Participants*

The first study comprised of 30 students asked to participate in journal writing. This second study is a collection of 19 studies about learning disability that show SRSD is an effective way to progress. These interventions apply (Englert et al., 2009) specific instruction explicitly taught to students. The most wondering characteristic of instruction of writing strategies is consideration of students' need. This treatment is a combination of different interventions on disable students (Taft & Mason, 2011). They have problem with how to design, construct, and govern their own writing. To overcome writing difficulties, self-regulation and cognition are needed (Graham & Harris, 2003). In this study, participants comprised eight students with EBD, 12 with ADHD, Four with AS, two with ASD, five with MMR, and one with orthopedic impairment (OI). About 21 individuals have probability of being at risk for EBD. Their ages from 7 to 12 years old and some students are from 12 to 17 years in several studies by (Delano, 2007b; Guzel-Ozmen, 2006; Jacobson & Reid, 2010). They are 35 male and 22 female. About 11 studies include 2<sup>nd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade students in elementary school; about two studies (Delano, 2007a) include 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> in middle school, and one study includes 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade students. One single study contains 12 to 17 years old high-school students. Percentage of non-overlapping data (PND) was used to describe the results of single participant design study.

The third study investigated the learning to learn strategies by (Englert et al., 2009) comprising highlighting, note taking, planning, and organizing the composition. The assessments discover how students produce expository ideas and whether they can apply the strategies like cognitive ones to back up writing in social studies. Disable students encounter difficulties in applying learning to learn strategies. Moreover, the curriculum, based on the content area, criticized due to the two main reasons. First the large massive of unknown words cannot be understood readily (Jetton & Alexander, 2004). Second, the text structure changes more than story structure (Kamberelis, 1999)

##### B. *Instruments*

To evaluate performance of students, the proficiency and background knowledge should take into account. Since disable students are not able to change their verbal ideas to written form (McNamara, 2007), they should record their journals. They can use computer programs like Dragon Naturally Speaking. Using this program, students can not only to compose what they need to say without applying the cognitive tasks but also to utilize word- processed entries.

Three methods of instruction as intervention treatment consist of Self-regulated strategy development (SRSD); Self-regulated strategy development with video self-modeling; Cognitive strategy instruction writing (CSIW) with self-regulation. Self-regulated strategy development (SRSD) contains six educational stages: (1) Promotion of the background knowledge and pre-skills; (2) Discussion of the strategies; (3) Modeling the strategies; (4) Memorization of strategies; (5) Guidance of practices; (6) Practicing independently.

##### C. *Procedure*

Teachers outline the plan of lesson in terms of students' repertoire. First, teachers ask students to compose about their former experiences. Second, teachers concentrate on how to make the plan. On the other hand, how to write conferences is a chance for teachers and students to work collaboratively.

Self-regulation comprises four processes: How to determine the paraphrase; Self-monitoring; Instruction based on needs of students; Reinforcement. Strategies use to teach how to write story to EBD, ASD, AS, MMR, ADHD, and SLI students: (1) Picking my ideas, Organizing my notes, Write and say more + Who are the main characters, Where does the story take place (POW). (2) When does the story take place, What the main characters do, What happens next, How does the story end, How do the main characters feel (WWW). (3) To examine the effect of ADHD and EBD students' persuasive essay (Lienemann & Reid, 2008; Mason & Shriner, 2008), the persuasive writing strategy such as Topic sentence, Reasons, Ending, Examine (TREE+POW). (4) To teach one MMR student and three ADHD students (De La Paz & Graham, 1997), STOP (Suspend judgment, Take a side, Organize my idea, Plan more as you write) & DARE (Develop your topic sentence, Add supporting ideas, Reject possible arguments for the other side, End with a conclusion) are considered. (5) To teach essay writing to two SLI students and one ADHD students (De La Paz, 2001), PLAN (Pay attention to the prompt, List main ideas, Add supporting ideas, Number your ideas) + WRITE (Work from your plan, Remember your goals, Include transition words, Try to use different kinds of sentences, Exciting interesting words) are utilized to improve in expository essay writing. (6) To improve in informative essay writing in student with EBD and SLI (Mason, Snyder, Sukhram, & Kedem, 2006), reading comprehension plus writing strategy was used. (7) One intervention is investigated the effect of integrating SRSD with video self-modeling (Delano, 2007a). (8) To teach problem-solution summary writing to MMR students, CSIW instruction is integrated with SRSD.

In the third study, students must classify the ideas, and write them coherently to determine the relationship among detailed and main ideas, and meaning of structures (Englert & Mariage, 2003). At the global level, how local information is integrated, sequenced and related are considered (Meyer, 1975). To apply learning to learn strategies, students must think about texts. The assessment tool used here is a part of the Accelerating Expository Literacy (ACCEL) project. In this tool, through writing informational articles, learners summarize, accumulate and underline the ideas in text.

The fourth study (Datchuk & Kubina, 2013) examined a kind of difficulties in disabled students encountering problems in sentence-level skills such as handwriting, sentence construction, and grammar or usage. The three levels of improvement comprise: (1) The interaction surrounded by levels, (2) The conservative growth sustainment, and (3) The elimination of changes in composition. Elements of linguistics begin at the sentence level (Graham, 2006) comprising handwriting, sentence construction, and grammar/usage. Handwriting is in terms of transcribing the letters. Sentence construction is in terms of arranging words or phrases. Grammar is in terms of applying correct grammar, punctuation, and capitalization.

#### D. Data Collection

In the first lesson of journaling, diverse kinds of journaling, purposes of writing journal, and types of individuals using journal writing were explained. Besides, a mentor text selected to contribute students to comprehend more about type of journaling, language, syntax, graphics, and, authors' craft. The succeeding lesson concentrate on types of journaling, and students and teachers can practice writing cooperatively and independently, as they progress. Having written conferences, they read their own papers and teachers comments on notes of students. To improve in writing conferences, specific feedback based on design of papers, and their styles of writing is needed. Considered needs of students, strengths and weaknesses are determined.

In cognitive writing instruction (CSIW), four steps were followed (Englert & Mariage, 2003): First, teachers instruct text-specific writing strategies (e.g., for writing expository text). Second, the connection between writing actions and purposes is explained obviously. Third, specific acronyms as language tool are used. Finally, students move from dependency to independency. Elements of writing to analyze the effect of studies: in story writing, different elements were considered such as Character, Setting, Time, What character wants to do, what character wants to do next, how character feel, Story ending. In persuasive writing, factors such as a) Topic sentence, b) Supporting reasons, c) Explanation of reason, and d) Sentence ending were focused. In Expository and Informative writing, main ideas, supporting ideas, quality, number of words, and coherence were important.

In third study, 80% of students are disabled that 31% out of them are girls and rest of them are boys. There are two kinds of disabilities: 3% and 6% of them are respectively cognitively and emotionally. Moreover, rubrics use to determine the appropriateness and effectiveness of learning to learn strategies in process of writing assessment (Englert et al., 2009). For instance, learners highlight, take notes, and sum up the content to clarify the meaning and support the main ideas. This intervention conducted in two days to evaluate students' repertoire, how they apply strategies. The passage is composed of 740 words. First, the passage read aloud as students listen and underline the necessary points. Moreover, booklets were given to learners, and they are required to imagine that they live with tribes for six months, so they must transfer their experience about people, their lives, also their composition must have introduction, body, and conclusion.

## V. DISCUSSION

Finally, process of writing is surveyed by teachers or students self-assessment. The students provide a file of their writing used to show how much progress they have been up to now. Distinguishing the weakness points leads to improvement of writing proficiency. Then both teachers and students put more effort to solve their disabilities.

The results of studies about students with EBD (Adkins, 2005; Lane, Harris, Graham, Weisenbach, & Murphy, 2008) demonstrate positive effect of elements of story, quality of story, and the numbers of written words.

#### A. Outcomes of ADHD Students

Stories of one ADHD student include 1 to 3 story elements throughout baseline, 5 to 6 story elements during post instruction, and 4 to 5 story constituent during maintenance (De La Paz, 2001; Jacobson & Reid, 2010; Lienemann & Reid, 2008). In the second study, baselines are changed as element scores change. After instruction, their writing processes are improved.

To improve in persuasive writing (Jacobson & Reid, 2010), SRSD is examined. Constituent scores change from 1 to 5 throughout baseline, 8 to 14 in after instruction, and 8 to 12 in maintenance. Second, their scores change. In two these studies the quality and the number of written words are developed.

#### B. Results of SLI Students

Having examined the effect of SRSD in expository essays (Delano, 2007a; Saddler, Moran, Graham, & Harris, 2004), mean scores change from 7.6 to 11.6 constituent throughout baseline and 23.7 to 35.3 elements in post instruction for two SLI students for story writing. Scores of one SLI student change from 2 to 3 elements throughout baseline, 4 to 7 constituents in post instruction, and 5 story constituents at maintenance. The quality and numbers of words are developed.

#### C. Outcomes of MMR Students

Having examined expository writing of scores of MMR students by (Guzel-Ozmen, 2006), essay constituents scores change from 1 to 4.3 throughout baseline, and post instruction's scores change from 10.6 to 15 constituents.

#### D. Results of AS and ASD Students

The effects of integration of persuasive writing instruction and video self-modeling on AS students are demonstrated. Students' writing baseline includes a mean of 2 to 3 functional essay constituents. During post-instruction, constituents change from 10 to 15. Throughout 12 weeks, writing baseline change from 6 to 14 functional essay constituents. Having Studied scores of story writing of ASD students and AS student, it is determined that Student performance range from 1 to 4 story factors throughout baseline, 6 to 7 factors during post instruction, and 5 to 7 factors during maintenance.

### VI. RESULTS OF OI STUDENTS

The number of story factors throughout baseline change from 1 to 4 constituents (Lienemann, Graham, Leader-Janssen, & Reid, 2006). Both post instruction and maintenance writing comprise 7 factors. Quality and number of written words are considered.

The assessment of writing strategies in third study comprises two phases: the planning phase based on how to gather information and plan and the writing phase includes how to write a paper. The features of highlighting and note taking were important such as the organizational structure: learners' repertoire to underline, take notes, and arrange them, the extent of content coverage: Spread of topical coverage coincides to major points and the extent of explanation relates to details, and the reduction/selectivity to sum up, rephrase, and clarify main points. The persuasive writing characteristics involve Topic introduction, Main idea introduction, Extend of coverage of content, Explanation of details, Deduction, Organization of introduction, body, and conclusion. Report writing characteristics comprises Paper introduction, Topic sentence insertion, spread of classification of information, providing details, Results, Coherence. The data analysis, based on ANOVA, compares performance of seventh grade disable students with non-disable students. The results show that non-disable students use more details than disable. Although 52% of non-disable students are not so proficient in distinguishing major points, and 3% illustrate no ability in determining the major details. On the other hand, 90% of the impairment students are notable to underline the major and minor ideas, since they do not perform strategically and specifically and distinguish them in the proper and acceptable way. The outcomes demonstrate through MANOVA: The content coverage ( $p < .001$ ), the reduction of content and paraphrase the sentences ( $p < .001$ ), the rating of validity of notes ( $p < .01$ ), and the structure of notes ( $p < .01$ ). Both groups are not so proficient how to take notes, since their mean of performance falls near standard deviation. Highlighting main ideas is more facile than producing major ideas (Williams, 2003). Disable students have trouble to organize the notes, in spite of producing the essay format, they are not able to organize details, describe them, and demonstrate the relationship among explanatory ideas (DiCecco & Gleason, 2002). Finally, this study rejects the hypothesis that note taking applies as cognitive tool including how write to learn. The results demonstrate that learners with difficulties cannot produce information through mental macrostructure. The most prevalent strategy used by majority of students is copy the original passage. When the source of texts is not determined, they use relative information that they applied in their notes and plans. Moreover, this investigation shows importance of determining the conceptual connection among ideas. Generally, as suggestion, teachers must be responsible to provide explanations and graphical models that contribute students to connect the super-ordinate and subordinate concepts. Should graphical organizers apply, they promote students' expository comprehension and composition performance (Deshler et al, 1996). They instruct students to plan their own organizers as a basis for planning, comprehending, interpreting, and writing expository texts strategically and comprehensively.

The studies related sentence-level skill comprised of several researches reviewed below hierarchically.

Six studies contain students with low scores on alphabet and copy tasks (Berninger et al., 2006; Berninger et al., 1997; Jones & Christensen, 1999). In order to perform alphabet tasks, participants orderly write alphabet letters from memory. Copy tasks asked participants to copy the letters drawn from passages.

Handwriting is in terms of legible formation of alphabetic letters (Graham & Weintraub, 1996). Various processes backup handwriting (Berninger et al., 1992) such as Orthographic coding which writers must keep images of the alphabet and words in memory, Fine-motor leads to transcribing letters, and Visual-motor processes adapts motor movement according to optical materials (e.g., legibility and writing within scope)

An integration of memory retrieval and visual cues tends to the highest performance during time on an alphabet task ( $ES = 1.71$ ) and copy task ( $ES = 1.12$ ). Visual cues characterize numbers and arrows around each letter to develop correct letter formation and succession. Memory retrieval comprises investigating a fully formed letter. Participants compose the letter from memory.

Burns and colleagues (2009) applied cover-copy-compare (CCC) approach to letter formation, with one participant across three sets of discreet alphabetic letters. The participant utilized a model of correct letter formation, covered the model, copied it from memory, and compared it with the original model. If the copied letters compare appropriately with the model, the participants reproduce the letter five additional times.

Some studies examined letter formation and the related process of orthographic coding. To teach orthographic coding, participants use the alphabet and orally answer to sets of letters with the names of letters. At posttest, alphabet task scores contradict significantly from a control group that receive phonological awareness instruction ( $ES = 1.17$ ).

Three studies examine the effect of motor-process component to handwriting process. The first study (Berninger et al., 2006) understand that participants receive instruction in letter formation show faster speed but less accuracy on an alphabet task contrast with a group that get several letter formation process, motor skills, and orthographic coding.

Motor process comprises activities designed to influence on hand strength, kinesthetic recognition in fingers and hands, expertise, and motor planning.

Two studies make a comparison with those who receives either motor intervention or letter formation. (Sudsawad, Trombly, Henderson, & Tickle-Degnen, 2002) ask participants complete activities designed to develop kinesthetic movement or the position and sensation of body parts without optical material.

For handwriting instruction, participants duplicate individual letters, words, and sentences, and get feedback on incorrect letter formation from the instructor. At posttest, the handwriting group improve to some extent on word legibility in contrast with the fine-motor group ( $ES = 0.13$ ) but scored lower on letter legibility ( $ES = -0.11$ ) by (Amundson, 1995). One study (Zwicker & Hadwin, 2009) makes a comparison with motor instruction to handwriting and orthographic coding. Participants pursue letters with an index finger on different surfaces, such as sand, cornmeal, or on letters composed in glue or glitter. Compared with a control group of no intervention, the handwriting with orthographic coding group ( $ES = 0.50$ ) and motor intervention group ( $ES = 0.39$ ) score higher at posttest (Amundson, 1995) although scores did not vary considerably from the control group.

Four studies investigated syntactic and sentence performance with model-lead-test formats (Archer & Hughes, 2011). Instructors model simple sentence construction with picture. Using the prompted words, participants vocally explain and describe pictures, and instructors give instant feedback related to error correction. Having corrected their errors, participants transcribed their answers. Sentence constructions gradually became more sophisticated, turned to compound and complex constructions, as instructors instructed irregular verb usage, subject-verb agreement, and appropriate capitalization and punctuation.

Three studies illustrated effects of grammar instruction (Campbell, Brady, & Linehan, 1991; Dowis & Schloss, 1992; Saddler, et al., 2004). Studies included 51 middle and primary school participants. The participants were between 9 to 12 years. One grammar study showed low performance on the Sentence-Integration (Hammill & Larsen, 1996). Two usage studies (Campbell, et al., 1991; Dowis & Schloss, 1992) illustrated low performance on using correct capitalization and possessive adjectives and pronouns.

Moreover, Instructors designed correct usage of possessive and contribute participants to perform independently. Only one study illustrated effects of grammar instruction (Saddler & Graham, 2005). Instructors designed several parts of speech: nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. When students received the parts of speech, they changed incomplete sentences to complete ones by putting a missing part of speech. Grammar comprised several parts of speech: nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. Participants increased from pretest to posttest on the Sentence-Combining subtest from the ( $ES = 1.9$ ).

Otherwise, one study (Jones & Christensen, 1999) found some new results in handwriting adapted with findings in compositional quality by rubric measured in four areas: ideas, spelling and grammar, syntax, and fluency. The participants heighten in means from 7.42 at baseline to 12.47 following intervention ( $ES = 2.34$ ).

On the other hand, the rubric accommodated a compound measure of several areas: ideation, organization, grammar, sentence structure, word choice, and mechanics. Although they improved in quality, they only apply little amount of sentence integration in expanded writing. The findings compared with results of sentence combining and grammar, Saddler & Graham (2005) demonstrated that students who are instructed grammar instruction show no improvement in writing quality.

One study investigated various kinds of letter formation models (Graham & Weintraub 1996). They found that optical cues with memory retrieval perform better than other model types (Berninger et al., 1997). The process of letter formation and orthographic coding were verified to be useful and valuable, but motor-process does not produce significant results.

Various studies examined sentence level skills specifically handwriting and sentence construction, It was found that there is a relationship between handwriting (Graham, Berninger, Abbott, Abbott, & Whitaker, 1997) and sentence combining (Hillocks, 1986). Both sentence-combining studies do not demonstrate improvement in composition at sentence level skills. Moreover, they illustrate that progression in quality is not based on learning complicated sentence types.

## VII. CONCLUSION

The four studies above reviewed the articles about different way of teaching to disable students at different levels such as sentence construction, grammar, vocabulary... Some problem occur that once disable students know the grammar, vocabulary, but they are not able to accumulate these discrete items together and build a complete sentence or to understand the meanings. It is concluded that teaching journaling promote both reading and writing procedures. Not only does student progress in English Language Arts but also in other content. Evaluation is a distinctive part of journal writing done by the teacher and student increase the promotion of composition. Writing instruction should be based on the needs of disable students. It comes to conclusion that SRSD can be applied to instruct a number of proficiency to students across the story, persuasive, and expository or informative writing genres. It should be noted that a great deal of elementary and middle school contexts make benefit from SRSD writing approach.

The results demonstrated that disable students were not able to build a mental macrostructure of information. It was obvious that once they are questioned to take notes, highlight, and composite explanatory ideas, they did not know how

to categorize, arrange, and schedule the information. They had difficulty determining the major ideas and explaining the relationship among ideas. The students reported to have mastered on the informational passages. The most strategy that they used in learning to learn task was to copy the passage again. Expanding this research to the content area classroom, the results illustrated that many junior high students did not have repertoires and strategies such as writing-to-learn and reading-to-learn strategies.

### VIII. SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In the first study, various disabilities were not explained, and the findings were generalized to all groups of disable students. These two limitations tend to further research in these areas and obviate in the next reviews.

Overall, the mentioned study comprised some limitation that can be considered for further research. One of them is that the results cannot be generalized to a whole population. Because the various studies differed in demographic and functional depiction of participants (Wolery & Ezell, 1993), external validity of results were restricted. Although the grammar or usage studies presented just one positive aspect, different dependent variables, and variety of grammar skills are not taken into account. Further research is needed to specify more time to promote handwriting and survey different skills related to sentence-level skills.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Adkins, M. H. (2005). Self-regulated strategy development and generalization instruction: Effects on story writing among second and third grade students with emotional and behavioral disorders. University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-7011 (301) 314-1328.
- [2] Amundson, S. J. (1995). Evaluation tool of children's handwriting. Homer, AK: OT Kid.
- [3] Armbruster, B. B., McCarthey, S. J., & Cummins, S. (2005). Writing to learn in elementary classrooms. In R. Indrisano & J. R. Paratore (Eds.), *Learning to write, writing to learn: Theory and research in practice* (pp. 71–96). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- [4] Berninger, V. W., Rutberg, J. E., Abbott, R. D., Garcia, N., Anderson-Youngstrom, M., Brooks, A. & Fulton, C. (2006). Tier 1 and Tier 2 early intervention for handwriting and composing. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44, 3-30. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2005.12.003.
- [5] Berninger, V.W., Vaughan, K.B., Abbott, R.D., Abbott, S.P., Rogan, L.W., Brooks, A., Reed, E., and Graham, S. (1997). Treatment of handwriting problems in beginning writers: Transfer from handwriting to composition. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 652-666.
- [6] Berninger, V. W., Yates, C., Cartwright, A., Rutberg, J., Remy E., & Abbott, R. D. (1992). Lower-level developmental skills in beginning writers. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 4, 257-280.
- [7] Campbell, B. J., Brady, M. P., & Linehan, S. (1991). Effects of peer-mediated instruction on the acquisition and generalization of written capitalization skills. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 26, 6-14.
- [8] Chan, L. K. S. (1991). Promoting strategy generalization through self-instructional training in students with reading disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 24, 427-433.
- [9] Datchuk, Shawn M., & Kubina, Richard M. (2013). A Review of Teaching Sentence-Level Writing Skills to Students With Writing Difficulties and Learning disabilities. *Remedial & Special Education*.34(3), 180-192.
- [10] De La Paz. (2001). Teaching writing to students with attention deficit disorder and specific language impairment. *Journal of Educational Research*, 9, 37-47.
- [11] De La Paz, S., & Graham, S. (1997). Strategy instruction in planning: Effects on the writing performance and behavior of students with learning difficulties. *Exceptional Children*. 63, 161-181.
- [12] Delano, M. E. (2007a). Improving written language performance of adolescents with Asperger syndrome. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 40, 345-351.
- [13] Delano, M. E. (2007b). Video modeling interventions for individuals with autisms. *Remedial and Special Education*, 28, 32-42.
- [14] Deshler, D. D., Ellis, E. S., & Lenz, B. K. (1996). Teaching adolescents with learning disabilities: Strategies and methods. Denver, CO: Love Publishing.
- [15] DiCecco, V. M., & Gleason, M. M. (2002). Using graphic organizers to attain relational knowledge from expository text. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35, 306–320.
- [16] Dowis, C. L., & Schloss, P. (1992). The impact of mini-lessons on writing skills. *RASE: Remedial & Special Education*, 13, 32-42.
- [17] Englert, C. S., & Mariage, T. V. (2003). The sociocultural model in special education interventions: Apprenticing students in higher order thinking. In H. L. Swanson, K. R. Harris, & S. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of learning disabilities*, (pp. 450-467). New York: Guilford Press.
- [18] Englert, C. S., Mariage, T. V., Okolo, C. M., Shankland, R., Moxley, K., Courtad, C., et al. (2009). The learning-to-learn strategies of adolescent students with disabilities: Highlighting, notetaking, planning, and writing expository texts [Special issue on written language]. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 34(3), 147–161.
- [19] Englert, C. S., & Thomas, C. C. (1987). Sensitivity to text structure in reading and writing: A comparison between learning disabled and non-learning disabled students. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 10, 105-03.
- [20] Fahsl, Allison J., & McAndrews, Stephanie L. (2011). Journal Writing: Support for Students With Learning Disabilities. *Intervention in School and Clinic*. 47(4), 234-244.
- [21] Gersten, R. , & Baker, S. (2001). Teaching expressive writing to students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis. *Elementary school Journal*, 101, 251-272.
- [22] Graham S. (2006). Writing. In Alexander P., Winne P. (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 900-927).

- [23] Graham, S., Berninger, V. W., Abbott, R. D., Abbott, S. P., & Whitaker, D. (1997). The role of mechanics in composing of elementary students: A new methodological approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 170-180.
- [24] Graham, S., & Harris, K. (2003). Students with learning disabilities and the process of writing: A meta-analysis of SRSD studies. In H. L. Swanson, K. R. Harris, & S. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of learning disabilities* (pp. 323-344).
- [25] Graham, S., & Weintraub, N. (1996). A review of handwriting research. Progress and prospects from 1980 to 1994. *Educational Psychology Review*, 8(1), 7-87.
- [26] Guzel-Ozmen, R. (2006). The effectiveness of modified cognitive strategy instruction in writing with mildly mentally retarded Turkish students. 281-296.
- [27] Hammill, D., & Larsen, S. (1996). Test of Written Language-3. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- [28] Hillocks, G. (1986). Research on written composition. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse.
- [29] Jacobson, L. T., & Reid, R. (2010). Improving the persuasive essay writing of high school students with ADHD. *Exceptional Children*, 76, 157-174.
- [30] Jetton, T. L., & Alexander, P. A. (2004). Domains, teaching, and literacy. In T. L. Jetton & J. A. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 15-39).
- [31] Jones, D., & Christensen, C. A. (1999). The relationship between automaticity in handwriting and students' ability to generate written text. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91, 44-49.
- [32] Kamberelis, G. (1999). Genre development: Children writing stories, science reports and poems. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 33, 403-460.
- [33] Lane, K. L., Harris, K. R., Graham, S., Weisenbach, M. B., & Murphy, P. (2008). The effects of self-regulated strategy development on the writing performance of second grade students with behavioral and writing difficulties. *Journal of Special Education*, 41, 234-253.
- [34] Lienemann, T. O., Graham, S., Leader-Janssen, B., & Reid, R. (2006). Improving the writing performance of struggling writers in second grade. *Journal of Special Education*, 40, 66-78.
- [35] Lienemann, T. O., & Reid, R. (2008). Using self-regulated strategy development to improve expository writing with students with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Exceptional Children*, 74, 471-486.
- [36] Mason, L. H., Snyder, K. H., Sukhram, D. P., & Kedem, Y. (2006). TWA + PLANS strategies for expository reading and writing: Effects for nine fourth-grade students. *Exceptional Children*, 73, 69-89.
- [37] Mason, L. H., & Shriner, J. G. (2008). Self-regulated strategy development instruction for writing an opinion essay: Effects for six students with emotional/behavior disorders. *Reading and Writing*, 21(1-2), 71-93.
- [38] McNamara, B. E. (2007). Learning disabilities: Bridging the gap between research and classroom practices. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- [39] Meyer, B. J. F. (1975). The organization of prose and its effects on memory. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: North-Holland.
- [40] Saddler, B., & Graham, S. (2005). The effects of peer-assisted sentence combining instruction on the writing of more and less skilled young writers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(1), 43-54.
- [41] Saddler, B., Moran, S., Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2004). Preventing writing difficulties: The effects of planning strategy instruction on the writing performance of struggling writers. *Exceptionality*, 12, 3-17.
- [42] Spandel, V. (2005). Creating writers through 6-trait writing assessment and instruction 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- [43] Sudsawad, P., Trombly, C. A., Henderson, A., & Tickle-Degnen, L. (2002). Testing the effect of kinesthetic training on handwriting performance in first-grade students. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 56, 26-33.
- [44] Swanson, H. L. (1987). Information processing theory and learning disabilities: A commentary and future perspective. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 20, 155-166.
- [45] Taft, R. J., & Mason, L. H. (2011). Examining effects of writing interventions: highlighting results for students with primary disabilities other than learning disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 32(5), 359-370.
- [46] Williams, J. P. (2003). Teaching text structure to improve reading comprehension. In H. L. Swanson, K. Harris, & S. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of learning disabilities* (pp. 295-305). New York: Guilford Press.
- [47] Wolery, M., & Ezell, H. K. (1993). Subject descriptions and single-subject research. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 26, 642-647.
- [48] Wong, B. Y. L. (1979). Increasing retention of main ideas through questioning strategies. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 2, 42-47.
- [49] Wong, B. Y. L., & Wilson, M. (1984). Investigating awareness of and teaching passage organization in learning disabled children. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 5, 228-238.

**Yasaman Rouhani** was born in Iran, 1985. She did her BA in English Language and Literature at Hakim Sabzevari University in 2009. She is a student of M.A in TEFL at Azad University, Tonekabon Branch, Mazandaran, Iran. She is the educational manager and advisor at Tehran Technical Complex, Sabzevar branch. Her research interests include language teaching and learning, sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, discourse analysis, and translation studies.

**Asghar Moulavi Nafchi**, the corresponding author in the current article entitled Applying Different Interventions to Teach Writing to Students with Disabilities: A Review Study, is a senior lecturer (2002- to date) in English Language and Literature at the English Language and Literature Department of Hakim Sabzevari University, Iran. He is a top graduate of BA (1993-1997) in English language and literature from Shahid Beheshti University, Iran, and a top graduate of MA (1998-2001) in English language and literature from Allameh Tabatabaie University, Iran. His main areas of research include English teaching, translation, and literature.



**Seyyed Mehdi Ziaee** was born in Iran, 1974. He has received his BA in English Language and Literature from Shahid Beheshti University in 1998. He has been the assistant manager to the General Education Office at Hakim Sabzevari University for the last five years. He is an MA student of TEFL at Hakim Sabzevari University, due to graduate by the end of 2015. He is the licence holder and owner of Sina Ketab Publications, centered in Sabzevar. He has published many handbooks and guidebooks for EFL learner in Iran. His research interest include teaching and translating English.