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According to IDEA (1997), students who receive special education must have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). Student goals are a required portion of the IEP and can be developed, monitored, and evaluated with or without the student. The literature indicates personal involvement in goal setting increases commitment to achieve the goal, mastery of learning concepts, and intrinsic motivation (Muir, 2000). The purpose of this study was to investigate (a) students’ knowledge of their IEP goals, (b) the level of participation students “liked” as depicted in 3 videotaped IEP development scenarios, and (c) the extent of students’ participation in IEP goal setting. A sample of 30 males in grades 6, 7, and 8 who received special education services were participants in the study. The students rated videos depicting three levels of involvement in student-teacher educational goal setting. The students were also interviewed to determine (a) knowledge level of existing IEP goals and objectives, (b) reasons for video preferences, (c) and the way the students would like to work with their teachers. Results indicated a significant rank order for the amount of involvement with high involvement first, limited involvement second, and low involvement third. Further results revealed students had general goal knowledge, but did not have the ability to recall specific objectives written in their IEP. Students also related that they would like to work with their teacher in a similar manner to the high involvement video scenario. Results were discussed in terms of methodological limitations and the need for additional research.
Literature Review

All students receiving special education services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 1997) have a document on file titled an Individual Education Program (IEP). The IEP is a contract for the provision of services that exists to ensure students with disabilities have equal educational opportunities. This document is a written guideline for educators, administrators, families, and the student to follow and regularly revise as appropriate. While the intended purpose of the IEP is to provide accountability, the literature reviewed indicates that personal involvement in goal setting increases commitment to achieve the goal, mastery of learning concepts, and intrinsic motivation (Muir, 2000). The purpose of this study is to investigate students’ knowledge of their IEP goals, preferences for involvement, and the extent of the students’ participation in IEP goal setting. The literature regarding goal setting, self-regulation through goal setting, and student achievement is examined, along with a description of Individual Education Programs and the process of IEP development. Following this review, the purpose of the current study will be described.

Individual Education Plans For Special Education Students

Individual Education Programs are established for every student identified with a disability that impedes educational functioning, according to federal law (IDEA, 1997). Further, IEPs are developed according to procedures developed by each state. These documents and the process of IEP development are set forth by federal legislation.

The specific components of each IEP are consistent across individuals, although individually tailored to meet the needs of each student. Special education and related services are to be determined by a careful assessment of an individual student’s needs. The services designed for a student are specified in each IEP and federal law stipulates the necessary components of the IEP. One component of the IEP, should be a complete documentation of the student’s present levels of education performance. Also included in
the IEP is a list of strengths and weaknesses of the student. Another component must be a statement of measurable goals or benchmarks and short-term objectives. The goals in the IEP must address how the team will meet the student’s needs to enable him or her to be involved and progress in the general education curriculum. Each goal is accompanied by specific time lines for mastery and must describe the measurement used to assess progress as well as the process of monitoring the goal. The person responsible for implementation and monitoring these goals must be designated in the IEP. These goals are important to the direction of the instructional process (Snyder & Shapiro, 1997).

Federal regulations specify the committee members required to make decisions regarding special education eligibility, placement decisions, and goals. The student is determined to be a participant in the educational planning committee meetings “if appropriate” (IDEA, 1997). This statement leaves members of the educational system and committee members responsible for deciding the circumstances under which a student should or should not attend his or her special education meeting. Therefore, the student is not required by law to attend meetings that design his or her educational program. In fact, most students in special education do not participate in the development of their IEP (Van Reusen, 1998). For example, a random sample of students with IEPs found that only 36% of the 74 high school students had attended an IEP meeting (Synder & Shapiro, 1997).

Goal Setting

Goal setting is defined as a method of focusing attention toward the current and projected state, the steps toward the goal, and the effort that is required of the individual (Fuchs, Fuchs, Hamlett, & Allinder, 1991). Goal setting is the act of setting up standards of performance through the examination of a current level of functioning. The difference between the current state of behavior or performance and a desired condition is the beginning point for the production of goals (Miller & Kelley, 1994). Goal setting is a method that will give children and educators a path to improved outcomes. Involving a
Student in this process is considered a relevant and effective method of influencing motivation to succeed (Davis, Fuchs, & Fuchs, 1995).

Student participation through teaching and working through a goal-setting process as well as attending educational meetings may give the student focus in the educational endeavor. Participation in goal setting provides an individual with focus, an examination of current and desired states, and the steps to reach that point of reward (Pajares, Britner, & Valiante, 2000). If an individual does not have knowledge of the current state, steps to take, or an understanding of what will occur once effort is made, an internal desire to improve performance may or may not develop.

The Relationship Between Goal Setting and Motivation

The relationship between goals and motivation is an important consideration when trying to help students reach their academic potential. Student participation in educational goal setting allows the individual to focus on the current condition and the desired condition. The ability to understand goals will first emerge in children as desired outcomes until a child can relate the outcomes of their activities with their purposeful actions (Lisyuk, 1998). Once that skill emerges in a child, goals that are in place and monitored serve to direct the focus of the child’s actions toward a desired state. The process of setting goals and frequent monitoring with feedback could serve to improve focus and motivation to accomplish the desired task (Fuchs et al., 1991).

Relevant to this discussion is the importance of well-written goals as well as the level of appropriateness of the goal. The results of appropriate goal setting extend well beyond the initial investment and desired outcome. For example, as far back as 1953, researchers found three percent of Yale graduates had clearly defined, written financial goals. Through follow-up questioning in 1973, researchers found that the three percent with written goals had accumulated wealth that totaled more than the other 97% combined (Donohue, 1999). As educators, we know socioeconomic factors, social and family supports, and achievement motivation influence many students’ ability to work to
potential. Goal setting may provide students an opportunity to gain a skill that will help students consider their potential and accommodate behavior.

Transition to middle school is a significant time for a student socially and academically. This period of development has been carefully examined concerning student social goals, school belongingness, and classroom goal orientation. One skill that is important to the development of a middle school aged youth may include completing a task with a strong focus on educational commitment and opportunity for success (Pajares et al., 2000). In addition, social and academic improvement in students is associated with responsibility goals (Anderman & Hicks, 1999). Youth in this stage of development will display many needs as regards life skills, social skills, and academic functioning.

Attention to specific steps that lead to the accomplishment of a student's desires may provide the connection and experience needed to adjust effort, performance, and awareness of current functioning.

Goal setting in particular is found to improve the likelihood that students will become motivated to direct behavior in a positive direction and achieve according to higher academic standards (Sweet, Guthrie, & Ng, 1998). Furthermore, including the student in goal setting and problem solving may increase motivation to improve and send a message that the student is important (Grossman, 1997). According to Gentry and Neu (1998), a curriculum called High Hopes developed a forum of constructing goals for students with special needs. Students with a disability, who were also identified as gifted in the areas of visual or performing arts, engineering, or life sciences participated in the specifically designed program implemented in six middle schools. Creative problem solving was used in a real life dilemma in which a decaying water system was the focus during the three-year project. Students made great strides in many personal and academic areas of development when given a hands-on, student engagement approach that directly involved the students in developing goals. Students in High Hopes began to volunteer for clubs, focus on strengths, and set academic goals for themselves after the completion of
the program. Thus, the curriculum that involved students in goal setting was followed by increased activity and focus in academic and social endeavors.

Children with various disabilities have characteristics or associated conditions that range from passivity or learned helplessness to aggressive, manipulative behaviors. An engaging and challenging atmosphere is highly beneficial to the early development of a student's self-regulated learning and promotes the necessary conditions for achievement. Adult role models are particularly important in assisting children to overcome their feelings of helplessness and lack of decision-making within their environment. Role models can provide evidence for goal directed behavior and outcomes that are consistent with social and vocational needs (Lisyuk, 1998). For example, a student can observe an adult role model planning projects and designating intermediate steps to an outcome. The accomplishment of the outcome after consistent and prolonged effort can help the student associate effort and planning behavior with a desired outcome.

A student's participation in the goal setting process will enable the student to understand expectations and the steps required to attain results agreed upon in advance. Regular monitoring of goals with immediate feedback to the student can help the student connect the effort expended to the outcome (e.g., test scores, positive behavior points). The encouragement of student attendance and participation in the formal development of goals designed through special education services may lead to an improved motivation to succeed (Snyder & Shapiro, 1997). Goal setting through special education services includes the requirement of maintaining regular monitoring records and review of progress. Therefore, the meeting in which goals are developed and reviewed may be beneficial to the student through planning objectives or specific steps that lead to the attainment of a general goal as well as review of previous goals and objectives.

Therefore, through the examination of current levels of performance and attention to the student's ability to self-regulate, goal setting is a method that may be used to assist in motivating a student to perform. A student may find the process of goal setting to be a
new endeavor that may assist the student in lifelong accomplishments. Attention to progress will also develop the ability to evaluate oneself and adjust efforts and plans (Davis et al., 1995).

**Goal Setting Through Self-Regulation**

One method in which a student may become involved in educational progress is through self-regulation of behavior and effort. One avenue in which self-regulation can occur includes the development of goals (Davis et al., 1995). Self-regulated learners gravitate toward challenges, expend higher levels of effort, and find value in the task (Grolnick, Kurowski, & Gurland, 1999). Students can be regarded as self-regulated learners when their behavior displays active participation in personal learning (Zimmerman, 1989). In order to move forward in terms of acquired knowledge, classroom performance, and study skills, students need to develop self-regulation. Therefore, the ability to self-regulate learning through setting goals can lead to improved motivation and educational progress (Grolnick et al., 1999).

Self-regulation is explained by Butler and Winne (1995) as one’s ability to monitor activities with internal feedback. Internal monitoring is done through the process of sequencing future events, setting goals, and adjusting motivation. Further expected in the concept of self-regulation is the value of reasonably accurate self-evaluation and internal demands or goals that are consistently fine-tuned. The behavioral intervention of self-management includes teaching students to attend to the problems in their environment, monitor their behavior, and reinforce themselves for appropriate behaviors (Grossman, 1997). Therefore, self-management techniques provide the student with specifically designed strategies to direct attention and awareness of behavior toward independent functioning found in self-regulation (Grolnick et al., 1999).

Goal setting has been a focus for interventions designed to assist students with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). Barkley (1992) found that ADHD results from deficits in the self-regulation of behavior. These children lack executive
processing ability found in planning and goal setting activities. Suggested treatments include training in goal setting and self-monitoring procedures. One activity associated with self-monitoring is self-management. Self-management is an intervention employed by educators that helps students learn independent behaviors. Students use self-monitoring procedures to record their own behavior and adjust the behavior accordingly through self-management.

The ability to regulate thoughts must develop in an individual prior to the regulation of behavior. The first step in teaching self-regulation to students is often internal speech. The internalization of speech is a process that leads to the regulation of attention and behavior (Westby & Cutler, 1994). The child's ability to self-regulate influences affect, drive, and motivation (Barkley, 1997). The ability to attend and focus on a necessary task is guided by internal information. Therefore, the information in turn leads to behavior control that executes an individual's plans, intentions, and therefore goals (Barkley, 1997).

Executive functioning is the ability to plan and organize behavior through the purposeful planning of events and behavior. One area of executive functioning, referred to as retrospective and prospective functions, is important to the process of goal directed behavior (Grolnick et al., 1999). These functions rely on information kept in memory in sequential order, thereby allowing a person to decide upon certain actions and guide performance toward goal-directed behavior (Barkley, 1997).

Educational Motivation Through Goal Setting

Participation in the goal setting procedure is vital to the success of the student and the possibility that the student will meet the intended outcomes. One study of curriculum-based measurement suggested the systematic measurement of progress and continuous feedback may lead to a higher degree of student involvement in learning processes and provide accountability to students as they learn (Davis et al., 1995). Feedback is an important aspect of self-regulation because students need to remain aware
of the degree of effort needed to reach a goal or recognize the achievement made as they work toward a goal and make additional goals.

General research in goal setting acknowledges that effective plans must be written, well defined, clear, and realistic (Bolling, Piersel, & Allinder, 1999). Student involvement in the development of goals may help to ensure the goals developed are not only practical but also understood by the person working toward them. Therefore, student involvement in the development of goals may provide the conditions research suggests are necessary for effective plans. Personal investment in the development of goals as well as self-monitoring and evaluation are equally important to the highest degree of success (Grossman, 1997). Another point to consider is the level of student goal knowledge. Students can not attempt self-monitoring activities without knowing their goals. When students participate in the development of their goals, they are more likely to know their goals, according to curriculum-based measurement studies. Fuchs, Deno, and Mirkin (1984) conducted student interviews to discover student knowledge of learning goals. The interviews found that goal setting and regular feedback through curriculum-based measurement resulted in more frequent goal statements, more correctly estimated goal progress, and a clearer interpretation of the work necessary to reach the current goal.

Theories of motivation should be kept in mind when attempting to work goal setting into an academic environment. The goals students hold as they approach their work can be divided into the categories of mastery goals or performance goals. A mastery goal is also referred to as a task-involved goal (Archer, 1992). The student working toward the mastery of a goal expends effort to learn, accomplish, or master the material or task. Thus, effort is given in proportion to the task required. Students working toward a performance goal demonstrate their ability to others by being successful, in particular by doing well despite expending little effort (Pajares et al., 2000). Performance goal success is usually attributed to the students' ability rather than
their effort (Morrone & Pintrich, 1997). An example of a performance goal is the practice of posting grades for all the students to observe. The classmates desire to perform well in comparison to others, rather than to see their score for what it means to them.

However, when the focus is placed on student self-improvement or reaching a predetermined standard, students focus on the effort they expended or the strategies they used to finalize the task. This type of goal is referred to again as a mastery goal. Adoption of a mastery goal has been linked to variables that may enhance learning. The definition of success is found in an increase in learning, choosing a challenging task, and contributing success to trying hard (Archer, 1992). A practical use of mastery goals is evident in the specific, learning-based goals set in compliance with the Individual Education Program. The very effort of including a child in the development of these goals during a meeting with the necessary professionals could set up the conditions to heighten the student's motivation to tackle his or her goals.

Therefore, the efforts of professions to increase student exposure to goal setting opportunities and techniques suggested through available research will empower the student to succeed academically. The information available on goal setting does indicate the need to provide students with clear, written expectations (Donahue, 1999). A challenging and rewarding use of strategies to enhance learning and intrinsic motivation is useful to students in general. In addition, an educational program that provides the student with the opportunity to focus on mastery of goals, self-regulation of attention, and work efforts will provide the conditions that lead to a motivation to achieve.

**Purpose of Present Study**

Given the literature reviewed regarding student knowledge of goals and student participation through self-regulation and goal setting, the following research was conducted. The focus of the researcher sought to determine students' awareness of their IEP goals and objectives as well as the degree of participation students would like to have
when setting IEP goals, and the extent of students’ participation in IEP goal setting. There has been little research available to determine if students are aware of their goals or objectives. Research on goal setting and continuous feedback with students using curriculum-based measurement showed student participation helped increase the accuracy of student goal knowledge and student estimations of their own performance (Fuchs et al., 1984). However, research on students’ knowledge of their IEP goals has not been found in the literature. Therefore, the current study addressed students’ IEP goal knowledge. Do students know what goals and objectives are included in their IEPs?

Research has not been found on students’ likes or dislikes as regards their participation in educational goal setting. Although student participation is legally encouraged, there is no requirement that educators must include students in the development of goals for their IEP. Literature in the area of goal setting and self-regulation supports student involvement in goal setting activities. Therefore, the current study was focused on the degree of participation students would like. Specifically, will middle school students show a rank order preference for higher levels of student involvement in goal setting?

Specifically, it is hypothesized that:

1. When students are questioned about what they are working on with their special education teacher, they will be able to accurately state their goals as found in their current IEP.

2. When comparing three videos scenarios that represent three levels of student participation in goal development, research will find that students indicate they like the scenario most frequently that depicts a high degree of student participation in goal setting. The scenario ranked second in frequency would be the scenario depicting a limited degree of student participation in goal setting. The scenario ranked third in frequency would be the low degree of student participation in goal setting.
Method

Participants

This study was completed in one school district in central Kentucky. The district is the third largest district in Kentucky and consists primarily of rural communities. Reports as of December 1, 2000, indicate the total student population is 12,690 registered in grades K – 12. Eleven percent (1,328 children) of these students receive special education services. There are five middle schools in the district. The researcher was able to use only three middle schools in the study because access was limited to those schools with which the researcher had professional affiliation. The students registered within those three schools represent fifty-seven percent of the special education students in middle schools in this district. The participants in this study were not randomly selected due to the need to obtain parental consent, student assent, and the use of selected schools in the district.

Furthermore, the research pool was limited to male students in these three middle schools. Males were chosen for this study due to the higher representation of males in the population of the study and the desire to match the gender of the actor used in the videotaped scenarios. There are 191 students receiving special education resource assistance in the three middle schools in the study, and 122 (69%) of those students are male. All 122 male students were invited to participate in the study. Thirty students (25%) returned the consent form signed by their parents and checked “yes” to indicate consent was granted. All thirty students were also given an assent form and an explanation of the study prior to their participation. Those students signed the assent form, viewed the videos, and cooperated with interviews to completion. The Human Subjects Review Board of Western Kentucky University reviewed all procedures and indicated the procedures met ethical standards for conducting research (see Appendix A).
Students in the study participated in special education services according to Kentucky guidelines through five disability placement categories: Specific Learning Disability, Emotional/Behavior Disability, Mild Mental Disability, Other Health Impaired, and Multiple Disability. Twenty-three (76%) male students in the study received services as students with a Specific Learning Disability. One student (3%) received services due to Emotional/Behavior Disability, and two students (7%) received services for Mild Mental Disorder. Two students (7%) received services for Other Health Impaired, and two students (7%) received services for Multiple Disability.

Students’ ages in the sample ranged from 12 years of age to 16 years of age, with a mean age of 13 (standard deviation of .81). The study included students in sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. Forty percent of the students were in sixth grade, fifty percent were in seventh grade, and ten percent were in eighth grade. The students in the sample received special education services ranging from 5 to 25 hours per week. Seven students (23%) received six hours to seven hours and six minutes per week of special education, while other students’ time per week fell sporadically throughout the range reported. The mean number of years students in the sample have received special education services was 3.60 (standard deviation of 1.83; ranging from one to seven years). Thirty percent (n=9) of the sample had received three years of services. Only one student had received seven years of special education services.

Information obtained from each student’s Individual Education Program revealed goals to address educational needs in reading, writing, social studies/science, and math. Each student in the study had one, two, or three goal areas. Eleven students (37%) had only one goal area reported, another eleven students (37%) had two goal areas reported, and eight students (26%) had three goal areas documented. Seventeen percent of the students in the sample had goals in the area of writing. Eighty-seven percent of the students had goals written in the area of reading. Math goals were reported for 53% and 13% of the students had goals in social studies/science.
Materials

Important instruments used in the interview process were three videotaped scenarios. The video scenarios were taped in an educational setting and included a 12 year-old boy and a female special education teacher in all three video scenarios. The videos were comprised of discussion between the teacher and student about IEP goals and objectives. The scenarios were designed to represent three levels of student involvement in goal setting. The high level of student involvement (scenario one) depicts the student giving suggestions regarding his goals. The teacher gives the student the opportunity to decide what he wants to work on in the area of reading. The second level of involvement, limited student involvement, takes place in a scenario in which the teacher proposes choices for the student when setting goals (scenario two). Video scenario three represents low student involvement in which the teacher tells the student what his goals will be and student input is not encouraged (see Appendix B). The high involvement video (scenario one) was 120 seconds in length, the limited involvement video (scenario two) was 107 seconds in length, and the low involvement video (scenario three) was 115 seconds in length. Thus, the largest length of time between videos was 13 seconds. Other differences to note include the number of words spoken in each scenario by the teacher and student actor. The student in the video spoke 131 words during the high involvement video scenario, while the teacher spoke 290 words. The student spoke 52 words in the limited involvement video scenario and the teacher spoke 304 words. In the low involvement video the student spoke 21 words, while the teacher spoke 336 words.

Prior to taping the videos, content validity was evaluated to determine if the video scripts represented the three different levels of student involvement targeted. This evaluation was done by three psychologists through independent ratings of the level of student involvement found in the video scripts. Each professional reported his/her experience to be 5, 6, and 25 years, respectively. They were presented with a packet
containing the video scripts in a mixed order. They were instructed to rank order the scripts according to the level of student participation represented, ranging from highest involvement to lowest involvement. All three psychologists correctly ordered the video scripts. After the tapes were prepared, three different school psychologists viewed the videotaped scenarios to further ensure the manipulation of the three scenarios was appropriately depicted in the tapes. Psychologists with 5, 15, and 27 years of experience rated the level of student participation from highest to lowest. All three psychologists correctly ordered the videos.

Another resource used in this study included a method used with children to determine preference through a visual modality. A Likert rating scale with a range of one to five, accompanied by faces that represent the various degrees of positive or negative emotional preference, was used (Kunin, 1955). The Faces of Job Satisfaction measures global satisfaction and has been noted to be the third most common measure of satisfaction (see Addendix C). The Faces scale is a single-item scale that captures affective and cognitive components associated with satisfaction. Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) found the Faces scale had good discriminant and convergent validity when compared with the Job Descriptive Index.

Procedure

Information about the research was provided to school principals of the schools included in the study. The information was a verbal explanation of the purpose, procedures, confidentiality, and approval granted from the Western Kentucky University Human Subjects Review Board. Verbal consent to proceed with the study was given. Individual contact was made by the examiner with the special education facilitator in each school. The facilitator is the contact teacher for special education in each school. An explanation of the study, confidentiality, and the procedure to obtain participants was given. Detailed information about the study was not revealed to teachers. Next, a parent information letter explaining the study and a consent form with the option to consent or
decline consent was sent out to all parents of male students who receive special education resource classes in the three appointed schools (see Appendix A). A reward of a candy bar was given to all students returning the form signed and checked either yes or no regarding participation in the study. Students whose parents had given consent were asked to sign an informed assent form individually immediately prior to the interviews. This form served to give the students the opportunity to indicate their desire to participate in the study or decline participation. The form was read to each student individually by the investigator while the student read along. All students given parent permission assented to participate in the study.

A code was developed for each student to ensure confidentiality. The code was recorded on all interview forms. Videos were presented in a counterbalanced order that mixed the order of presentation according to the six possible scenario order combinations. A brief standard introduction to establish rapport was developed for use with each student (see Appendix D). The standard greeting was delivered to the student privately in route to the interview room (e.g., hallway). The interview room was arranged in a similar way with the same equipment (television and VCR) in each school. The interview room was kept quiet and free of distraction by use of a “do not disturb” sign posted on the door.

At the time of the interviews, students were escorted one at a time to the interview room. Following the standard greeting, a series of questions were asked of the participants before viewing the three video scenarios. The questions were developed to gain information regarding knowledge of the student’s current special education goals (see Appendix E). The questions included follow up probes to discourage “I don’t know” responses and provided choices to facilitate communication and clarify each answer. In addition, the term “goal” was defined for the student.

Each student was asked a series of questions prior to viewing the video tapes to determine his knowledge of special education goals and objectives. Then the video
scenarios were viewed by students in a counterbalanced order that mixed the order of presentation of the three scenarios according to six possible orders. After each of the three video scenarios were viewed, the children were given a Likert scale form and asked how they would rate that scene on a scale of one to five (see Appendix C). The scale accompanied faces that exhibit a range of global satisfaction (Kunin, 1955). The students were asked to point to the face that represented how they rated the video scenario. All three videos were viewed and rated one after the other without interruption. Following all video presentations, a brief set of questions was given in the same manner every time to determine scenario, reason for preference, and to determine if the student had an experience resembling the scenario (see Appendix F). In addition, one last question asked which video showed the level of participation they would like to have with their special education teacher.

One researcher interviewed the students in the study. Therefore, reliability of the procedure was addressed by video taping the interviews with the first four students as well as four interviews in the middle of the list of interviews. The tapes of the interviewer were observed by a psychologist to determine the interviewer's adherence to study procedures and methods of questioning. No deviation from study written procedures or standard questions were found. Demographic information was obtained with a form to record information from the IEP after the interviews were completed (see Appendix G). The information required included: (a) area of disability, (b) date of initial placement, (c) area of service, (d) current goals, (e) objectives, (f) minutes per week in special education, (g) age; and (h) grade placement.
Results

The results of this study could not be interpreted without a method of checking students’ ability to discern the difference between the three scenarios in terms of student involvement in goal setting. Discrimination between the levels of student involvement is necessary if for their choice of favorite scenario is to be considered meaningful. This determination was made through the analysis of two questions in which students were asked which scenario showed the boy most involved in setting his goals and which scenario showed the boy least involved in setting his goals. A Pearson Chi Square was computed on the responses to these questions (see Table 1). The obtained value \[x^2 (4, n = 28) = 10.55, p < .01\] was found to be significant. This result indicates a nonrandom response pattern when comparing most involved with least involved video scenario. Two students were unable to give a response to the questions and, therefore, were not included in the results.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that students would have an accurate knowledge of IEP goals. The IEP goals or areas of service for each student were recorded after a review of each participant’s school records, and included the following areas: (a) writing (language arts/spelling), (b) math, (c) reading (English), and (d) science/social studies. The students interviewed had one to three goals each. Thirty-seven percent of the students interviewed had one general goal, another 37% had two goals, and 26% had three goals on their IEP.

To compare student knowledge of IEP goals and objectives with the goals and objectives found in school records, the goals and responses were grouped according to nine possible categories. The possible responses included (a) one out of one goal named correctly, (b) one out of two correct, (c) one out of three correct, (d) two out of three
Table 1

The Relationship Between Scenario Selected as Most Involved and Least Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Selected as Most Involved</th>
<th>Involvement Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least Involved</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two students were unable to respond to the question, n=28.

\[ x^2 = 10.55; \text{df} = 4; \ p < .01. \]
correct, (e) three out of three correct, (f) two out of two correct, (g) all goal responses incorrect, (h) one correct one incorrect, and (i) two correct along with one incorrect. The researcher decided to condense the information from nine categories to three. The decision was made to more clearly and succinctly represent the responses due to a large number of student representation in the correct or partially correct category. The three condensed categories examined were (a) match-all goals correct, (b) partial match-some goals correct, or (c) no match-no goals correct.

An analysis of goal information obtained from the participants revealed four students were able to identify all their IEP goals (see Table 2). A match was determined when a student named a goal that was found on the IEP document. If the student named a goal that was listed along with a goal that was not listed or did not name all the goals listed on the IEP, a partial match was noted. That scenario occurred for 13 students who were able to partially identify their educational goals (e.g., one goal identified out of two goals listed on the IEP). Therefore, 17 out of 30 (57%) of the subjects were able to express some level of understanding of their own educational goals. A Pearson Chi Square was calculated to determine whether the frequency of responses differed among the three groups of student goal knowledge compared to the video scenario students reported they liked most of the three presented. The obtained value \( \chi^2 (4, n = 30) = 0.977 \), \( p > .01 \) was not significant. There was no relationship between the students' knowledge of their goals and video scenario of choice.

A follow up question was given to further probe the level of students' goal knowledge. The students were asked what they were working on with their special
Table 2

Relationship of Goal Knowledge to Video Scenario Chosen Most Liked of the Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Match</th>
<th>High Involvement</th>
<th>Limited Involvement</th>
<th>Low Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Match</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Match</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers indicate how many students chose a particular scenario as the most liked of the three presented in the groups of goals identified correctly. Match = all goals identified; partial match = some goals identified; no match = no goals identified.

\[ x^2 = .977; \text{df} = 4; p > .01. \]
education teacher. If the student did not respond, a cue was used that asked the student if his work was related to the goal area named previously. This question was matched for responses that corresponded to the objectives found in the IEP document. Objectives are the specific, measurable components of goals or specific requirements within the general goal area (e.g., Jon will write five related sentences that make a paragraph). Twenty-eight students (93%) were unable to give any detailed information about their educational objectives. Only two students were able to give any detailed indication of objectives (e.g., “to get my multiplication tables down pretty good”). These two students had three objectives and discussed one.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that the middle school students interviewed would indicate they liked the video scenario depicting the student highly involved in goal setting best of the three scenarios. It was also predicted that the limited involvement video scenario would be chosen over the low involvement video scenario. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov one-sample test was used to compare an observed cumulative frequency distribution of scores to a theoretical distribution. The test determines if the scores in the sample could have reasonably been derived from a population having the theoretical distribution. To determine if there was a significant order effect, the maximum difference between the two distributions was calculated and compared to critical tabled value. The test was a two-tailed test.

The results indicated a maximum value or D (.10) was less than the expected value (.29) at the .01 level of significance. The analysis revealed a higher rank order for the high involvement scenario than could be expected by chance, followed by the limited involvement scenario, and the least favorite of the three noted for the low involvement
scenario. A frequency count shows that 13 students or 43% of the sample picked the high involvement scenario as the one they liked most. Eleven students or 37% of the sample chose the limited involvement video two as their favorite. Analysis shows that six students liked the video scenario three accounting for only 20% of the sample.

An additional analysis was conducted to determine if there was a relationship between reasons for selecting a scenario as most liked and the involvement level of the selected scenario (see Table 3). A Pearson Chi Square was used to determine whether the pattern of observed reasons for selecting the preferred video scenario was different depending on the involvement level of the scenario. The obtained value \( \chi^2 (6, n = 30) = 34.0, p < .01 \) was significant. More students expressed relevant (substantive) reasons for selecting the high involvement scenario as most preferred. Seven students identified the high involvement scenario as the scenario they liked most of the three presented and expressed the reason as “students should make goals themselves.” Other reasons for picking the high involvement scenario included “the student should get to choose” and they “liked the way they worked together.” Only one student picked the high involvement scenario because he liked the way the video actors talked or looked; whereas, all the children who identified the low involvement scenario as their favorite stated they did so due to the way the video participants talked or looked without elaboration.

Additional information was obtained using a follow up question. The students were asked, “Which video represents the way you want to work with your teacher?” This question was used to check the preference ratings for possible application in the student’s educational setting. The involvement level of the scenarios chosen as the
Table 3

Reasons for Scenario Chosen as Most Liked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Selection</th>
<th>Most Liked Scenario</th>
<th>Involvement Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Way the Teacher/Student Talked or Looked</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Way the Teacher/Student Worked Together</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Student Should Get to Choose His Goals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Student Should Get to Decide His Goals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers indicate the students who chose a particular scenario in each category of reasons given.

\[ x^2 = 34.0; \text{df} = 6; p < .01. \]
the way the student wants to work should be considered in developing procedures when working with students.

A Chi Square test was used to examine the relationship between the scenario liked most and the scenario depicting the way the student wanted to work with his teacher. The obtained value \[ \chi^2 (4, \ N = 30) = 29.52, \ p < .01 \] was significant (see Table 4). Ninety-two percent of the students who chose the high involvement scenario as the preferred video also chose the high involvement scenario as the one they would like to practice with their own teacher. One hundred percent of the students who picked the limited involvement scenario as the preferred video also picked the limited involvement scenario as the one they would like to experience with their own teacher. Thirty-three percent of the students who picked the low involvement scenario chose the low involvement scenario as the one they would like to practice with their teacher. In addition, 27 students identified the high involvement scenario or the limited involvement scenario as the one they would like to experience with their own teacher.

An additional follow up question was given to discover if the students have had an experience similar to the video scenarios depicting a student and teacher working together to develop IEP goals. Descriptive information reveals fifteen out of thirty students (50%) did not recall an experience resembling any of the three scenarios. Six students (20%) reported they may have talked with their teachers in a manner somewhat similar to the scenes in the scenarios. Nine students (30%) reported they did not talk with their teachers as pictured in any of the scenes in the scenarios.
Table 4

Relationship Between Scenario Students Like Most and Scenario Depicting How Students Want to Work With Their Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Showing How Students Want to Work With Their Teacher</th>
<th>Level of Involvement</th>
<th>Scenario Students Like Most</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $x^2 = 29.52; \ df = 4; p < .01$. 


Discussion

Goal setting has been found to improve the likelihood that students will become motivated to do more and achieve more (Sweet et al., 1998). It has also been noted that attendance and participation in goal setting may lead to improved motivation to succeed (Snyder & Shapiro, 1997). The act of setting goals for the improvement of future performance allows the individual an opportunity to evaluate current performance and plot desired. Taking part in goal setting is one facet of self-management and self-regulation of behavior. Self-regulation and self-management are found to be useful for students who have deficits in executive functioning and the ability to plan activities (Barkley, 1992). The purpose of this study was to investigate (a) students’ knowledge of their IEP goals, (b) the level of participation participants “liked” as depicted in three videotaped IEP development scenarios, and (c) the extent of students’ participation in IEP goal setting.

The data collected included a manipulation check to determine if students were able to recognize the difference in student involvement in goal setting portrayed in the three video scenarios. The students were asked which video showed the boy most involved in setting goals and which video scenario showed the boy least involved. If students were not able to recognize the manipulation of involvement between the three scenarios, the results obtained would not be interpretable. A Chi Square test did indicate a significant relationship existed. The group of students interviewed were able to recognize the levels of student involvement. This information is important and should be considered because the students needed to attend and retain the information to make that distinction. Therefore, the students appeared to understand the information requested and were able to retain the scenario contents in memory through the duration of the interview.

The current research investigated a hypothesis predicting students would be able
to report their general IEP goals correctly. The results indicated that 17 out of 30 (57%) of the subjects were able to provide some general information about their educational goals. Only seven percent of the students interviewed were able to give any specific information referred to as objectives in their educational plan. It appears that some of the students have a general concept of what they are working on in special education. All but two students lacked information about their objectives. It is not unusual for students to be able to state the goals they are working on at the middle school level. Goals are written in a general way (e.g., “Jay will improve skills in the area of reading”), and students are able to identify the goal through knowledge of daily schedules. Therefore, specific information would be relayed in terms of objective statements.

Another purpose of the present study was to examine the scenario middle school students liked most with respect to three levels of student involvement in goal setting. The hypothesis predicted that the high involvement video scenario would be chosen over the other two scenarios, significantly rank ordered first. The limited involvement scenario and the low involvement scenario would have a rank order second and third, respectively. No previous research was found targeting students’ likes or dislikes in the goal setting methods employed in special education settings. The importance of this study is related to the research findings that the process of setting goals is a useful technique and valuable tool for tracking and adjusting effort to achieve a desired condition (Snyder & Shapiro, 1997). The findings of the current study revealed the students interviewed chose a high or limited level of involvement in the goal setting process as their favorite.

The second highest rank scenario chosen was the video representing a limited degree of participation in which the student was given choices. The last rank order video depicted a student with a low level of involvement. It is important to note that when asked follow up questions about their scenario choices a response pattern emerged. When providing a reason for their scenario choice, the students who selected the high
involvement scenario provided reasons related to the way the teacher and student worked together. Students who chose the low involvement scenario provided reasons that were more superficial (e.g., they liked the way they talked or looked). Therefore, it appears as though the students choosing the high involvement video provided thoughtful answers about choice and the need to be involved. In contrast, the students who chose the video with low involvement appeared to do so with less consideration of video content and gave a more superficial answer. Chi Square analysis further supports that this difference was not a chance occurrence to evidence such a pattern. The fact that some students indicated superficial reasons for video choice may reflect other variables coming into play such as attention span and cognitive retention.

This study provides the reader an opportunity to consider the desires of students in special education in connection to research findings in the area of goal setting. It was noted that 30% of the students interviewed did not recall working with their teacher to set goals at any time in their education. An additional 20% of those students believed they had some past experience setting goals with a teacher or could not remember for certain. Fifteen students or 50% of those interviewed had never experienced a goal setting session with a teacher.

In summary, this study revealed that students were able to distinguish between the levels of involvement represented in the video scenarios. General knowledge of goals is very evident (e.g., reading, writing, math, or science/social studies), but specific knowledge (objectives) was not evident. The data collected for 30 special education students revealed a high level of student involvement was chosen significantly higher in rank order as the scenario students liked most of the three presented. In addition, the students indicated they would like to work with their teacher in a manner similar to the high involvement video scenario. The high involvement scenario depicted the student contributing ideas to the goal setting procedure and selecting goals for his program.

Research clearly supports goal setting as a tool to increase self-management and
improve academic and behavioral performance (Grossman, 1997). Therefore, this study points out that goal setting through the federally mandated IEP document may give students the level of involvement they would like. Information reported by students regarding their experiences in goal setting revealed that students and teachers do not always work on the development of goals together. In fact, only 30% of the students were able to recall working with their teacher in the ways pictured in any of the scenes in the video scenarios. Therefore, it appears that the results reported in this study would support a higher level of student involvement in the development of Individual Education Programs.

Limitations

Several limitations are evident in this study. As regards internal validity, some sample bias may exist in that some students eligible for the study did not have permission to participate from parents. However, all of the students with parental consent assented to the study and were included in the study. Another limitation noted may have affected the external validity of this study but also involves the sample population. In addition to its small size, the children were from rural, mid-southern communities. The students included from the study were drawn from three of the five middle schools in the district. The students in the video did not include students with severe and profound disabilities or behavior requiring placement in an alternative or hospital setting. The schools were representative of the district in size and location. Also, all participants were male. The restrictive sampling process with regard to size, gender, and geographic location may have been a contributing factor in the results obtained.

The last limitation involves the fact that interview questions for the study were designed by the researcher. The content validity of the questions has not been tested, and the questionnaire has not been previously used in a study. A final limiting factor was the fact that the interviewer was not blind to the hypothesis and purpose of the study.
Implications

The findings of the present investigation lead to further questions and therefore recommendations for future investigations. Considering the restrictive nature of this sample, it would be desirable to replicate this investigation on a larger scale. Also, it is important to include females and the full range of disabilities that will more appropriately represent the population of students with mild disabilities receiving special education services. Future samples should also consider including a balance of metropolitan areas. This larger sample will lead to an increase in the generalizability of the results.

Furthermore, it is suggested that further research consider an alteration of procedures. It may be useful to provide students with two options of IEP involvement instead of the three used in this study. Students representing a wider range of disabilities may require an interview with fewer demands for attention and concentration exhibited in fewer scenario choices. This study required the students to retain the content of the videos presented through an approximate six minute time period. However, a valuable aspect of this study was examining three levels of student participation which provides the opportunity to view results on a continuum.

Overall, the results of this study suggest that there is a need for future research in the area of student participation in goal setting within the federally mandated IEP process. As indicated in this study, students prefer to participate in the development of their educational goals. In addition, 70% of the students interviewed had no experience with their current teacher in developing goals, and these children did not have specific knowledge of their educational objectives. Further information of value may include an examination of how student participation in goal setting and knowledge of IEP goal setting may influence student achievement.
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Appendix A

Human Subjects Review Board Approval

Parent Letter

Consent Form

Participant Assent Form
In future correspondence please refer to HS0149R, January 12, 2001

Sharon Eagles
200 South Hewitt Lane
Bowling Green, KY 42103

Dear Sharon:

Your research project, “Examining Children’s Knowledge and Preferences in the Special Education Process,” was reviewed by the HSRB and it has been determined that risks to subjects are: (1) minimized and reasonable; and that (2) research procedures are consistent with a sound research design and do not expose the subjects to unnecessary risk. Reviewers determined that: (1) benefits to subjects are considered along with the importance of the topic and that outcomes are reasonable; (2) selection of subjects is equitable; and (3) the purposes of the research and the research setting is amenable to subjects’ welfare and producing desired outcomes; that indications of coercion or prejudice are absent, and that participation is clearly voluntary.

1. In addition, the IRB found that: (1) informed consent will be sought and documented from each prospective subject. (2) Provision is made for collecting, using and storing data in a manner that protects the safety and privacy of the subjects and the confidentiality of the data. (3) Appropriate safeguards are included to protect the rights and welfare of the subjects.

   Your research therefore meets the criteria of Full Board Review and is approved.

2. Please note that the institution is not responsible for any actions regarding this protocol before approval. If you expand the project at a later date to use other instruments please re-apply. Copies of your request for human subjects review, your application, and this approval, are maintained in the Office of Sponsored Programs at the above address. Please report any changes to this approved protocol to this office. A Continuing Review protocol will be sent to you in the future to determine the status of the project.

Sincerely,

Phillip E. Myers, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Sponsored Programs and
HSRB Coordinator

c: Human Subjects File0149R
   Dr. Elizabeth Jones, Department of Psychology

HSApprovalEaglesHS149R
Dear Parents:

Your child is asked to take part in a study about setting goals at school. This study will be done by Sharon Eagles, School Psychology Intern, along with Dr. Libby Jones, Associate Professor of Psychology at Western Kentucky University. Results of this study may be used to find out how much children would like to help set their goals in school and how much they know about what they are working on.

This study will be done during the school day for 10-15 minutes. This time will be set up through your child’s teacher to find a time that does not take the place of teaching. Each student will watch a video of a student and teacher talking about an education plan. Then they will be asked to tell which video they liked most and also asked to tell about their own educational program. Everything written down will have number codes to keep every child’s name private.

Your child does not have to be part of this study. If you or your child do not to take part in the study, there will be no loss to you or your child in any way. Your child may refuse to answer any question and may change his/her mind at any time. All information will be locked up and no names will be used. The study will look at the children’s answers as a group.

The steps in this study have been looked over and approved by the Western Kentucky University Committee for the Protection of Human Research Participants. If you have questions about the study, you may call Sharon Eagles, School Psychology Intern at the Hardin County Board of Education at (270)-769-8886 or Dr. Libby Jones, Committee Chairperson for this project at (270) 745-4414. Feel free to call if you have any questions. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Sharon Eagles
School Psychologist Intern
Parental Consent Form

Child’s name: ___________________________ Date of birth: ______________

Teacher’s name: ____________________________________________

Please mark “yes” or “no” and return this form to your child’s teacher so that we won’t continue to send you extra consent forms.

{ } “Yes” I have read the information provided about this study and give my consent for my child to participate in the study conducted by Sharon Eagles of Hardin County Public Schools.

{ } “No” I do not give my consent for my child to participate in the study.

Parent/Guardian’s signature: ________________________________
Date: ________________

Your child’s class was informed that each child who returns the consent form will receive a small reward. If the students return the form, marked {yes} or {no} and signed, the reward will be given regardless of whether or not the parents give consent.
Informed Assent Form

I, _________________________, understand that my parents have given permission (said it's okay) for me to take part in a project about knowledge and preferences in goal setting for middle school youth under the direction of Sharon Eagles, School Psychologist Intern and Dr. Elizabeth Jones, Associate Professor of Psychology at Western Kentucky University.

My participation in this project is voluntary, and I have been told that I may stop my participation in this study at any time. If I choose not to participate, it will not affect my grade in any way.

Signature_________________________ Date_________________________
Appendix B

Scenario Scripts
Scenario 1

Goal Setting Procedure

The middle school student and special education teacher are in a classroom. The teacher and the student are seated at a table working together. This situation depicts a student given the opportunity to have a high degree of participation in setting his academic goals for reading.

The teacher begins, “Thank you for meeting with me, Zachary. Today we will work on goal setting for your individual education plan. You can give me some ideas about the things you would like to work on this year. The goals you and I decide on will be what we shoot for while we work together in reading. Are you ready to get started?”

Zachary says, “Yes, what kind of things do I need to work on this year?”

The teacher responds, “Do you remember what you worked on last year?”

Zachary says, “Well… I think I worked on reading harder words.”
Teacher states, “Yes, that’s right. You were sounding out more difficult words.”

Zachary asks, “Since I am reading better, can I work on trying to remember what I read so I can do better on tests?”

Teacher replies, “Yes, what exactly do you want to work on?”

Zachary says, “I am having trouble remembering what I read about and deciding what is important to remember for a test. Can I work on that?”

The teacher replies, “Yes, you can work on improving your reading comprehension or understanding what you read. What are some ways you can see if you are improving your ability to understand?”

Zachary states, “I can try to answer your questions about the things I read. You could also ask me what the important parts were.”

The teacher says, “It sounds like you would like to improve reading comprehension and become able to pick out the main idea in a passage. (She
writes this down.) Zachary nods. When you read something out loud I find out how you are doing by asking you questions with tests I make up for you. How many questions would you like to get right from each test to show you are improving?"

Zachary states, "I have a lot of trouble with this, is 6 or 7 out of 10 a good amount?"

The teacher responds, "Yes, that sounds about right." Now, you also wanted to be able to pick out the main idea. How would you like to show your progress on that?"

Zachary says, "Can I use a high-lighter to show you which one is the main idea and try to get most of them right?"

The teacher replies, "Can you try to get it right 8 out of 10 times?"

Zachary nods.

The teacher says, "You did a good job setting your goals for the year. We can look at those as often as you like or at least once each week, okay?"
Zachary says, "Sure!"
Scenario 2

Goal Setting Procedure

The middle school student and special education teacher are in a classroom. The teacher and student are seated at a table working together. This situation depicts a student given some degree of participation in setting his educational goals for reading.

The teacher begins, “Thank you for meeting with me Zachary.” Today we will work on goal setting for your individual education plan. I will tell you the areas I believe you need to work on and you can tell me what you think of each one. The goals made in your plan will help us know what we will work toward during our time together. Are you ready to get started?”

Zachary says, “Yes, what are the things I need to work on this year?”

The teacher responds, “There are a couple of areas I feel you need to concentrate on right now. Last year you were working on sounding out some of the more difficult words in your reading book. Now that you have mastered that goal you need to work more on understanding and remembering the information you read.”
Zachary says, “How do I do that?”

The teacher states, “There are several ways you can go about that. You can highlight important passages in your reading book, underline the main idea or topic sentence, or answer questions about what you read. What would you like to do?”

Zachary says, “I would probably like to underline the topic sentence or answer questions if you ask them out loud.”

The teacher begins to write the goals down. “All right, do you think 6 or 7 correct answers to the questions out of 10 is a good goal for you?”

Zachary states, “That sounds okay.”

The teacher says, “So another goal for you could be to underline topic sentences in the passages you read. Would you like to use a bright color to underline with in order to keep this goal separate from other work we do?”
Zachary nods, “Can I use a red pen for that?”

The teacher replies, “That would be great. Do you think you can work on getting 8 topic sentences correct for every 10 you work on?”

Zachary says, “I think so.”

The teacher says, “If you think that is too difficult we can think about it for a couple of days and try finding topic sentences to see how you do first.”

Zachary says, “That sounds good.”

The teacher says, “You did a good job working with me to set you goals for the year in reading. We can look at those as often as you need to or at least once each week.”
Scenario 3

Goal Setting Procedure

The middle school student and special education teacher are in a classroom. The teacher and the student are seated at a table working together. This situation depicts a teacher explaining the goals to the student that have been chosen for him. The student has no choices or opportunity for opinions in his academic goal setting.

The teacher begins, “Thank you for meeting with me today, Zachary. I would like to go over the goals I have written down for you to work on this year in reading. While you work in my room we will do the activities I have listed here and look at your goals each week to see how you are doing. Are you ready to see what I have?”

Zachary says, “O.K. What do I need to work on?”

The teacher responds while pointing to the papers on the desk, “I have two goals written for you in reading. Last year you were working on sounding out some of the more difficult words in your reading book. Now that you
have mastered that, I’d like to see you work on understanding what you read and remembering the important things.” Zachary nods.

“The reading objective I have written here is for you to improve reading comprehension. You can do that by picking out the main idea in a written passage.”

Zachary nods.

The teacher states, “You can use a highlighter to pick out the topic sentence in each paragraph. I will begin teaching you this skill next week and I will count how many times you can pick the right one. I think a good goal for you would be to pick out the topic sentence 8 times correctly for every 10 tries.”

Zachary states, “O.K.”

The teacher responds, “I’ll help you with this. Now, the next goal is for you to answer questions about what you are reading. After you read a passage, you can answer the questions about it to see if you can remember the important parts and show how you understand the reading assignment.”
Zachary states, "How many questions do I answer?"

The teacher answers, "I think you should work on answering 8 questions correctly out of each 10 you try. Remember, I will teach you how to find your answers and picking out the topic sentence will help you know what is important."

Zachary says, "O.K. I’ll try."

The teacher states, "I will keep track of how you are doing and you won’t have to do 10 questions at one time, O.K?"

Zachary nods.

The teacher says, "We will look over your goal and how you are doing each week. You can move on to other goals as soon as you have mastered these."

Zachary says, "That sounds good."
Appendix C

Likert Scale
Rate how you like or dislike this scene.
Standard Greeting to Child

Hi, my name is (name of interviewer). I have some short videotapes to show you and some questions about what you do here at school. Would you like to go with me to watch the tapes? I will bring you back to class in about 15 minutes. (If so walk toward the room)

Questions for rapport:

How is your day going?

What kind of things do you like to do outside of school?

Do you play sports or musical instruments?

Do you have any questions for me?
Appendix E

Pre-video Scenario Questions
Interview Questions Prior to Video

1. When you work with (special education teacher) here at school what are you working on?

   B. What type of work do you do? (worksheets?) (reading series?)

   If 2 or more are named ask: Which one do you work on more? How much time in each area?

Define Goal: A goal is something you are working toward and want to get in the future. One example is when you want to buy a new stereo and you have to save money every week to get the amount you need. Your goal is buying the stereo. Another example is when you want to become friends with someone at school you have to work on several steps of talking and doing things with them. Your goal is having that person as a friend. School work can be just like that. When you want to learn something new at school you study or practice the new thing until you know it well and have achieved or reached your goal.

2. What the goals or things (special education teacher) and you are working on together?

No response: You said you work on __1B__, do you think it might be related to that?
Appendix F

Post Video Scenario Questions
Questions Following all Scenarios

1. Have any of your teachers talked with you like any of the scenes in these videos?
   Who?
   In what ways were the scenes like your experiences?

2. Which video did you like best?
   The one where the teacher told the student what his goals would be?
   The one where the teacher gave the student a choice of what he would work on?
   The one where the teacher let the student decide what he wanted to work on?
   (Say these in the order in which they were presented.)

3. Why did you pick this video?
   No response ask: Was the reason because you liked the way they talked or looked?
   Was the reason because you liked the way they worked together?

4. You saw 3 videos-which video shows the way you want to work with your teacher?

5. In which video showed the boy most involved with the teacher to set goals?

6. In which video was the boy least involved?
Appendix G

Demographic Information
Demographic Information
Most Current Individual Education Program

1. Area of disability

2. Date of initial placement in special education

3. Area of service (reading, writing, math)

4. Minutes per day in special education

5. Age: ______ Sex: ______ Grade placement:

6. IEP Goals: Date of goals: Child’s Responses:

Objectives: