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Abstract: This study used a multiple-probe across participants design to examine the effects of the CD-Rom version of the Self-Advocacy Strategy on quality of contributions in Individual Education Plan (IEP) meetings of five high school students with intellectual disability. Results indicated a functional relationship between using the CD-Rom version and students’ quality of contributions in their IEP meetings. In addition, all five students maintained their skills for four weeks and were able to generalize skills to their actual IEP meeting. Implications for practice and recommendations for future research are described.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) legislation mandated involvement of students who are 16 years or older in the Individual Education Program (IEP) process (IDEA, 2004). Inviting students to participate in their IEP meetings provides them with an opportunity to communicate their strengths, needs, and future goals.

In addition to IDEA requiring involvement of students in the IEP, federal mandates in the Rehabilitation Act 1992 amendments were made for individuals with disabilities entering employment. This federal mandate stated that the Individualized Plan for Employment (IPE) must include a statement by the individual, in their words, describing how they were informed about and involved in choosing alternative goals, objectives, services, entities providing such services, and methods used to provide or obtain these services. Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1992 further support self-determination/self-advocacy skills. In the absence of these skills, adults with disabilities would have to rely on others (i.e., family members, service providers) to make important life decisions for them (Rehabilitation Act, 1992).

According to the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS-2), students with an intellectual disability are less likely to (a) leave school with a diploma, (b) participate in community groups, and (c) engage in work, post-secondary education, or work preparation than persons with other disabilities. When compared to other students with disabilities and to students without disabilities, students with an intellectual disability have some of the poorest post-school outcomes (Newman et al., 2009).

Fortunately, research has indicated one way to improve student post-school outcomes was by improving their self-determination skills (Wehmeyer & Schwartz, 1997). Self-determination includes teachable, measurable skills, such as choice making, decision making, and problem solving (Wood, Karvonen, Test, Browder, & Algozzine, 2004). For example, Wehmeyer and Schwartz (1997) found that if self-determination instruction was provided in high school, youth were better able to achieve positive post-school outcomes as young adults.

Although research has shown that systematic instruction in self-determination improves post-school outcomes of students with disabilities, unfortunately, instruction in self-determination has not been widely incorporated into school environments or curricula (Test et al., 2004).

One method that has been used to promote students self-determination skills has been...
to teach students to actively participate and develop their IEP. Without the specific IEP meeting instruction, students attending their meetings do not know what to do, do not understand the purpose of what is said, and feel as if none of the participants listen to them when they speak (Martin et al., 2006). One strategy that has been demonstrated to promote student involvement in the IEP process through teaching skills such as self awareness, self advocacy, goal setting, and monitoring goal achievement is the Self-Advocacy Strategy (Van Reusen, Deshler, & Schumaker, 1989). Several studies have investigated the effectiveness of this strategy with students with learning disabilities.

First, Van Reusen et al. (1989) developed an IEP participation strategy (called IPARS and later changed to Self-Advocacy Strategy) to evaluate the effects on student participation in their IEP meetings with 16 high school students with learning disabilities. Using a multiple-baseline across participants design and a posttest-only control group, results demonstrated a functional relation between implementing the IEP participation strategy and the number of relevant verbal contributions.

Next, Van Reusen and Bos (1994) investigated the effects of the IEP participation strategy (IPARS) designed to increase student participation in IEP conferences. Parents were included in the study to see if the students and parents could be simultaneously taught skills to participate as partners in the IEP process. Twenty-one high school students with learning disabilities and their parents were included in this study. Results indicated students from the treatment group provided more goals and information during their conferences than those from the control group.

Third, Lancaster, Schumaker, and Deshler (2002) investigated the effects of using an interactive hypermedia program delivered via CD-ROM, to teach the Self-Advocacy Strategy to 22 high school students with high incidence disabilities on quality of contributions in IEP meetings. Using a multiple-probe across participants design with a posttest-only comparison group, results indicated students with high incidence disabilities increased the number of quality contributions during their IEP meetings, extending research on the Self-Advocacy Strategy with computer-assisted instruction.

Fourth, Hammer (2004) investigated the effects of using the CD-Rom version of the Self-Advocacy Strategy to increase student participation in IEP meetings. Three middle-school students with learning disabilities and one student with Tourette syndrome, OCD, and ADHD were included. Using a multiple-baseline across subjects design, results indicated that following instruction, all participants were more involved in their IEP meetings and were able to make verbal statements about their preferences, interests, and needs.

Finally, Test and Neale (2004) examined the use of the Self-Advocacy Strategy without the CD-Rom on increasing middle school students’ contributions in IEP meetings. Four middle school students were included in this study, two with learning disabilities, one with an emotional disability, and one with a mild intellectual disability. Using a multiple-probe across participants design, results demonstrated a functional relationship between the Self-Advocacy Strategy and the quality of student’s contributions in the IEP meetings.

Although these studies have demonstrated the Self-Advocacy Strategy can have positive impacts on participation and involvement in IEP conferencing with students with learning disabilities, research is lacking with other disability groups such as intellectual disability. Also, researchers have suggested collecting maintenance and generalization probes (Lancaster et al., 2002), as well as generalization probes during baseline and maintenance for comparison purposes (Test & Neale, 2004).

Therefore the purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of the Self-Advocacy Strategy using the CD-Rom version on quality of contributions in IEP meetings of high school students with intellectual disability. In addition, generalization data were collected in the students’ actual annual review of the IEP at the end of the school year and maintenance data were collected for up to four weeks after instruction ended.

Method

Participants

Five high school students with intellectual disability participated in this study. Students ranged in age from 14 to 16 years, were in the
10th grade, had an annual review of their IEP scheduled in the spring semester, and were enrolled in a curriculum focused on post-school employment and independent living. Criteria for participant selection were ability to (a) operate a computer, (b) use keyboard and mouse, (c) manipulate and follow a computer program, and (d) work independently.

Paris was a 14-year-old Caucasian female identified as having a mild intellectual disability. Her IQ was 69 as measured by the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children IV and her psychosocial report stated her adaptive behavior was in the low range. Paris had the prerequisite computer skills to participate in the study.

Jennifer was a 15-year-old Caucasian female identified with a mild intellectual disability. Her IQ was 71 as measured by the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children IV and her psychosocial report stated her adaptive behavior was in the low range. Jennifer was a high school sophomore participating in the state’s occupational course of study. She had the prerequisite computer skills to participate in the study.

Seth was a 15-year-old Caucasian male identified as having a mild intellectual disability. He has also been diagnosed with ADHD for which he took medication. His IQ was 72 as measured by the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children IV and his psychosocial report stated his adaptive behavior was in the low range. Seth was a high school sophomore participating in the state’s occupational course of study. In addition to special education services, he received one hour of occupational therapy each week. Seth had the prerequisite computer skills to participate in the study.

Patrick was a 15-year-old Caucasian male identified with a mild intellectual disability. His IQ was 72 as measured by the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children IV and his psychosocial report stated his adaptive behavior was in the low range. Patrick was a high school sophomore participating in the state’s occupational course of study. He had the prerequisite computer skills to participate in the study.

Miley was a 16-year-old Caucasian female identified with a mild intellectual disability and a speech and language impairment. Her IQ was 70 as measured by the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children IV and her psychosocial report stated her adaptive behavior was in the low range. Miley was a high school sophomore participating in the state’s occupational course of study. In addition to special education services, she received one hour of speech and language therapy a week. Miley had the prerequisite computer skills to participate in the study.

**Setting/Materials**

Intervention took place in the students’ high school special education classroom located in a rural community in the southeastern United States. The classroom was located in a designated area of the library where students had access to a laptop computer and printer. Generalization probes were conducted at each student’s actual IEP meeting in the conference room of the school.

Materials included the Self-Advocacy Strategy CD-Rom, a laptop computer, and a wireless routed printer to print reports generated as a result of student responses. The Self Advocacy Strategy is a motivation strategy that can be used by students when participating and preparing for any type of educational or transition planning conference. The cost involved in purchasing the Self-Advocacy Strategy with CD-Rom was $90.00. The steps involved in the strategy enable students to become organized before the meeting and techniques for effective communication during the meeting.

The researcher provided earphones for the students. These were purchased for $1.00 and the students were allowed to keep their set of earphones. An audio recording device was used during collection of probe data and a video recording device at the IEP meetings was used for generalization.

**Interventionist**

The students’ classroom teacher served as the facilitator of the Self-Advocacy Strategy CD-Rom instruction. She supervised and provided assistance to participants as needed. She had an Associate’s degree in English and a Bachelor’s
degree in Liberal Studies. She had worked as a special education teacher for eight years. Prior to beginning the study, the primary observer trained her on the Self-Advocacy Strategy and procedures for administering the probe questions. The teacher had the materials for a week after the training and was given an opportunity for questions before data were collected.

**Observers**

The first author served as the primary observer. She scored baseline, intervention, maintenance, and generalization data and collected procedural fidelity data on the interventionist. The third author collected inter-observer reliability data during baseline, intervention, maintenance, and generalization. Both observers in this study were doctoral students in Special Education with a primary focus of secondary transition.

**Data Collection Procedures**

**Dependent variable.** The primary dependent variable was quality of student contributions. Students were asked 10 questions related to their IEPs to measure the dependent variable (see Table 1). The questions were adapted from probe questions developed by Test and Neale (2004). Responses to questions were scored on a 0–3-point scale. A student received a score of “0” if they did not respond or if they said “I do not know.” A score of “1” was given if the student answered the question, but response did not relate to the question asked. For example, if the student
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**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probe Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (Student’s Name), what do you think are your strongest study or learning skills? 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can you tell me what you think are your weakest study or learning skills? 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What skills do you want to improve or learn over this next year that will help you to do better in school, or get along better with other people? 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can you tell me about any activities or materials that teachers have shared with you in the past that have helped you learn your school subjects? 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are there any after school activities, such as sports, jobs, or clubs, in which you want to become involved? 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Many students at your age have begun to think about careers or jobs they might like after they finish high school. Upon graduating from school, what kind of job or career would you like to pursue? 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What types of study or learning activities work best for you? 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What size learning or study group works best for you? 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I’m sure you’ve taken a lot of tests during your years in school. Can you name or describe the type of test items on which you do best when taking tests over material you have learned? 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is there anything we’ve overlooked or something you’d like to say about school, or any other area you are concerned about? 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores are on a 4-point Likert-scale: “0” point indicates they did not respond or said “I don’t know”; “1” point indicates the response was not related to the specific questioned asked; “2” points indicates that the response was related to the question, but was not specific; “3” points indicates the student appropriately responded to the question with details.
was asked, “Can you tell me what you think are your weakest study or learning skills?” and the student responded with “girls get in my way.” A score of “2” was given if the student provided a relevant answer, but was not specific. A score of “3” was given if the student answered appropriately and was specific.

Generalization measures. Generalization of skills learned through Self-Advocacy Strategy instruction was assessed by asking the 10 probe questions at the students’ actual IEP meeting. IEP meetings were held during baseline and again in the maintenance phase of the study.

Interobserver reliability. Interobserver reliability data were gathered on 100% of the probes collected during baseline, intervention, generalization, and maintenance phases of the study. The two trained observers each visited the classroom weekly and the classroom teacher audio-recorded the other probes. The teacher and one trained observer scored the probe questions for each student. An item-by-item comparison of agreements and disagreements was conducted. Agreements were divided by 10, the total number of probe questions, and multiplied by 100 to yield a reliability coefficient. Interobserver reliability was 99.8% for baseline and 100% for intervention, maintenance, and generalization.

Social validity. To determine the social importance of the effects of the Self-Advocacy Strategy, data were gathered using a questionnaire/interview format (Wolf, 1978; Cooper, Heron, & Heward, 2007). First, the teacher was interviewed about her perceptions of the usefulness and effectiveness of the Self-Advocacy Strategy. Second, students were interviewed about their perception of the usefulness of skills learned. The teacher read the questions aloud to students and recorded responses on the form. The first three questions asked if the training was fair, too difficult, or if there were better ways to train these skills. The last three questions asked if they thought the training would be good for other students, if they liked the training, and if the strategy would help them do better in school. Last, participants’ parents were interviewed immediately following the final IEP meeting about their perception of the student’s participation and involvement in the IEP meeting and usefulness of the training their child received. Parents were asked three open-ended questions about their perception of their child’s contributions to the IEP meeting, how they felt about the usefulness of the skills learned, and if this strategy helped their child in school.

Experimental Design

The experimental design was a multiple-probe across participants design (Horner & Baer, 1978). Prior to being introduced to the Self-Advocacy Strategy, baseline data for all participants were collected using the 10 probe questions. The Self-Advocacy Strategy was introduced to the student showing the greatest need after a minimum of five baseline data points in which a stable level and trend were established. Once the first participant reached the mastery criteria two times consecutively during intervention, that student entered maintenance phase, and the other four participants were administered another baseline probe. Mastery criterion was a score of 20 on the probe questions without an individual score of a “0” or “1.” The next participant with the lowest stable baseline score then began intervention. This sequence continued until all participants entered intervention, met the mastery criteria for completing the intervention phase, and entered maintenance.

Procedure

Baseline. During baseline, a minimum of five data points were collected for each participant. The teacher probed students individually without providing prompts, intervention, or feedback. Student responses were recorded on the probe sheet. When observers were not present, baseline data were audio recorded for purposes of data collection.

Self-Advocacy Strategy instruction via CD-Rom. Instruction on the Self-Advocacy Strategy was delivered using a CR-Rom. The computer program included five lessons and review. Each lesson required a minimum of 45-minutes each to complete (ranging from 45–135 minutes).

The first lesson of the strategy provided students with an introduction to the Self-Advocacy Strategy. This included the definition of an advocate, what self-advocacy skills include, and how to use them. There were also videos
to watch about self-advocacy. Upon completion of this lesson, participants were administered the probe questions by the teacher.

The second lesson instructed students on appropriate physical and verbal behaviors that should be exhibited in meetings. Instruction included using the mnemonic SHARE (i.e., Sit up straight, Have a pleasant tone of voice, Activate your thinking, Relax, and Engage in eye Communication; Van Reusen et al., 1989). While interacting with the CD-Rom, participants were able to identify two scenarios of examples and non-examples of the SHARE components. Participants were quizzed on the computer on the SHARE behaviors using examples, non-examples, and multiple-choice question format on the screen. Upon completion of this lesson, participants were administered the probe questions by the teacher.

After completing instruction of the SHARE behaviors, the steps of Self-Advocacy Strategy were introduced to the student in the third lesson. The fives steps to promote active participation in the IEP process are called the IPLAN steps.

Lesson three addressed (I) for Inventory. This step included multiple inventories and could take the student up to three class periods to complete. A probe was administered after the academic inventories and another probe was administered after the transition inventories. During this step, students were responsible for completing an inventory of their learning strengths, areas to improve or learn, goals and interests, and choices for learning in the classroom. Once the inventory was completed, it was used as a reference for the student during their actual IEP meeting. Students completed inventories based on academics and transition and were able to identify and develop goals in relation to their preferences, interests, and areas to improve/develop. Students completed the academic inventories on a separate day from the transition inventories. The academic inventories included an inventory in reading, writing, math, study skills, social skills, computer and technology skills, classroom behavior, career and employment, and study skills. The transition inventories included citizenship and legal skills, community involvement, financial and consumer skills, health and wellness, independent living, leisure and recreation, social and family, career and employment, and age of majority, if appropriate. Once the student completed the inventory, the strengths and areas to develop were listed. From that information, the student was prompted to develop a goal in that particular area. Upon completion of this lesson, participants were administered the probe questions by the teacher.

In lesson four, students were introduced to the other four steps (PLAN). These involve behaviors related to communicating information in an IEP meeting. The second step, Provide your Inventory (P), focused on the student providing input during the conference. In the third step, Listen and Respond (L), the students were taught to listen to what others say and respond at the appropriate times. Closely related to the third step, Ask Questions (A), focused on how and when to ask questions during a meeting. The final step in the strategy, Name your goals (N), the student summarized the goals to be targeted in the next school year and were taught to communicate personal goals. This final step allowed students and all other participants in the IEP meeting to check their understanding and agreement with goals identified to meet the student’s individual needs. Upon completion of this lesson, participants were administered the probe questions by the teacher.

During lessons three and four on the IPLAN instruction, the CD showed video scenarios that used components of the strategy effectively and ineffectively. Additionally, students were provided with opportunities to take notes. The teacher printed the notes section daily from the CD-Rom. At the end of each lesson in the CD-Rom, the students were required to take quizzes to move to the next lesson on the CD.

The fifth lesson was called conferences. In this lesson, the CD-Rom used videos of students using the IPLAN strategies and SHARE behaviors in conferences. Participants viewed clips of students conducting their IEP meetings, assessed their appropriateness, and were then quizzed for understanding. Within the videos, there were students using the IPLAN strategies or SHARE behaviors incorrectly and the students were responsible for identifying those behaviors or strategies. Upon completion of this lesson, participants were administered the probe questions by the teacher.
Maintenance and generalization. After each student met mastery criteria during the CD-Rom instruction (scored 20 of 30, without any “0” or “1” scores), maintenance data were collected. During baseline, a “mock” IEP was held and students were asked 10 probe questions. Maintenance probes were conducted using a “mock” IEP meeting during the 1st and 3rd weeks after the intervention had ended. A “mock” IEP included all participants of an actual IEP meeting and was held in the classroom. Generalization probes were conducted at the students’ actual IEP meeting held four to five weeks after intervention had ended. The 10 probe questions for the “mock” IEP meeting in baseline, maintenance, and the actual IEP in generalization were the same questions.

Procedural fidelity. The teacher would place the CD-Rom into the computer and check to make sure it was audible to the participant. She checked to ensure the mouse was working properly and that the CD-Rom ran from start to finish. After completing CD-Rom instruction, the teacher would ask the student the probe questions and then dismiss the student.

Procedural fidelity were gathered on 84% of the training sessions by having a trained observer view and score the number of training instruction steps followed by the teacher using a copy of a checklist of steps. Procedural fidelity was 100% throughout the study.

Results

Figure 1 shows participant scores on the probe questions. Results indicated the Self-Advocacy Strategy was effective in teaching students with a mild intellectual disability to increase the number of quality contributions.

Paris

During baseline, Paris’s scores ranged from 2 to 4 with a mean of 3.6. During instruction, Paris’s scores ranged from 16 to 27 with a mean of 21.4. During maintenance, Paris scores were 27 and 28. During generalization, Paris’s baseline score was 4 and her maintenance score was 27.

Jennifer

During baseline, Jennifer’s scores ranged from 4 to 5 with a mean of 4.6. During instruction, Jennifer’s scores ranged from 18 to 29 with a mean of 24.8. During maintenance, Jennifer’s scores were 29 and 29. During generalization, Jennifer’s baseline score was 4 and her maintenance score was 28.

Seth

During baseline, Seth’s scores ranged from 3 to 7 with a mean of 3.8. During instruction, Seth’s scores ranged from 23 to 28 with a mean of 25.2. During maintenance, Seth’s scores were 28 and 28. During generalization, Seth’s baseline score was 7 and his maintenance score was 28.

Patrick

During baseline, Patrick’s scores ranged from 8 to 10 with a mean of 8.3. During instruction, Patrick’s scores ranged from 20 to 30 with a mean of 26.4. During maintenance, Patrick’s scores were 30 and 30. During generalization, Patrick’s baseline score was 8 and his maintenance score was 30.

Miley

During baseline, Miley’s scores ranged from 6 to 15 with a mean of 12.5. During instruction, Miley’s scores ranged from 18 to 30 with a mean of 25.8. During maintenance, Miley’s scores were 30 and 30. During generalization, Miley’s baseline score was 13 and her maintenance score was 29.

Social Validity

During the teacher interview, she indicated that after the Self-Advocacy Strategy instruction all five students were able to contribute more in their IEP meetings. She indicated that she liked the training, it was fair, it would be good for other students, and was effective for teaching students to contribute to their IEP meetings. She stated the students’ progress was “remarkable.” She “loved the CD-Rom” and felt that it was “age-appropriate for high school students.”
Figure 1. Student scores on probe questions. Open squares represent generalization probes.
During student interviews, all five students stated they liked the training, it was fair, it would be good for other students, and was effective in teaching them to contribute to their IEP meetings. Jennifer stated the Self-Advocacy Strategy training would “help her in all of her classes and all of her life.” Seth stated “finally someone was listening to him” when he was able to express his strengths and needs.

Parents were interviewed immediately following the final IEP meeting about their perception of their child’s ability to participate and be involved in the meeting. All parents were happy with the contributions made by their students. Patrick’s father expressed that “he wished Patrick would have learned the strategy before high school” and that it was “important for the kid’s voice to be heard.” All parents agreed the Self-Advocacy Strategy instruction that their child received would help them do better in school.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of using the CD-Rom version of the Self-Advocacy Strategy on quality of contributions in IEP meetings of high school students with intellectual disability. Results demonstrated a functional relation between the CR-Rom version of the Self-Advocacy Strategy and student’s scores on probe questions, indicating the instruction was an effective method for teaching high school students with intellectual disability to increase quality of contributions in their IEP meetings. In addition, all five students were able to maintain their skills for up to four weeks after intervention and generalize the skill to their real IEP meeting held four or five weeks after instruction ended. According to the teacher, using the CD-Rom to teach the Self-Advocacy Strategy proved to be easy to use, cost-efficient, and effective.

While results of this study lend additional support to previous studies indicating the Self-Advocacy Strategy was a viable way to teach students participation and involvement in their annual IEP meetings (Test & Neale, 2004; Reusen & Bos, 1994; Van Reusen et al., 1989), this study extended the literature on use of the Self-Advocacy Strategy in several ways. First, while it is the second study to examine the use of the CD-Rom version of the Self-Advocacy Strategy, this research adds to the literature by including high school students with intellectual disability. Previous research included students with learning disabilities (Van Reusen et al., 1989; Reusen & Bos, 1994; Lancaster et al., 2002; Hammer, 2004; Test & Neale, 2004) and Tourette syndrome, OCD, and ADHD (Test & Neale, 2004). Only one middle school participant with intellectual disability was included in previous research (Test & Neale, 2004).

Second, this study extended the literature by addressing limitations and future research recommendations from previous studies by including measures of both maintenance and generalization (Lancaster et al., 2002), as well as generalization probes during baseline and maintenance for comparison purposes (Test & Neale, 2004). During generalization measures held four to five weeks after instruction ended, participants made more quality contributions in their annual IEP meeting than they did during the baseline IEP meeting. Scores increased from a baseline mean of 9 (range 4–13) to a mean of 28.6 (range 27–30) four to five weeks after intervention ended.

Third, this study extended the literature by interviewing students, parents, and the teachers regarding their opinion of the usefulness of the Self-Advocacy Strategy. Previous research has shown that students felt the Self-Advocacy Strategy was helpful and useful in preparing them for participating in the IEP meeting (Test & Neale, 2004), teachers used the goals stated by the student in the meeting to develop IEPs (Van Reusen et al., 1989), and student and adult questionnaires indicated satisfaction with the Self-Advocacy Strategy in preparing students for their IEP meetings (Lancaster et al., 2002). In this study, parents, teachers, and students liked the use of the Self-Advocacy Strategy to increase participation and involvement in IEP meetings. In addition, since previous research suggested interviewing students about specific components of the strategy (Lancaster et al., 2002), data collected from students in this study indicated participants did not think the strategy was too difficult or that there was a better way for them to learn about managing their IEP. All students stated that they felt it was useful to be part of their IEP development, as well as the meeting.
Limitations

As with any single subject research design, generality is limited by the number of participants. This study included only five Caucasian students, ages 14 to 16 with intellectual disability who resided in a small rural community in southeastern United States. Therefore, results cannot be generalized to others due to the small number of participants, student demographics, and specific geographic location indicated.

Future Research

While, this is the second study to include participants with intellectual disability, Test and Neale (2004) only included one participant with intellectual disability. Although the results of this study help build generality for using the Self-Advocacy Strategy with students with intellectual disability, future research is needed with additional students with intellectual disability to demonstrate the effectiveness of the CD-Rom version of the Self-Advocacy Strategy.

Next, while this is the fourth study to use the Self-Advocacy Strategy with high school students (Van Reusen et al., 1989; Reusen & Bos, 1994; Lancaster et al., 2002), it is only the second using the CD-Rom version (Lancaster et al., 2002). The CD-Rom version has also been used in one of the two Self-Advocacy Strategy studies with middle school students (Hammer, 2004). Thus, more research is needed to demonstrate the CD-Rom version is effective with students in middle school and also elementary school.

Implications for Practice

Results of this study combined with previous research, demonstrate the Self-Advocacy Strategy to be an effective way to prepare students to make quality contributions in their IEP meetings. This involvement encouraged self-determination and allowed students to self-advocate and make decisions regarding their futures. These skills can be used in settings other than meetings. For example, students could use these skills in their IPE meetings with Vocational Rehabilitation counselors.

In addition, general education teachers could use this curriculum to help all students determine study skills to be improved. Many students, not just students with disabilities, struggle with organization. All teachers could use the SHARE behaviors component to teach effective communication techniques. For example, this study included students who were included in general education math courses for the first time.

Middle school and high school special education teachers could teach this strategy to students as they begin to develop their transition plans. Teaching students with disabilities a strategy for participating in their IEP meetings, or any decision-making meeting, could have immediate effects on their involvement in developing their educational and postsecondary goals. Having knowledge of their study skills, areas to improve, and how to communicate information effectively would be beneficial for students who are planning goals.

In conclusion, this study provided teachers with a cost-effective way to incorporate instruction on IEP participation into their instructional day. Special education teachers assume many roles during the school day and finding time to teach IEP participation skills can be difficult and often results in informal or unsystematic instruction (Mason, Field, & Sawilowsky, 2004). By using the CD-Rom version of the Self-Advocacy Strategy, teachers can be available to work with other students while the CD-Rom is providing instruction to other students.
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