

HOW ADMINISTRATION AND SCORING OF THE WOODCOCK-JOHNSON III  
EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT BATTERY AFFECTS STUDENTS' SPECIAL  
EDUCATION SERVICES

Patricia H. Smith

A Thesis Submitted to the  
University of North Carolina Wilmington in Partial Fulfillment  
Of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of School Administration

Watson School of Education  
University of North Carolina Wilmington

2006

Approved by

Advisory Committee

---

Chair

Accepted by

---

Dean, Graduate School

This thesis has been prepared in the style and format  
consistent with the  
American Psychological Association

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	vi
DEDICATION .....	vii
LIST OF TABLES .....	viii
LIST OF FIGURES .....	ix
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	1
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	12
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY .....	22
Overview .....	22
Survey .....	23
Woodcock-Johnson III Achievement Battery Protocol .....	24
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS.....	28
Results of Survey Data.....	28
Results of Protocol Data.....	39
CHAPTER V: SUMMARY.....	47
Key Findings.....	47
Recommendations.....	48
Further Research and Study.....	49
REFERENCES.....	51
APPENDIX A .....	53

## ABSTRACT

Many students in Onslow County, North Carolina show deficiencies in writing as measured by the North Carolina State Writing Test. 61.3% of Onslow County's fourth graders scored a Level 1 or 2 on the writing test. Although these students show deficits in written expression, when they take the Woodcock-Johnson Revised III Battery (WJR-III) they are still found to be ineligible for Special Education services under the category of Specific Learning Disabilities. Many of these students might benefit from these Special Education services. It is hypothesized that the manner in which the Onslow County evaluators (teachers or counselors) are prepared to administer the WJR-III and the way it is administered and interpreted by evaluators may be faulty.

This study examined three factors that may have impacted the evaluation process in which the WRJ-III was administered and interpreted. These factors were the accuracy of evaluators' test interpretations, training time of evaluators, and perceived adequacy of training time. Testing accuracy was determined by comparing five elementary evaluators' scores to determine if there was acceptable consistency in their scoring. Surveys received from twenty-seven K-12 evaluators ascertained the actual training hours the evaluators received and if the evaluators felt the amount of time was adequate.

It appeared that a substantial number of evaluators perceived their preparation time as inadequate. In addition, there was some inaccuracy shown in the administration and interpretation of the WJR-III scores. 31% of the evaluators felt they had not received enough preparation for administering and interpreting the WJR-III. The amount of time devoted to training did not appear to be positively correlated with the evaluators' perceptions of how prepared they were to administer the test. In fact, 67% of the

evaluators who received the most training (over twenty hours) said they did not receive an adequate amount of training. 29% of the evaluators' scores were inconsistent when compared with other evaluators' scores. One evaluator from the first school that data was collected, reported that he felt he had not received adequate training.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge several people who have guided me along my path in education. These people encouraged me to always give 100%, to never give up, and to believe that molding the life of a child is the most important career anyone can have.

Special thanks to Pamela Hatch who helped me find my voice and inspired me to become an educator. Her faith made me reach higher than I thought possible. Thank you to James Lanier who encouraged me to go into administration. I would also like to thank Linda Stripe for giving me opportunities to participate in administrative activities which enhanced my professional development.

I would also like to thank Anita Brown and Dr. Catherine Nesbit who have been there to help me work through the trials that were faced along the way. Thank you to Dr. Marcee Steele whose knowledge of Special Education helped me to prepare this thesis. Thank you to Dr. Marc Sosne who was my advisor and helped me establish critical points for research.

I am especially grateful to Dr. Martin Kozloff. His patience and knowledge have guided me every step of the way through this process.

## DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my husband, Hubert. Because of his support, patience, and belief in my abilities, I was able to complete this thesis and the MSA program. I would also like to dedicate this thesis to my children, Hillary, Bert, and Lauren. Their love and support have helped me through this process.

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	North Carolina Testing Program Annual Writing Assessment, 1997-98 to 2003-04, Distribution of Low Performance Scores Across Years, Grade 4.....	3
2	North Carolina Writing Assessment Proficiency, Onslow County Elementary Schools, Grade 4, 2003-2004 .....	4
3	North Carolina Testing Program Annual Writing Assessment Proficiency in Onslow County, Grades 7 and 10 for Years 2003 and 2004.....	6
4	Perception of Chairpersons' Instructional Training Time.....	35
5	A list of Alternate Assessments Being Utilized within Onslow County, North Carolina and the Number of Examiners Using These Assessments ....	40



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Comparison of surveys sent to number returned .....	29
2	Percentage of surveys returned .....	30
3	Number of chairpersons trained to administer the Woodcock-Johnson III Battery compared to those that are not trained .....	32
4	A comparison of the total amount of instruction time received to the amount of instruction time per subtest .....	34
5	Comparison of how chairpersons perceived amount of training time with comfort level of test administration .....	36
6	Test administration used in schools for the Woodcock-Johnson III Battery .....	38
7	Discrepancies between evaluators' scores on same student protocols for School A.....	43
8	Discrepancies between evaluators' scores on same student protocols for School B.....	46