

DIFFERENCES IN NARRATIVE AND PERSUASIVE
WRITTEN COMPOSITIONS OF TWELFTH
GRADE ADVANCED PLACEMENT
AND REGULAR STUDENTS

By

COURTNEY PAIGE BRANCH

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

2000

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
In partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 2002

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to several people who have helped me complete my thesis. First I would like to thank my committee members for their encouragement, understanding, and willingness to help me complete my thesis on time and in the most efficient manner possible. Without their diligence I would not have been able to finish my analysis and writing in such an organized manner. Dr. Connie Stout has persevered through the last few semesters to aid me in my analysis procedures, to help me discover new and novel ways to organize my thoughts and interpret them on paper, and to provide me with a wonderful mentor. My experience with Dr. Stout has taught me more than I can even now realize and I will always be grateful for the faith she has in me. Dr. Stout, thank you so much!

My other committee members have also provided me with insightful information. Their ideas and experience have truly been inspiring. Dr. Mokhtari has answered several questions about the education system that otherwise would have been a mystery. Mr. Beeby has been such a great support and so willing to help in any way possible. I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Catt. I have been her graduate assistant for the last year and a half and I appreciate all that she has done for me during that time. She has been willing to help me with schoolwork, my thesis, and truly been a great influence on me. I would also like to thank the faculty and staff of the Communication Sciences and

Disorders Department for their support and encouragement throughout undergraduate and graduate school.

My appreciation goes to the students who participated in the study, the schools for allowing me to visit them, and the wonderful teachers who were so supportive and willing to help in any way they could. I would not have been able to complete my project if any of these individuals had not been so willing to provide their time and effort. Special thanks go to Mrs. Beaudette, Mrs. Malloy, and Mrs. Crane.

A big thank you goes to my parents, family, and friends. My father has helped me in so many ways throughout my years in school and without him I would not be where I am today. My mother is one of my best friends and I know that it is through her support and drive that I have persevered. My brother and sister have provided support through the years that no one else could. I would especially like to thank my grandparents who have played such a huge role in my life that I am not sure what I would do without them. My graduate school friends have been great throughout the past two years. Without Hannah I would have no one to help me relax, without Laura I am not sure how I would have finished, and the rest of the girls have helped me so much!!

A special thanks goes to my husband, Roy, who has never abandoned me. This project has taken many hours of my time away from him and he has never complained. I appreciate all the things he has done for me in the last two years of graduate school and promise to always remember how supportive and loving he is.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHODS	13
Subjects	14
Procedures	17
Measures	19
Analysis	22
Reliability	23
III. RESULTS	25
IV. DISCUSSION	35
Main Findings	36
Clinical Implications	37
Limitations and Future Research	41
REFERENCES	44
APPENDIXES	47
APPENDIX A – PARTICIPANT SURVEY	48
APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANTS	51
APPENDIX C – PARENT AND STUDENT LETTERS AND CONSENT FORMS	56
APPENDIX D – TASK INSTRUCTIONS	63
APPENDIX E – PERSUASIVE PROMPT	66
APPENDIX F – NARRATIVE PROMPT	68
APPENDIX G – TTR GUIDELINES	70
APPENDIX H – T-UNIT ANALYSIS GUIDELINES	73
APPENDIX I – COHESION ANALYSIS GUIDELINES	76
APPENDIX J - HOLISTIC SCORING GUIDELINES	78
APPENDIX K - INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD AND APPROVAL FORMS	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary of Participants	15
2. Results of ANOVAs for Narrative task	26
3. Results of ANOVAs for Persuasive task	27
4. Results of ANOVAs for Genre	28

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

People communicate with each other through both spoken and written language every day. Both spoken and written language serve to inform, entertain, persuade, and educate. Children develop spoken language first. Later, they begin to write and throughout their school careers learn to express their thoughts and feelings through writing. Children learn to compose letters, personal stories, descriptions of objects, instructive or “how to” essays, informative pieces, or persuasive compositions. The development of writing begins in kindergarten and continues throughout high school. Writing skills must be taught to aid in the students’ progress in developing written language.

Students first learn the alphabet and advance to writing their names. When they are taught writing skills in school, they continue to learn the basics of writing and begin using writing for more purposes. Narratives or stories are introduced in the first grade. Students start writing simple three or four sequence stories. As they continue through elementary school they learn more complex narrative structures. As early as third grade students are instructed how to write simple persuasive writings. However, it is not until high school that students will develop the skills to write a well-organized persuasive composition.

The Oklahoma State Board of Education expects all high school students to graduate with specific writing skills (Priority Academic Student Skills [PASS],

2000). The Board has developed the Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS) document, which outlines the general knowledge that students are expected to acquire from Kindergarten through 12th grade. PASS was adopted in the 1993-94 school year and is revised every 3 years. Included in PASS are the writing and grammar skills that high school seniors are expected to know and use. Seniors should be able to use prewriting strategies and revise and edit drafts (PASS, 2000). Students' essays should contain a central idea, thesis statement, supporting paragraphs, and a conclusion. The range of their writing skills should include the ability to research and document for an essay and to critically analyze literature (PASS, 2000).

Oklahoma schools currently provide a variety of English classes ranging from learning disabled to advanced placement and students are placed into the different class types (Oklahoma Advanced Placement, 2001). The instruction that each student receives is different and therefore it is hypothesized that the skills that students acquire may also differ. Advanced placement classes are usually structured similarly between school districts and they include specific instruction on writing (Oklahoma Advanced Placement, 2001). During the 12th grade advanced placement English class, students focus on literature analysis. Writing is the primary focus of literature analysis and, therefore, whether the students are reading *Hamlet* or studying current events the assignments the students complete are most often essays (L. Beaudette, personal communication, March 20, 2001). Although the exact instruction is different depending on the teacher, composition is a main part of advanced placement

English classes across settings. For example, Mrs. Jane Malloy, a senior English teacher at Shawnee High School in Shawnee, Oklahoma, focuses on different styles of writing including style analysis, literary essays, timed writings, and free responses (J. Malloy, personal communication, August 24, 2001).

Advanced placement classes attempt to give the students more complex language instruction and tasks than the regular classes provide. The AP classes were established to better prepare high school students for college (Oklahoma Advanced Placement, 2001). Students who complete AP classes often demonstrate scholarship on national and international academic levels, study in greater depth, improve their chances of being accepted by the college of their choice, are often exempted from introductory courses in college, and may be granted sophomore standing in college (Oklahoma Advanced Placement, 2001). Students can be placed in advanced placement classrooms for varied reasons. Students could be enrolled in advanced placement due to high-test scores, teacher recommendation, and/or parental request (M. Peters, personal communication, June 29, 2001).

Mrs. Malloy believes writing is important for both advanced placement classes and regular English classes. She teaches both classes and provided a syllabus for each class for comparison. The literature assignments covered vary greatly; however, the writing assignments are somewhat similar. Both classes are required to write literary essays. Yet, the regular English class does not learn style analysis, free responses, or timed writings. Instead the regular classes learn more traditional discourse types such as narrative, descriptive, and

persuasive. Both classes receive writing instruction but in different styles. The advanced placement students receive more in-depth training of writing styles than the regular English students. Writing is a part of the curriculum rather than an assignment that reinforces what is being taught in the classroom.

The teaching of writing has changed over the years. In the 1960's writing was taught as a process (Judy and Judy, 1981). Writing a composition is a process and it was thought that to teach writing one must follow the operations that make up compositions (Judy and Judy, 1981). Instead of learning the terminology and underlying structure of English the students experienced this structure through writing. The students were taken through the steps and stages of writing including planning, drafting, and revising (Judy and Judy, 1981). These steps are still used in the contemporary English classroom, but there are additional theories teachers are using. The steps teachers generally follow today include rehearsing or the gathering of data and preliminary planning, drafting, and revising (Judy and Judy, 1981). The first step has expanded to include more detailed planning and researching of the topic. Some teachers have also adapted the perceptual approach, which requires the students to observe carefully, absorb details, select the appropriate details, and then write them down on paper (Judy and Judy, 1981). This approach tries to make the students perceive the world around them in full detail. Writing tends to flow from simple to complex (Judy and Judy, 1981). Writing tasks for students in twelfth grade English might be arranged so that each step increases in complexity requiring the writer to use higher-level reasoning and thought processes. An example of

the increased load is provided in the following topic order: “1) enjoying senses, 2) employing senses, 3) being aware of surroundings, 4) observing a scene, 5) getting the feel of action, 6) perceiving emotional attitudes, 7) estimating a person, 8) identifying with a person, 9) perceiving a relationship, 10) looking at yourself, 11) examining a desire, 12) and seeing the whole picture” (Judy and Judy, 1981, p. 132).

Another trend that began in the 1980’s is to teach writing in the content areas (Tchudi and Yates, 1983). For example, a secondary history teacher may implement a writing assignment such as a research paper, a creative writing assignment reviewing a specific historical figure, or a book report. This requires the student to use language to learn subjects. English teachers are concerned not only with the way the students use language but also if the content is accurate (Tchudi and Yates, 1983). Narratives or stories can be used to help the students learn about the Amazon River (Tchudi and Yates, 1983). An assignment could be made in which the students had to write a story about a trip along the river (Tchudi and Yates, 1983). When learning about business, it would be beneficial to the students to actually write a business letter or memo as if they were truly in a company (Tchudi and Yates, 1983).

Writing is used in a variety of settings and for a variety of reasons, but being a successful writer in any setting requires specific skills. It requires writers to switch between oral and written codes as they brainstorm ideas and eventually put those ideas onto paper (Rubin, 1987). Many steps come between brainstorming and the finished writing (Hayes & Flower, 1987). When following

the writing as a process theory, the writer first plans the writing. This involves gathering and organizing information about the topic, deciding what information to include, and outlining the information (Hayes & Flower, 1987). Second, the writer must formulate the sentences or draft the paper. This step is time consuming because the writer often writes multiple variations of the sentences until it is worded to the writer's liking. Last the writer revises, which involves editing grammatical and punctuation errors and reviewing the whole text for organization and flow (Hayes & Flower, 1987). Even an essay on a test requires the writer to go through these processes in an abbreviated form. For an essay the writer must make the intended point explicit and relevant in a short period of time (Haneda & Wells, 2000). However, the goal of the writing does not change.

Writing serves many purposes. Writing discourse tasks that high school students are often required to complete are narrative and persuasive (Oklahoma Board of Education, 2000). Discourse is defined as "two or more connected sentences or related linguistic units that convey a message" (Cherney, 1998, p. 2). Narrative discourse represents real or imagined actions or events (Cherney, 1998). Narratives are usually told in sequence according to time. The purpose of a narrative discourse is to entertain an audience. For example, telling a story from a series of pictures or from a complex action picture would be considered a narrative discourse task. Persuasive discourse tasks require logic and reasoning skills (Cherney, 1998). Creating a persuasive discourse involves defending "an opinion on a topic by giving reasons, examples, or facts to support that opinion" (Cherney, 1998, p. 3). Common persuasive tasks include letters to the editor

and taking sides in a debate. According to the American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA) most high school seniors are capable of writing well-formed narrative texts but persuasive texts are more difficult (American Speech-Language Hearing Association [ASHA], 2001).

More recent studies of written language such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in 1998 have included persuasive tasks for adolescents but earlier studies did not. Kellogg Hunt's (1965) study on the grammatical structures of written language for grades 4, 8, and 12 did not look at specific discourse tasks. Rather the study allowed the actual assignments in class to be measured according to mean sentence length, mean clause length, and the structures within the clause including coordinated conjunctions, nominals, auxiliary verbs, main verbs and complements, modifiers of verbs, and predicate adjectives (Hunt, 1965). Hunt was interested in describing the maturation of these writing measures across the school years. However, while analyzing the data Hunt realized the need for a more accurate means of dividing sentences than by punctuation due to the inconsistent and inaccurate use of punctuation by the subjects. Therefore, the T-unit was established to define the minimal terminal unit, which contains one main clause plus any subordinate clauses or nonclausal structures attached to or embedded in the main clause (Hunt, 1965). The use of T-units allows the sample to be segmented into the shortest unit that is grammatically allowed to be punctuated as a sentence. Hunt (1965) developed the T-unit to simplify the analysis according to the separation of syntactically complete thoughts. Hunt found the average T-unit length for 12th

graders was 14.4 words per T-unit. When dividing the written composition using punctuation, Hunt found the average sentence length to be 16.9 words per sentence. The use of the T-unit proved to reflect a more accurate measure when comparing the 12th graders to the other grades (Hunt, 1965).

Other studies have also looked at language across elementary to high school education levels. Walter Loban (1976) completed a study on language development from Kindergarten through the 12th grade. Loban observed the differences between the language proficiency for subjects at each grade level. He then analyzed the data to find a predictable growth pattern or sequence between the grades. At least two written compositions were taken from each subject and then analyzed according to dependent clauses and the variety of each clause type (i.e. nominal, adverbial, and adjective). Loban used the Lawton point system, which assigns a number from 1 to 3 for each dependent clause with 3 assigned for more complex usage of clauses (1976). The tasks that the subjects completed were describing pictures, retelling stories, and reacting to statements. Loban's results showed an increase in development across the ages but it was not dramatic (1976). Loban indicated that the results of his study were possibly limited due to uncontrolled subject characteristics, which might include race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status (1976). He indicated that these differences may have influenced some of the findings in his study, although to what extent is not determinable. More recent studies such as the NAEP considered these possible influences more specifically.

The NAEP assesses a variety of academic fields including written language. The most recent writing assessment data published are the 1998 results. The study included students in 4th, 8th, and 12th grades and measured narrative, informative, and persuasive discourse (National Center of Educational Statistics [NCES], 1999). The study contained relevant data on the basic writing skills that students demonstrate. In an effort to control for socioeconomic status and other subject characteristics the researchers formulated a survey that each student completed prior to testing. The survey consisted of questions ranging from age, ethnicity, and race to parent education levels and socioeconomic status according to the federally funded Free/Reduced Price School Lunch Program, which is provided for children near or below the poverty line (NCES, 1999). The students were then given prompts for each discourse task and allowed to either write one 50-minute response or two 25-minute responses. The data is reported according to the varied subject characteristics. Major findings from this study indicate that females have higher levels of writing abilities than males, students eligible for the Free/Reduced Price School Lunch Program performed lower than those not eligible, and students who had parents with higher education levels generally performed better than students whose parents had only completed high school or below (NCES, 1999). This information is vital for teachers, speech-language pathologists, and other professionals that work with children of varying capabilities and backgrounds. The students are each different and have varied home environments, abilities, and cultures and should

not be treated as a homogeneous group as the earlier studies did (e.g. Hunt, 1965; Loban, 1976).

The NAEP also measured the discourse tasks with a different view than Hunt (1965) and Loban (1976). Instead of measuring individual aspects of writing such as grammar, mean T-unit length, and punctuation, the writing compositions were measured using a scale that reflected the overall organization of the paper (NCES, 1999). This holistic measurement judged spelling, grammar, punctuation, word choice, organization and flow of the composition, and development of the writing simultaneously (Najimy, 1981). The scoring process was very detailed. The scorer first read all of the papers written. The papers were then placed into the appropriate category. The categories ranged from advanced to proficient to basic. Writing involves many processes and the holistic scoring method allowed the researcher to consider all of these when scoring the composition. For example, according to the NAEP's criteria, for a student's writing to be categorized as advanced the paper should reflect analytical, evaluative, and creative thinking. The writing should be detailed and fully developed as well as coherent and consistent in topic or theme. There should be few errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and sentence structure (NCES, 1999).

Speech-language pathologists play a direct role in the development of literacy. Due to the reciprocal relationship between spoken and written language speech-language pathologists are also involved in writing. The efficient use of written communication is built upon the efficient use of spoken communication

(ASHA, 2001). Therefore, many young clients who have speech and/or language disorders later have reading and writing developmental delays or deficits. ASHA indicated that writing instruction is within the speech-language pathologists' scope of practice and they should be involved in the assessment of reading and writing, provide intervention and document outcomes for reading and writing, and assume other roles such as providing assistance to general education teachers, parents, and students; advocating for effective literary practices; and advancing the knowledge base for reading and writing (ASHA, 2001).

There are many approaches to assessing language. Speech-language pathologists are interested in more specific measures along with the holistic score. ASHA suggests that the most efficient assessment approach involves collaboration with parents, teachers, and other service providers to collect informal and formal information (ASHA, 2001). The tools for assessment can be pulled from the students' curricula and classroom experiences. When evaluating the writing sample, measures such as productivity/fluency, T-unit length, average length of main clauses with their dependent clauses, clause density, grammar, vocabulary, spelling, use of morphemes (i.e. plural marker *s* or use of present progressive *ing*), organization of the text, and writing conventions should all be considered (ASHA, 2001). This process is very involved and time consuming but the information gained by these measurements cannot be reflected by only using a holistic score.

At this time, the knowledge base for writing does not thoroughly describe the writing abilities of adolescents and their writing skills. There is a need for research that takes a different perspective of adolescents. They are not a homogeneous group that can be looked at only by gender or socioeconomic differences. Adolescents are enrolled in varied levels of classes and the different instruction they receive in classes could greatly affect their writing development. Due to the more challenging aspects of advanced placement curricula it may be assumed that students who have taken advanced placement English classes would perform better on narrative and persuasive discourse tasks than their peers who took regular English classes.

This study is designed to better describe adolescent writing skills for both advanced placement and regularly placed English students. Writing samples will be obtained from 12th grade students in advanced placement and regular English classrooms. The study will ask the following questions: 1) Is there a significant difference in the overall writing skills as judged by a holistic measure between a sample of advanced placement students and regularly placed students? 2) Is there a significant difference in the overall writing skills according to genre type? 3) Is there a significant difference according to the specific measures including TTR, average T-unit length, grammatical complexity, and cohesion between the advanced placement students and the regularly placed students? 4) Is there a significant difference according to the specific measures including TTR, average T-unit length, grammatical complexity, and cohesion according to genre type?

CHAPTER II

METHOD

The purpose of the study is to describe the writing skills of advanced placement and regular placement 12th grade English students. The study asked the following questions: 1) Is there a significant difference in the overall writing skills as judged by a holistic measure between a sample of advanced placement students and regularly placed students? 2) Is there a significant difference in the overall writing skills according to genre type? 3) Is there a significant difference according to the specific measures including TTR, average T-unit length, grammatical complexity, and cohesion between the advanced placement students and the regularly placed students? 4) Is there a significant difference according to the specific measures including TTR, average T-unit length, grammatical complexity, and cohesion according to genre type?

Writing samples were obtained from 12th grade English students to provide data on adolescent writing skills. Two groups of students participated including advanced placement students and regularly placed students. This study compared the two groups according to overall writing skills (holistic measure) and specific elements of writing such as TTR, average T-unit length, grammatical complexity, and cohesion. These data were analyzed to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the groups according to

the measures and if there was a statistically significant difference according to genre type.

Subjects

There were a total of 65 subjects used in the study. These subjects were placed into two groups according to class placement. There were a total of 31 subjects in the advanced placement group and a total of 34 in the regular placement group.

Advanced Placement Subjects

A total of 31 subjects in advanced placement English classes were recruited from average-sized public high schools in Oklahoma that enroll approximately 150 to 250 students per grade. To qualify for testing each student completed a survey that included demographical and background information about the student (Appendix A). This information helped in describing the subjects' average age, gender, educational history, parental education level, socioeconomic status, and general background information (Table 1) (for more detailed data see Appendix B).

The advanced placement subjects were 17 or 18 years of age in the 12th grade. Subjects were enrolled in the English advanced placement program for at least their 12th grade English class. Students were not included in the study if they had any special education service except speech therapy (for articulation and fluency only) and if they had repeated a grade level higher than third grade. All subjects were native speakers of English. The ethnicity of the group was minimally varied including six students, who were American Indian (Native

Table 1

Summary of Student Participants

Student Information	Subject Groups	
	Advanced Placement (n=31)	Regular Placement (n=34)
Gender		
Male	9	21
Female	22	13
Age		
17	14	14
18	17	18
19	0	2
Ethnicity		
Caucasion	23	29
American Indian	6	3
African American	1	0
Hispanic	1	2

American), 23 students who were Caucasian, one student who was African American, and one student who was Hispanic. Socioeconomic status was determined by eligibility for the Free or Reduced Priced Lunch Program. Seven students indicated that they were eligible for the program while twenty-three answered no and one was unsure. Parental education was extremely varied ranging from a high school diploma to a Master's Degree.

The data was collected in the classroom setting in groups ranging from 15 to 20 students. The teacher was interviewed to clarify any information on the students' surveys and to provide more specific information on the structure, curricula, and format of the class.

Regular Classroom Subjects

The study also included 34 subjects from regular placement English classrooms attending the same public high schools as the advanced placement subjects. Subject selection was the same as for advanced placement students and the same criteria were followed. The regular classroom students also completed the student survey. The group was chosen according to the survey results (Table 1) (for more details see Appendix B). The students were between the ages of 17 and 19 years and had not received special education services other than speech therapy (articulation and fluency only). A few of the students had repeated kindergarten, pre-first, or first grade but none had repeated a grade level higher than third. The parental education levels were also varied ranging from less than a high school diploma to a doctoral degree. The students were all native speakers of English and had no outstanding or handicapping hearing or

visual deficits. Some of the students had taken advanced placement classes although most indicated that those classes were not English classes. These criteria helped to ensure the equality of the two groups.

The data was also taken in the classroom setting in groups of 15 to 20 students. The teacher for these students was also interviewed in order to determine the specific curriculum that the teacher follows.

Procedures

Tasks

Both subject groups completed the same tasks, which were analyzed on an individual basis. Data was collected for written discourse including narrative and persuasive forms. The researcher visited the classrooms two weeks prior to testing to provide a brief overview of the study and pamphlets for students to take home to their parents or guardians (Appendix C). The researcher asked the students to have a consent form signed by their parents or guardians if they were under eighteen years of age or if the students were at least 18 years old they signed the consent form themselves. The students were required to bring the consent form back before the testing to be allowed to participate.

The subject groups were tested in their classrooms. One person instructed both classes using prewritten instructions. To ensure that the instructions were not altered the researcher made a written copy of the instructions for the researcher to read prior to the beginning of the tasks (Appendix D). The classroom teacher was present to help as needed. Following the NAEP (NCES, 1999) format, each student first filled out the student survey

attached to the writing samples. Each student in the classroom that returned the consent form participated in order to minimize the effect of publicly excluding students from the study. After completion of the study the researcher determined if some students' samples would not be used according to the subject criteria such as not completing writing tasks, educational history, and primary language spoken.

A total of 13 students were not included in the study. Three students were unable to complete both compositions, one student's native language was not English, and the remaining students had repeated a grade level higher than third or received special education services other than speech therapy for articulation or fluency. To avoid the use of the students' names, the students were assigned a random letter and number (e.g. 3a), which they transferred from the survey to their composition.

Each student completed a narrative and persuasive discourse sample. For the persuasive task the students were given one topic choice. The topic was chosen according to an issue that is relevant for 17 or 18 year old, high school students and had been used successfully in past writing studies such as the NAEP's study in 1998. The prompt choice titled "One Vote" was used for the persuasive task (NCTS 1999) (Appendix E). Most 12th grade students are 17 or 18 years old, which is the age when young Americans have the first opportunity to register and vote in the United States. Therefore, this prompt was felt to be appropriate and relevant for the subjects participating in the study. The prompt for the narrative task was a narrative prompt also used in the NAEP's study

(NCES, 1999). Each student wrote a story over the excerpt of a poem by Walt Whitman (Appendix F).

The researcher first passed out college-ruled notebook paper to the students. The prompt was then given to the students and the researcher read the instructions. The students were given 25 minutes to write at least one page on the provided topic. After completing the first composition the students had a 15-minute break. The second prompt was then passed out and the students had 25 minutes to write at least one page over the second topic.

To control for testing order the researcher counter-balanced the persuasive and narrative tasks. Some of the students received the narrative prompt first while others received the persuasive prompt. Instructions for both tasks were read aloud by the researcher at the beginning of the testing session and after the break and a written copy of the instructions was provided to the students to refer to as necessary. The entire testing session was completed in an 80 minute time period.

MEASURES

The written samples were analyzed at various discourse levels. At the word level the researcher analyzed vocabulary variance using the type/token ratio (TTR). The measure examined the “proportion of different words used to total words used” (Shadden, 1998, p. 48). Type indicated a unique word form while token was the potential number of times a word was used. “This measure was developed for children from age 3 to age 8, but it has been used with older populations as well” (Shadden, 1998, p. 48). Rules for completing TTR analysis

allow for inter-judge reliability. The researcher followed the TTR analysis guidelines provided by Shadden (1998) (Appendix G).

The writing samples were also analyzed at the sentence level. The T-unit developed by Hunt (1965) was used to segment the writing samples of continuous language into “the shortest unit that is grammatically allowed to be punctuated as a sentence” (Shadden, 1998, p. 22). The use of this measure eliminated the need to determine sentence length using punctuation and allowed the researcher to look at sentence complexity. Each sample was divided into T-units and then the mean number of words per T-unit was calculated. The mean T-unit length for the sample indicated the average sentence complexity. In order to insure that the T-units were divided accurately across the writing samples Hunt’s guidelines for T-unit Analysis were used (Shadden, 1998) (Appendix H). This measure yields three scores including total number of T-units, total number of words, and mean number of words per T-unit. Each of these scores will be used in the analysis.

Another measure at the sentence level looked at grammatical complexity. According to Loban (1976) “...research has established by now the fact that elaboration and complexity of syntax are clearly measures of development in oral and written language” (p. 15). This measure looked at the total number of dependent clauses used and the mean number of dependent clauses per T-unit. There are various types of dependent clauses including noun, adjective, and adverb clauses. A dependent clause is defined as a modifier of the main clause that contains both a subject and a verb but which cannot by itself be completely

understood. This study did not distinguish between the types of dependent clauses, rather the measure looked only at the average number of dependent clauses per T-unit.

The writing samples were also measured using a score that looked at the samples at the paragraph or discourse level. Cohesion is defined as the “structural coherence among parts of a text” (Liles & Coelho, 1998, p. 65). According to the type of discourse, different cohesive ties are used to organize the content of the writing. Cohesion analysis involves three major steps including identification of the words that are used as cohesive ties, the classification of those ties as linguistically structured categories of cohesion use, and the determination as to whether the tie is appropriately used in the text. Halliday and Hasan developed criteria for the purpose of identifying the cohesive ties and categorized them as reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, or lexical (Liles & Coelho, 1998). For the purposes of this study, the analysis was limited to reference because research has found that referential cohesion occurs more commonly in discourse than any other type (Glosser, 1993; Ripich & Terrell, 1988; Ulatowska, et al., 1986). To identify the cohesive ties the researcher must identify whether interpretation of the correct meaning of a sentence is dependent on the information provided in another sentence (e.g. Tom is an engineer. *He* works in Ohio.) (Liles & Coelho, 1998). The cohesive ties are then categorized according to the above types and subsequently, the ties are then identified as appropriate or not. Halliday and Hasan (1976) developed three appropriateness categories including complete, incomplete, or erroneous ties (Appendix I). Two

scores were then used from this measure for analysis purposes. The scores include the number of cohesive ties compared to the total number of complete cohesive ties and the percentage of incomplete or erroneous ties.

The final measurement used was a holistic measure of the writing sample. This measurement judges all components of the writing simultaneously (Najimy 1981). The NAEP study (NCES, 1998) used this type of scoring method. Scoring guidelines were provided that described the six levels of performance. There are different scoring guidelines for each type of discourse. The guidelines emphasize the students' abilities to develop and elaborate ideas, organize their thoughts and to write grammatically correct prose (NCES, 1999). The researcher used the exact NAEP guidelines when scoring the writing samples (Appendix J).

ANALYSIS

These data were summarized first using descriptive statistics including mean, median, mode, standard deviation, and distribution and range of scores. Single factor ANOVAs were used to analyze between group similarities and differences for each measure. The researcher assumed that the distributions for advanced placement and regular students were symmetric since both groups were normal developing and each group had at least 30 subjects (Doehring, 1996).

The data were arranged so that nine single factor ANOVAs were completed; one for each of the following measures: type/token ratio, number of clauses, clauses per T-unit, total number of T-units, T-unit length, number of words, percentage of incomplete or erroneous cohesive ties, number of total

cohesive ties compared to the number of complete cohesive ties, and the holistic score. Each score was analyzed separately to reduce the complexity of interactions and main effects in the factorial design. Since the measures used in the study were felt to have little or no relationship, each measure represented a unique framework. Each of the measures represented separate aspects of language including syntax, semantics, and overall writing organization. Each measure created a simple single factor design with the main effects as the class type and the difference between the two groups. The ANOVA helped determine whether there was a significant difference between the two groups in each of the measures.

Further analysis looked at the differences between genre types on each of the measures. Single factor ANOVAs were used to determine if there were also differences in performance according to genre across subject groups.

Reliability

A second judge, who was a graduate student in communication and science disorders, repeated the analysis process for twenty percent of the subjects for both the narrative and persuasive tasks. Additional training over the analysis measurements was provided to ensure that the student was qualified to complete the analysis. The student had previous experience analyzing written language samples using T-units, grammatical complexity, and cohesion. Using point by point reliability, inter-judge reliability was found to be 92% accurate for separation of T-units, 98% for total number of words, 95% for mean number of words per T-unit, 96% for type/token ratio, and 92% for the holistic score. Inter-

judge reliability was found to be 85% for total number of cohesive ties, and 82% for total number of clauses.

Upon review of the differences for both of these measures, it was apparent that the differences in clause identification were found primarily in sentences containing embedded clauses or multiple clauses. It was also apparent that the second judge failed to identify personal cohesive ties if the T-unit contained more than one cohesive tie for a single referent. Further instruction was provided to the second judge reviewing the rules for clause identification and cohesive ties. The second judge reanalyzed the data and inter-judge reliability was found to be 96% for total number of clauses and 99% for total number of cohesive ties (further analysis also illustrated inter-judge reliability of 100% for identification of the percent of incomplete or erroneous ties).

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Comparison of between class differences according to each measure were made as well as comparison of the differences between genre type across the subject groups. Using a single factor ANOVA the differences for each measure were compared between groups. The ANOVA allowed the researcher to determine whether there was a significant difference between the two groups for a specified measure. Summaries of the differences between the groups according to measure and genre type are presented in Table 1 and Table 2. The data was also analyzed according to differences between the genre types. Results for these differences are presented in Table 3.

ANOVA Analysis

Single factor ANOVAs were used to explore the differences between groups according to one measure. A total of nine ANOVAs were run for the five measures used in the study. Although this approach does allow the researcher to observe significant differences between the groups it does not illustrate interactions across measures. However, it was determined that the amount of interaction would be minimal due to the nature of the measures used and therefore, multi-factor ANOVAs were unnecessary. The results below are summarized according to each measure.

Table 2

Results of ANOVAs for Narrative Task

Group differences for the narrative task according to means, standard deviations (SD), and P-values (significant at $p < 0.05$), and F-tests

Measures	Advanced Placement (n = 31)		Regular (n = 34)		F-test*	P-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
<u>T-Unit Length</u>						
Total # of words	270.9	82.32	224.5	76.04	3.19	0.02**
Total # T-units	22.52	7.2	19.41	6.81	5.58	0.08
Avg # Words/T-unit	12.31	2.19	12.03	3.04	0.17	0.68
<u>Grammatical Complexity</u>						
Total # Clauses	12.55	5.73	9.59	4.80	5.13	0.03**
Clauses/T-unit	0.58	0.27	1.04	0.10	0.05	0.82
<u>Cohesion</u>						
Attempts/complete	1.03	0.07	1.04	0.10	1.10	0.30
% Incomplete/Error	2	0.06	3	0.07	0.08	0.77
<u>Type/Token Ratio</u>	0.51	0.05	0.52	0.08	0.35	0.55
<u>Holistic Score</u>	4.42	1.06	3.76	1.05	6.28	0.02**

* degrees of freedom (1, 63)

** $p < 0.05$

Table 3

Results of ANOVAs for the Persuasive Task

Group differences on the persuasive task according to means, standard deviations (SD), P-values (significant at $p < 0.05$), and F-tests

Measures	Advanced Placement (n = 31)		Regular (n = 34)		F-Test *	P-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
<u>T-Unit Length</u>						
Total # of words	221.29	51.02	213.06	63.86	0.33	0.57
Total # T-units	15.9	4.077	15.79	5.35	0.01	0.93
Avg # Words/T-unit	14.3	2.99	13.85	2.26	1.10	0.30
<u>Grammatical Complexity</u>						
Total # Clauses	13.4	4.24	15.56	5.03	3.40	0.07
Clauses/T-unit	0.91	0.373	1.05	0.35	0.91	0.34
<u>Cohesion</u>						
Attempts/complete	1.006	0.036	1.14	0.37	4.21	0.04**
% Incomplete/Error	0.005	0.03	0.07	0.15	6.73	0.01**
<u>Type/Token Ratio</u>	0.54	0.06	0.53	0.0767	0.63	0.43
<u>Holistic Score</u>	4.61	1.05	3.647	0.812	17.29	< 0.01**

* degrees of freedom (1, 63)

** $p < 0.05$

Table 4

Results of ANOVAs for Genre

Genre differences across subject groups according to means, standard deviations (SD), P-values (significant at $p < 0.05$), and F-tests

Measures	Narrative (n = 65)		Persuasive (n = 65)		F-test *	P-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
<u>T-Unit Length</u>						
Total # of words	246.63	81.82	216.98	57.79	5.69	0.02**
Total # T-units	20.89	7.12	15.85	4.75	22.60	< 0.01**
Avg # Words/T-unit	12.16	2.65	14.08	2.619	17.24	< 0.01**
<u>Grammatical Complexity</u>						
Total # Clauses	11.00	5.43	14.53	4.76	15.61	< 0.01**
Clauses/T-unit	0.55	0.26	0.98	0.37	60.33	< 0.01**
<u>Cohesion</u>						
Attempts/complete	1.03	0.08	1.08	0.28	1.64	0.20
% Incomplete/Error	0.03	0.06	0.04	0.20	1.06	0.34
<u>Type/Token Ratio</u>	0.51	0.06	0.53	0.068	2.33	0.13
<u>Holistic Score</u>	4.07	1.09	4.11	1.05	0.03	0.87

* degrees of freedom (1, 128)

** $p < 0.05$

either. The advanced placement students produced a mean of 15.9 T-units while the regular students produced a mean of 15.79 T-units.

In further analysis, the two genres were compared across the groups. The average number of T-units produced for the narrative discourse task was 20.89 while for the persuasive discourse task it was 15.85. The results revealed that there was a statistically significant difference at $[F(1, 128) = 22.60, p = 0.01]$.

Mean number of words per T-unit

The narrative task and persuasive task were compared separately between the two groups. The ANOVA for the narrative task did not reveal a statistically significant difference between the advanced placement students and the regular students for mean number of words per T-unit. The advanced placement students' results indicated an average of 12.31 words per T-unit and the regular class 12.03 words per T-unit. The ANOVA for the persuasive discourse task also did not reveal a statistically significant difference. The advanced placement students produced an average of 14.33 words per T-unit and the regular students 13.85 words per T-unit.

Further analysis between the genre types revealed a statistically significant difference at $[F(1, 128) = 17.24, p = 0.01]$. The students produced an average of 12.16 words per T-unit on the narrative discourse task and 14.08 on the persuasive discourse task.

Grammatical Complexity

Total number of independent clauses

ANOVAs were completed for both the narrative and persuasive discourse tasks. Results for the narrative task revealed a statistically significant difference at $[F(1, 63) = 5.13, p = 0.03]$. The advanced placement students produced a mean of 12.54 clauses while the regular students produced a mean of 9.59 clauses. The persuasive task results did not reveal a statistically significant difference between the groups. The advanced placement students used a mean of 13.41 clauses and the regular class a mean of 15.56 clauses.

When comparing the two tasks across groups the ANOVA revealed a significant difference at $[F(1, 128) = 15.61, p = 0.01]$. On the narrative task the students produced a mean of 11 clauses while on the persuasive task the students produced a mean of 14.54 clauses.

Mean number of clauses per T-unit

Each task was compared separately between the two groups. The ANOVA for the narrative task did not reveal a statistically significant difference. The advanced placement students produced a mean of 0.58 clauses per T-unit and the regular students produced a mean of 0.52 clauses per T-unit. The persuasive task ANOVA did not reveal a significant difference either. The advanced placement students produced 0.91 clauses per T-unit and the regular students 1.05 clauses per T-unit.

When comparing the two tasks across subjects the ANOVA revealed a significant difference at $[F(1, 128) = 60.33, p = 0.01]$. The average number of

clauses per T-unit for the narrative task was 0.55 while the average number of clauses per T-unit for the persuasive task was 0.98.

Cohesion Analysis

Total number of cohesive ties compared to total number of complete ties

Results for the narrative task revealed a mean of 1.03 cohesive ties compared to complete ties for the advanced placement students and 1.03 for the regular students. Therefore, the ANOVA did not identify a statistically significant difference between the two groups. However, results for the persuasive task revealed a mean of 1.01 for the advanced placement students and 1.14 for the regular students. The ANOVA did indicate a statistically significant difference between the two groups at [F (1, 63) = 4.21, p = 0.04].

Further analysis between the two tasks across groups did not reveal a significant difference between the narrative and persuasive tasks. Results for narrative indicated a mean score of 1.03 total number of cohesive ties over the total number of complete ties compared to the persuasive mean score of 1.08.

Percentage of incomplete and/or erroneous cohesive ties

The ANOVA for the narrative task did not reveal a statistically significant difference between the advanced placement and regular students for the percentage of incomplete and/or erroneous cohesive ties. The advanced placement students' results were a mean of 2% while the regular students' results were a mean of 3%. For the persuasive discourse task the ANOVA revealed a significant difference between groups at [F (1, 63) = 6.73, p = 0.01].

The mean of 0.5% for the advanced placement students was significantly lower than the mean of 8% for the regular students.

When looking at the difference between the two tasks across groups the ANOVA revealed no statistically significant difference. For narrative discourse the results indicated a mean of 3% while the persuasive discourse results were at a mean of 4%.

Type-Token Ratio

The ANOVA for the narrative task did not reveal a statistically significant difference between the advanced placement and regular students. The advanced placement students' mean ratio was 0.51 and the regular students' mean ratio was 0.52. For the persuasive task the ANOVA did not reveal significance between the two groups either. The advanced placement students were found to have a mean ratio of 0.54 and the regular students 0.53.

For further analysis the two tasks were compared across groups. The ANOVA did not reveal a significant difference between the tasks. For the narrative task the mean ratio was 0.51 and for the persuasive 0.53.

Holistic Measure

ANOVAs were run for both the narrative and persuasive tasks. The narrative ANOVA indicated a statistically significant difference at [F (1, 63) = 6.28, p = 0.01] between the advanced placement and regular students. The advanced placement students' mean score was 4.41 while the regular students' mean score was 3.76. For the persuasive task the ANOVA again found a statistically significant difference between the two groups at [F (1, 63) = 17.29, p

= 0.01]. The advanced placement students' mean score was 4.61 while the regular students' mean score was 3.64.

When comparing the two discourse tasks across groups the ANOVA revealed no statistically significant difference between the narrative and persuasive discourse tasks. The mean score for the narrative task was 4.07 and the mean score for the persuasive task was 4.11.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

This study described the writing differences on narrative and persuasive discourse between twelfth grade advanced placement English students and regular English students. The groups were first compared according to total number of words, total number of T-units, and average number of words per T-unit on each task. Measures of grammatical complexity involving the use of dependent clauses were used to compare sentence complexity. Referential cohesion was analyzed for the total number of cohesive ties and also the percent of incomplete or erroneous ties. As a measure of vocabulary use, the type/token ratio compared the total number of different words to the total number of words produced. Finally, an overall measure of the writing was used to determine the holistic score.

Each of the measures was also used to compare differences in genre type. These were analyzed across the student groups to determine if any statistically significant difference was found between the narrative or persuasive discourse tasks.

English classes across settings. For example, Mrs. Jane Malloy, a senior English teacher at Shawnee High School in Shawnee, Oklahoma, focuses on different styles of writing including style analysis, literary essays, timed writings, and free responses (J. Malloy, personal communication, August 24, 2001).

Advanced placement classes attempt to give the students more complex language instruction and tasks than the regular classes provide. The AP classes were established to better prepare high school students for college (Oklahoma Advanced Placement, 2001). Students who complete AP classes often demonstrate scholarship on national and international academic levels, study in greater depth, improve their chances of being accepted by the college of their choice, are often exempted from introductory courses in college, and may be granted sophomore standing in college (Oklahoma Advanced Placement, 2001). Students can be placed in advanced placement classrooms for varied reasons. Students could be enrolled in advanced placement due to high-test scores, teacher recommendation, and/or parental request (M. Peters, personal communication, June 29, 2001).

Mrs. Malloy believes writing is important for both advanced placement classes and regular English classes. She teaches both classes and provided a syllabus for each class for comparison. The literature assignments covered vary greatly; however, the writing assignments are somewhat similar. Both classes are required to write literary essays. Yet, the regular English class does not learn style analysis, free responses, or timed writings. Instead the regular classes learn more traditional discourse types such as narrative, descriptive, and

Main Findings

Groups Differences

Several statistically significant groups differences were found for both the narrative and persuasive discourse tasks. Significant differences were evident for three of the nine analysis scores in favor of the advanced placement students. These measures included the holistic score, total number of clauses, and total number of words. The advanced placement students performed at a higher average holistic score than their regular student counterparts. They also produced more words and clauses than the regular students.

The persuasive discourse task also revealed several statistically significant differences between the two groups. The advanced placement students also performed better on these measure. Statistically significant differences were noted for the holistic score, ratio of total number of cohesive ties to number of complete ties, and the percentage of erroneous or incomplete ties. The advanced placement student made less errors in their use of cohesive ties, produced more cohesive ties, and their average holistic score was higher than the regular students' scores.

Genre Differences

In the analysis of genre difference across the subjects several measures had statistically significant differences. Two measures were found to be better for the narrative compositions. Students tended to produce more words for the narrative task than the persuasive task. The students also produced more T-units for the narrative task than the persuasive. However, three measures were

found to be significantly different in favor of the persuasive compositions. The average number of words per T-unit was more for the persuasive composition than the narrative composition. The total number of clauses and average number of clauses per T-unit was also greater on the persuasive task.

ASHA indicated that persuasive discourse was found to be more difficult for high school seniors than narrative discourse (ASHA, 2001). The findings above reveal that the students did produce more for the narrative task according to total number of words and total number of T-units. However, it is noted that the results demonstrate that the students' persuasive compositions contained a greater number of words per T-unit and also a greater number of total clauses and clauses per T-unit. The persuasive writing task generated more grammatically complex language from the students. Since the persuasive discourse task was considered to be more difficult, does this indicate that more difficult tasks lead to more grammatically complex language? Although this study does not provide a final answer to this question, it does appear that in this case the more difficult persuasive discourse task did elicit more complex productions from the students.

Clinical Implications

Total number of words

When comparing the two groups on total number of words produced, it was evident that the advanced placement students produced a greater number of words on the narrative task than the regular students. However, it is interesting to note that there was no statistically significant difference on the total number of

words used for the persuasive task. Persuasive discourse is considered to be more difficult task (ASHA, 2001). Generally persuasive writing does not become proficient until high school or later. Therefore, it was expected that both the advanced placement students and the regular placement students would perform slightly lower on the persuasive discourse task. The scores for production length of words did reflect this assumption. Students regardless of classroom type produced more words for the narrative task than the persuasive task.

Total number of T-units

There was no significant difference between the groups on the total number of T-units produced for the tasks. However, when the two tasks were compared across the student groups there was a significant difference. Students produced a higher number of T-units on the narrative task than on the persuasive. Again, considering the persuasive task is considered to be more difficult, students regardless of classroom type produced fewer T-units.

Average number of words per T-unit

With the above findings one would expect that the students produced more words per T-unit on the narrative task. However, just the opposite occurred. It was found that the students produced a higher number of words per T-unit on the persuasive task than on the narrative task. However, there were no significant differences found between the groups for either task. So although narrative discourse tasks may provide a larger sample, the students produced more words per T-unit for the persuasive discourse task. These differences might be as a result of differences in grammatical complexity between the two

genres. Persuasive discourse requires a greater amount of reasoning skills than narrative discourse. Higher-level cognitive functions include reasoning, problem solving, and organizational skills. Narrative discourse requires mainly the ability to organize and sequence as compared to persuasive discourse, which requires the ability to reason and possibly solve a problem in order to persuade the reader or listener. High school students are not expected to master the writing of persuasive discourse compositions. However, they are expected to already know how to write a well-organized narrative composition. Since the persuasive discourse task was more complex and difficult for the students, they produced a fewer number of T-units on the persuasive task than on the narrative task.

Grammatical complexity

When comparing the two groups for each genre there were some significant differences. For the narrative task the advanced placement students used more clauses than the regular students. However, there was no significant difference found on the persuasive task. When analyzing the differences between the tasks across the student groups, the number of clauses and the average number of clauses per T-unit was greater for the persuasive discourse task. So as predicted, the advanced placement students produced more clauses on the narrative task but not for the persuasive task. It could be considered that since there was a greater amount of clause production on the persuasive task this could influence the number of words per T-unit. If more T-units contained clauses as they did for the persuasive task, it can be concluded that the average number of words per T-unit would also be greater.

Considering the differences for grammatical complexity between the two discourse tasks, it was evident that the students produced more clauses on the persuasive discourse task. As discussed previously, the persuasive discourse task requires the use of more complex language and reasoning skills. The difference in the complexity of the task possible influenced the resulting complex language produced by the students.

Cohesion

Significant differences were found between the two groups on the persuasive discourse task for use of cohesion. The advanced placement students produced less erroneous and incomplete ties when compared to the total number of cohesive ties used. There was no significant difference found between the groups on the persuasive discourse task or between the genres across the groups. The greater difficulty of the persuasive task may have influenced the regular students' use of incomplete or erroneous cohesive ties.

Holistic Measure

The advanced placement students performed significantly better than the regular students on the holistic measure for both discourse tasks. There were some differences evident on the specific language measures; however, this overall measure of writing was sensitive to the style, grammar, spelling, and word choice difficulties that the regular students presented in their compositions. It was evident when reading the advanced placement and the regular students compositions that there were slight style differences. The regular students used fewer transitions causing their compositions to be choppy. The regular students

also produced far more errors in word choice (e.g., using *there* instead of *their* or *aloud* instead of *allowed*). It seemed the majority of their word choice errors dealt with homonyms (e.g., *their* and *there*) and homophones (e.g., *your* and *you're*) more than other kinds of errors. The regular students' use of punctuation was poor and inconsistent as well as their use of capital letters to begin sentences. The holistic score is the only measure used in the study that took into account these important differences between the two groups.

Due to the differences found between the discourse tasks, it is evident that different types of discourse tasks provide different types of information. Speech-language pathologists and teachers must take this into consideration when treating and/or teaching adolescents. Students must be able to sufficiently write in order to complete any task at hand, whether it is a narrative summary, letter to the editor, instructions to building a birdhouse, or description of a picture in art class. Speech-language pathologists must also take this into consideration when treating an adolescent with a language deficit. Providing a variety of opportunities for the students on all types of discourse is essential to helping them become proficient writers. This study has illustrated several differences between two discourse types. There are most likely differences between each discourse type, and therefore, it is important to teach students to write using a variety of discourse types.

Limitations and Future Research

The study was limited due to various subject characteristics. Several of the regular students had taken advanced placement classes prior to their senior

year. Many of the regular placement students did indicate that the advanced placement classes they had taken were not English. If the students had taken advanced placement English classes their compositions might have been non-representative of a student that had never previously had the advanced placement English instruction.

Secondly, the study included students who had repeated a grade during their elementary school. These students were included in the study because it was felt that this repetition was before they received a significant amount of formal writing instruction. It was also noted that each group contained a few subjects who had repeated a grade level. Therefore, it was determined that the groups were equal for this characteristic.

The third factor that limited the study dealt with the inability to gain access to some form of score that represented the student's overall academic ability. It was assumed that the advanced placement students were at a higher academic level than the regular students, but this could not be confirmed without access to intelligence quotient scores or past writing scores and academic records. However, these were not available due to the inconsistent testing of these factors within the participating schools and confidentiality of such records.

These factors indicate the further need for research on adolescent writing at different ages. If a longitudinal study was constructed that first evaluated the adolescent during the freshman year, then sophomore, then junior, and finally as a senior the researcher could control for enrollment status throughout each grade level. This would also provide a level of writing for each year to better determine

whether the students in the advanced placement classes performed better on the tasks due to curriculum differences or simply due to overall better writing skills.

It would also be beneficial to more closely examine the differences of vocabulary and word choice in the current study's samples. The type/token ratio was used as a measure of vocabulary. Although it was determined that there were no statistically significant differences between the groups or between genre type, it would be worthwhile to develop a measure that might be more sensitive to the use of higher level vocabulary versus commonly used words. One would expect the advanced placement students to use more complex vocabulary. Further analysis of word choice is also warranted to determine the students' accurate use of homonyms and homophones.

Further research is imperative to determine the true difference between writing skills in adolescent groups. Currently there is little research in the area of adolescent language and the knowledge of adolescent language skills is essential for speech-language pathologists as well as teachers. A speech-language pathologist cannot plan treatment for an adolescent who has a learning disability or who has suffered brain damage if the writing skills of normal adolescents are not known. Also, a teacher cannot determine the appropriate writing curriculum for adolescents if their normal writing skills and abilities are not known. Continuing research will provide the data that speech-language pathologists and teachers need to provide effective services to adolescents.

REFERENCES

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2001). Roles and responsibilities of the SLP with respect to reading and writing in children and adolescents. Technical Report. Rockville, MD: ASHA.

Cherney, L. R. (1998). Pragmatics and discourse: An introduction. In L. R. Cherney, B. B. Shadden, & C. A. Coelho (Eds.), Analyzing discourse in communicatively impaired adults (pp. 1-7). Gaithersburg, MA: Aspen Publishers, Inc.

Doehring, D.G. (1996). Research strategies in human communication disorders. Austin, TX: PRO-ED An International Publisher.

Halliday, M. A. K., and Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. New York, NY: Longman Inc.

Haneda, M., and Wells, G. (2000). Writing in knowledge-building communities. Research in the Teaching of English 34, 430 – 457.

Hayes, J. R., and Flower, L. S. (1987). On the structure of the writing process. Topics in Language Disorders 7(4), 19-30.

Hunt, K. W. (1965). Grammatical structures written at three grade levels (NCTE Research Report No. 3). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Judy, S., and Judy, S. J. (1981). An introduction: The teaching of writing. New York City, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Liles, B. Z., & Coelho, C. A. (1998). Cohesion analyses. In L. R. Cherney, B. B. Shadden, & C. A. Coelho (Eds.), Analyzing discourse in communicatively impaired adults (pp. 65-83). Gaithersburg, MA: Aspen Publishers, Inc.

Loban, W. (1976). Language development: Kindergarten through grade twelve (NCTE Committee Research Report No. 18). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

National Center of Educational Statistics. (1999). National assessment of educational progress 1998: Writing report card for the nation and the states. Jessup, MD: US Department of Education.

Najimy, N. C. (1981). Measure for measure: A guidebook for evaluating students' expository writing. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Oklahoma Board of Education [On-line]. (2001). Available: www.sde.state.ok.us/board/default.html.

Oklahoma Advanced Placement [On-line]. (2001). Available: www.title3.sde.state.ok.us/ap/.

Priority Academic Student Skills [On-line]. (2000). Available: www.sde.state.ok.us/publ/pass.html.

Shadden, B.B. (1988). Obtaining the discourse sample. In L. R. Cherney, B. B. Shadden, & C. A. Coelho (Eds.), Analyzing discourse in communicatively impaired adults (pp. 9-34). Gaithersburg, MA: Aspen Publishers, Inc.

Shadden, B.B. (1988). Sentential/surface-level analyses. In L. R. Cherney, B. B. Shadden, & C. A. Coelho (Eds.), Analyzing discourse in communicatively impaired adults (pp. 35-63). Gaithersburg, MA: Aspen Publishers, Inc.

Rubin, D. L. (1987). Divergence and convergence between oral and written communication. Topics in Language Disorders 7(4), 1-18.

Tchudi, S., and Yates, J. (1983). Teaching writing content areas: Senior high school. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A
PARTICIPANT SURVEY

PARTICIPANT SURVEY

Subject #: _____

Date: _____

Age: _____ Birthdate: _____

Gender: Female Male

Race/ Ethnicity: Caucasian American Indian African American
Asian/Pacific Islander Hispanic Other

Answer the Following Questions by Circling the Appropriate Answer:

1. What is your parent's highest level of education (according to whichever parent has the highest level)?
 - a. less than high school
 - b. high school diploma/GED
 - c. 1-2 years of college
 - d. Bachelor's degree
 - e. Master's degree
 - f. Doctoral degree
2. Are you eligible for the Free/Reduced-Price School Lunch Program?

Yes No
3. How many years have you attended this high school?

a. 1 b. 2 c. 3 d. 4
4. Have you ever received special education services including speech therapy, learning disability classes, or help in specific subject areas?

Yes No
5. Have you ever been enrolled in Pre-Advanced Placement or Advanced Placement classes and if so for how many years?

No Yes, and if so, a. 1 year b. 2years c. 3 years d. 4 years

6. Have you ever taken any college level classes?

Yes No

7. Do you speak any other languages than English?

Yes No

If yes, is English your primary language?

Yes No

8. Have you ever skipped a grade or been retained in a grade in school?

Yes No

9. Have you ever been treated by a professional for a hearing loss?

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

10. Do you have any visual impairments?

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

APPENDIX B
SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANTS

Participant #	Age	Gender	Ethnicity	Parent Ed.	Lunch Program	Special Education	Repeat Grade	AP Enroll
<u>Advanced Placement Students</u>								
S1	17	Female	Caucasian	Bach.	No	No	No	Yes
S2	18	Female	Caucasian	Bach	Yes	No	No	Yes
S4	17	Female	Caucasian	Master	Yes	No	No	Yes
S5	18	Male	Am. Ind.	Master	No	Speech	No	Yes
S6	18	Female	Caucasian	Bach	No	No	No	Yes
S7	18	Male	Caucasian	Master	No	No	Pre-1 st	Yes
S8	17	Female	Caucasian	Bach	No	No	No	Yes
S9	17	Female	Caucasian	Master	No	No	No	Yes
S10	18	Female	Am. Ind.	H. S.	No	No	No	Yes
S11	18	Female	Af. Am.	1-2 yrs	No	No	No	Yes
S12	18	Male	Caucasian	Master	No	Speech	No	Yes
S13	18	Male	Caucasian	Master	No	Speech	No	Yes
T21	17	Female	Caucasian	Bach	No	No	No	Yes
T22	18	Male	Caucasian	1-2 yrs	No	No	3 rd	Yes
T23	18	Female	Caucasian	1-2 yrs	No	No	No	Yes
T27	17	Female	Am. Ind.	1-2 yrs	No	No	No	Yes
T29	18	Female	Caucasian	H.S.	No	No	No	Yes
T30	17	Female	Caucasian	Bach	No	No	No	Yes
T31	17	Female	Caucasian	Bach	No	No	No	Yes
T32	17	Female	Caucasian	1-2 yrs	Yes	No	No	Yes
T33	18	Male	Caucasian	H.S.	No	No	No	Yes
T35	17	Male	Am. Ind.	Master	No	No	No	Yes
T36	17	Female	Caucasian	H.S.	Unsure	Speech	No	Yes
T37	17	Female	Caucasian	Bach	No	No	No	Yes
T38	17	Female	Caucasian	1-2 yrs	No	No	No	Yes
T39	18	Female	Caucasian	Bach	Yes	No	No	Yes
T40	18	Female	Hispanic	H.S.	No	No	No	Yes

SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANTS

T41	18	Male	Am. Ind.	Bach	Yes	No	No	Yes
T42	18	Male	Caucasian	H.S.	No	No	No	Yes
T43	17	Female	Caucasian	H.S.	No	No	No	Yes
T46	18	Female	Am. Ind.	H.S.	Yes	No	No	Yes

Regular Students

S3	17	Female	Caucasian	Bach	No	No	No	No
S15	18	Male	Caucasian	< H.S.	Yes	No	Pre-1 st	No
T1	17	Female	Caucasian	H.S.	Yes	No	No	No
T3	17	Female	Caucasian	Master	No	No	No	Yes
T4	18	Female	Caucasian	Bach	No	No	1 st	No
T5	18	Male	Caucasian	1-2 yrs	No	No	No	Yes
T6	17	Female	Caucasian	H.S.	No	No	No	No
T7	18	Male	Caucasian	Bach	No	No	1 st	Yes
T8	18	Female	Caucasian	1-2 yrs	No	No	No	No
T10	17	Male	Caucasian	1-2 yrs	No	No	No	Yes
T11	18	Male	Caucasian	1-2 yrs	Yes	No	No	No
T12	18	Female	Caucasian	H.S.	No	No	No	No
T16	17	Female	Am. Ind.	H.S.	Yes	No	No	No
T17	17	Female	Caucasian	H.S.	No	No	No	No
T18	17	Male	Caucasian	1-2 yrs	Yes	Speech	No	No
T19	18	Male	Caucasian	< H.S.	Yes	Speech	No	Yes
T20	17	Male	Caucasian	Ph.D.	No	No	No	Yes
T45	17	Male	Caucasian	1-2 yrs	No	No	No	Yes
T47	18	Male	Caucasian	H.S.	Yes	No	1 st	No
T48	18	Female	Caucasian	1-2 yrs	No	No	No	Yes
T49	17	Male	Caucasian	1-2 yrs	No	Speech	No	No
T50	17	Male	Caucasian	Bach	No	No	No	No
T51	19	Male	Caucasian	Master	No	No	1 st	Yes
T52	18	Male	Caucasian	1-2 yrs	No	No	No	Yes
T53	18	Female	Caucasian	Bach	No	No	No	Yes
T54	17	Female	Am. Ind.	1-2 yrs	No	No	No	Yes
T55	18	Male	Caucasian	Bach	No	No	Kinder.	Yes
T56	18	Male	Caucasian	H.S.	Yes	No	No	No
T57	19	Male	Hispanic	H.S.	Unsure	No	1 st	Yes

T58	18	Male	Am. Ind.	3 yrs	No	No	Pre-K	No
T59	18	Male	Hispanic	Master	Yes	No	No	No
T60	18	Male	Caucasian	H.S.	Yes	No	No	No
T61	17	Female	Caucasian	1-2 yrs	No	No	No	Yes
T62	18	Male	Caucasian	Bach	No	No	Pre-K	No

APPENDIX C

PARENT AND STUDENT LETTERS AND CONSENT FORMS

PARENT AND STUDENT LETTERS AND CONSENT FORMS

October 9, 2001

Parents and Students

High School

Dear Parents and Students,

I am completing a Master's Thesis in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders at Oklahoma State University. My thesis topic is an analysis of the writing of 12th grade English students in advanced placement and regular classes. I am seeking students that would like to participate in the study. Each participant will be asked to write a narrative and persuasive composition using topics that I will provide. The students will complete the tasks during a 75-minute period during their English classes. At the end of the sessions the students' obligation to the study will be complete. To ensure that the students' names are kept confidential each student will be assigned an alphanumeric identifier and their names will not be used on any documents.

The writings will be analyzed according to vocabulary, grammar, length, and various other measures for writing. The resulting scores will be compared between the two groups (advanced placement and regular). This information will be helpful for speech-language pathologists and teachers. It will provide data on normally developing adolescents in the area of writing. The knowledge base for writing is at this time minimal. With the addition of the information provided from this study, speech-language pathologists and teachers will have a basis for the

expected writing performance for normal adolescents. This information can be helpful in therapy and in the planning of future writing curricula in schools.

I would like to request permission for your child to participate in the study. Please see the attached consent for more specific information. If you have any questions or concerns please contact my primary advisor, Connie Stout, Ph.D. or myself at 110 Hanner Hall, Oklahoma State University, (405) 744-6021. I appreciate your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Courtney Peters Branch, B.S.

Graduate Student

Consent Form

This research is being conducted through Oklahoma State University. The purpose of this study is to compare sixty 12th grade English students in advanced placement classes and regular classes. Participation in this study is voluntary and there is no penalty if you choose not to participate.

The study will be concerned with writing skills. The students will be asked to complete a survey, which identifies informational data such as age, gender, ethnicity, social-economic status, and family and education history. Each student will also write a narrative and a persuasive composition. Topics will be provided to the students on the testing day. Each student will receive the same topics and be given the same amount of time to complete each composition. At the beginning of the session the researcher will read the instructions to ensure that each student understands the tasks. The students will be provided with a copy of the instructions to refer to as needed. Both tasks will be completed on the same day in an 75-minute session.

To ensure that students' identities are kept confidential, each student will be assigned an alphanumeric reference number for use during the analysis. The students' names will not appear on any of the documents.

The results from this study will further the knowledge base of adolescent writing skills and provide a comparison between students who have different curricula. This knowledge will be both beneficial to secondary English teachers as well as speech-language pathologists.

I have read and understand the above information. I understand that my child's participation in the study is voluntary, there is no penalty for refusing to participate, and my child may withdraw from the study at any time. If I choose to do so I will notify the principal advisor, Dr. Connie Stout, or student examiner, Courtney Peters Branch, at (405) 744-6021. I may also contact the IRB Executive Secretary, Sharon Bacher, at 305 Whitehurst, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, 74078; telephone (405) 744-5700.

Signature of Parent/Guardian

Date

Signature of Student

Date

Signature of primary investigator
Or student examiner

Date

Consent Form

(Eighteen Years or Older)

This research is being conducted through Oklahoma State University. The purpose of this study is to compare sixty 12th grade English students in advanced placement classes and regular classes. Participation in this study is voluntary and there is no penalty if you choose not to participate.

The study will be concerned with writing skills. The students will be asked to complete a survey, which identifies informational data such as age, gender, ethnicity, social-economic status, and family and education history. Each student will also write a narrative and a persuasive composition. Topics will be provided to the students on the testing day. Each student will receive the same topics and be given the same amount of time to complete each composition. At the beginning of the session the researcher will read the instructions to ensure that each student understands the tasks. The students will be provided with a copy of the instructions to refer to as needed. Both tasks will be completed on the same day in an 75-minute session.

To ensure that students' identities are kept confidential, each student will be assigned an alphanumeric reference number for use during the analysis. The students' names will not appear on any of the documents.

The results from this study will further the knowledge base of adolescent writing skills and provide a comparison between students who have different curricula. This knowledge will be both beneficial to secondary English teachers as well as speech-language pathologists.

I have read and understood the above information. I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary, there is no penalty for refusing to participate, and I may withdraw from the study at any time. If I choose to do so I will notify the principal investigator, Dr. Connie Stout, or student examiner, Courtney Peters Branch, at (405) 744-6021. I may also contact the IRB Executive Secretary, Sharon Bacher, at 305 Whitehurst, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078; telephone (405) 744-5700.

Signature of Student

Date of Birth

Today's Date

Signature of primary investigator or
student examiner

Date

TASK INSTRUCTIONS

The examiner will provide the following instructions to the subjects:

At the beginning of the session you each will complete the survey attached to the top of your task. Please answer the questions to the best of your knowledge. At the top of the survey you will see a subject number. Please transfer this number to the top of each page of your writing task. This number will be used as an identifier for each subject. Please do not write your name on any of the pages.

NARRATIVE AND PERSUASIVE:

Each student will receive one of two tasks to begin with. You each will complete both tasks, but will receive only one task at a time. Some of you will receive a prompt titled “Special Object” while others will receive a prompt titled “One Vote”. For both tasks write at least one page on the paper provided to you. Please write in pen and write on every line. If you make a mistake, mark through it and continue writing. You have 25 minutes to complete the first task. At the completion of the first task you will turn it into the researcher and take a 15-minute break. Once the tasks have begun you may not ask the examiner any questions, so be sure that you fully understand the directions before the session begins. You will receive a copy of the instructions to refer to as needed.

For those of you who receive the “Special Object” prompt first, you will be asked to write a story over the poem excerpt. Read the excerpt closely and write a story according to the directions provided with the prompt. Be sure to include as much detail and you can.

For those of you who receive the “One Vote” prompt first, you will be asked to write a composition in which you persuade the reader to understand your opinion over the voting issue. Follow the instructions provided with the prompt and be sure and provide examples and reasons to support your opinion. Remember that you cannot ask question once we begin so please ask any questions at this time.

If you feel that you understand the directions, the testing will now begin.

APPENDIX E
PERSUASIVE PROMPT

PERSUASIVE PROMPT (NCES, 1999, p. 166):

“One Vote”

Your school is sponsoring a voter registration drive for 18-year-old high school students. You and three of your friends are talking about the project. Your friends say the following.

Friend 1: “I’m working on the young voters’ registration drive. Are you going to come to

it and register? You’re all 18, so you can do it. We’re trying to help increase the number of young people who vote and it shouldn’t be too hard --- I read that the percentage of 18- to 20-year-olds who vote increased in recent years. We want that percentage to keep going up.”

Friend 2: “I’ll be there. People should vote as soon as they turn 18. It’s one of the

responsibilities of living in a democracy.”

Friend 3: “ I don’t know if people should even bother to register. One vote in an election isn’t going to change anything.”

Do you agree with friend 2 or 3? Write a response to your friends in which you explain whether you will or will not register to vote. Be sure to explain why and support your position with examples from your reading or experience. Try to convince the friend with whom you disagree that your position is the right one.

APPENDIX F
NARRATIVE PROMPT

NARRATIVE PROMPT (NCES, 1999, p. 47):

Read the following excerpt from a poem by Walt Whitman.

There was a child who went forth every day,
And the first object he look'd upon, that
 object he became,
And that object became part of him for
 the day or a certain part of the day,
Or for many years or stretching cycles of years.

Whitman's poem suggests that certain objects become important to us and remain important to us even if we no longer have them.

Write a story in which you tell about an object that remains important to the main character over a period of years. The main character could be you or someone you know.

In your story, describe the main character's first encounter with the object, why the object is so important to the character, and how, over the years, it remains a part of the character's life.

APPENDIX G
TTR GUIDELINES

TTR GUIDELINES (Shadden, 1998, p. 48-50):

1. Prepare an analysis sheet as shown:

Noun	Verb	Adj	Adv	Prep	Pro	Conj.	Neg/Affirm	Articles	"wh" Words	Misc
Total number of unique words used										
Total number of words										
Type/Token Ratio =										
Most Frequent word type =										
Most frequent work tokens =										

2. Go through transcript word by word and assign each word to a part of speech. When a word occurs more than once, an extra tally mark should be placed next to the word on the analysis sheet. Rules for counting words are as follows:
- a. Count subject/predicate contractions as two words (e.g., we're, that's).
 - b. Count verbs/negative contractions as one word (e.g., don't).
 - c. Each part of a complex verb form with auxiliary elements counts as a separate word (e.g., has been jumping).
 - d. Count hyphenated and compound nouns as one word.
 - e. Count common verbal expressions such as *all right* or *oh gosh* as one word if they are used repeatedly as a unit.
 - f. Count articles (*a*, *an*, *the*) as single words.

- g. Do not count bound morphemes and noun or verb inflections separately.
3. Tally the separate words in each column. This gives the number of different types of each part of speech. Adding all of these tallies gives the total number of word types in the sample.
4. Tally the total number of words in each column. This gives the number of different tokens of each part of speech. Adding all of these tallies gives the total number of tokens in the sample (which should equal any other count of total words, with the exception of rules used to address contractions).
5. Divide total number of different words by total number of words yielding the TTR.

T-UNIT ANALYSIS GUIDELINES (Shadden, 1998, p. 24):

1. Read the transcript carefully several times so that you are certain you understand the meaning and intent of what is being said.
2. Look particularly for specific conjunctions that will act as signals to a specific type of clause being used. Simple sentences have one main clause only. Complex sentences have one main clause and one or more dependent clauses, which are introduced by various stated or implied subordinate conjunctions, such as *that, whatever, whoever, wherever, who, what, why, when, where, whether, which, after, although, as, as if, as long as, because, before, if, in order that, provided, since, so, so that, though, until, unless, while*. Compound sentences consist of two or more main clauses and thus are two or more T-units. They are conjoined by coordinating or correlative conjunctions or by conjunctive adverbs, such as *and, but, or, nor, yet, besides, so, either...or, neither...nor, both....and, not only....but also, also, however, then, therefore, accordingly, nevertheless, consequently*.
3. Identify main clauses first; then examine surrounding language to determine which other clausal units are attached to (dependent to) the main clause. Disregard false starts or revisions, since the final form of the utterance is all that matters. If necessary, edit out extraneous words and revisions before defining T-units. Even if you are dealing with a written discourse sample punctuated by the client, ignore the punctuation and follow the rules defined here.

4. Pencil in rough breaks between T-units, using a slash mark.

Read over the transcript again to make certain your segmentation is correct.

5. Underline dependent clauses within T-units (this can be done later if desired).
6. Number T-units.
7. If using a word processor, make a break at the end of each T-unit so that the next T-unit begins on a separate line.

APPENDIX I
COHESION ANALYSIS GUIDELINES

COHESION ANALYSIS GUIDELINES (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p.):

1. Identify the words used as cohesive ties throughout the writing sample.
2. Classify the cohesive ties using the following types:
 - a. Reference – The information to be retrieved is the identity of the thing or class of things being referred to in the preceding (anaphora) or following text (cataphora).
 1. Personal – the use of third person pronouns to refer to an object, person, or thing in another sentence.
 2. Demonstrative – the use of *the*, *this*, *these*, *that*, or *those* to refer to a specified object, person, or thing.
3. Determine if the subjects' use of cohesion is adequate.
4. Score the cohesive ties using the following formulas:
 - a. number of cohesive ties divided by the number of “complete” ties
 - b. percentage of erroneous or incomplete ties

APPENDIX J
HOLISTIC SCORING GUIDELINES

HOLISTIC SCORING GUIDELINES (NCES, 1999, p. 139 & 145):

NARRATIVE WRITING (Scale 1-6 with 6 the highest level)

6 Excellent Response

- Tells a clear story that is consistently well developed and detailed; details enhance story being told.
- Is well organized; integrates narrative events into a smooth telling; effective transitions move the story forward.
- Consistently exhibits variety in sentence structure and precision in word choice.
- Errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation are few and do not interfere with understanding.

5 Skillful Response

- Tells a clear story that is well developed and elaborated with details in much of the response.
- Is well organized with story elements that are connected across most of the response; may have occasional lapses in transitions.
- Exhibits some variety in sentence structure and uses good word choice occasionally, words may be use inaccurately.
- Errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation do not interfere with understanding.

4 Sufficient Response

- Tells a clear story that is developed with some pertinent details.

- Is generally organized, but transitions among parts of the story may be lacking.
- Sentence structure; may be simple and unvaried; word choice is mostly accurate.
- Errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation do not interfere with understanding.

3 Uneven Response (may be characterized by one or more of the following)

- Tells a story that may be clear and developed in parts; other parts are unfocused, repetitive, or minimally developed OR response is no more than a well-written beginning.
- Is organized in parts of the response; other parts are disjointed and/or lack transitions.
- Exhibits uneven control over sentence boundaries and sentence structure; may exhibit some inaccurate word choices.
- Errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation sometime interfere with understanding.

2 Insufficient Response (may be characterized by one or more of the following)

- Attempts to tell a story, but is very undeveloped, list-like, or fragmentary.
- Is disorganized or unfocused in much of the response OR the response is too brief to detect organization.
- Minimal control over sentence boundaries and sentence structure; word choice may often be inaccurate.

- Errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation interfere with understanding in much of the response.

1 Unsatisfactory Response (may be characterized by one or more of the following)

- Responds to prompt but provides little or no coherent content OR merely paraphrases the prompt.
- Has little or no apparent organization.
- Minimal or no control over sentence boundaries and sentence structure; word choice may be inaccurate in much or all of the response.
- Errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation severely impede understanding across the response.

PERSUASIVE WRITING (Scale 1-6 with 6 the highest level)

6 Excellent Response

- Takes a clear position and supports it consistently with well chosen reasons and/or examples; may use persuasive strategy to convey an argument.
- Is focused and well organized, with effective use of transitions.
- Consistently exhibits variety in sentence structure and precision in word choice.
- Errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation are few and do not interfere with understanding.

5 Skillful Response

- Takes a clear position and supports it with pertinent reasons and/or examples through much of the response.
- Is well organized but may have occasional lapses in transitions.
- Exhibits some variety in sentence structure and uses good word choice occasionally, words may be used inaccurately.
- Errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation do not interfere with understanding.

4 Sufficient Response

- Takes a clear position and supports it with some pertinent reasons and/or examples; there is some development.
- Is generally organized, but has few or no transitions among parts.
- Sentence structure may be simple and unvaried; word choice is mostly accurate.
- Errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation do not interfere with understanding.

3 Uneven Response (may be characterized by one or more of the following)

- Takes a position and provides uneven support; may lack development in parts or be repetitive OR response is no more than a well-written beginning.
- Is organized in parts of the response; other parts are disjointed and/or lack transitions.

APPENDIX K
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL FORMS

**Oklahoma State University
Institutional Review Board**

Date : Thursday, October 25, 2001

IRB Application No AS0221

Proposal Title: DIFFERENCES IN NARRATIVE AND PERSUASIVE WRITTEN COMPOSITIONS OF
TWELFTH GRADE ADVANCED PLACEMENT AND REGULAR STUDENTS

Principal
Investigator(s) :

Courtney Peters
212 Hanner
Stillwater, OK 74078

Connie Stout
212 Hanner
Stillwater, OK 74078

Reviewed and
Processed as: Expedited (Spec Pop)

Approval Status Recommended by Reviewer(s) : Pending Revision

You will need to make the following revisions to your research project before approval is granted. Please Submit a revised IRB application incorporating these changes. If you have questions, or wish to discuss the reviewers' comments, please schedule a meeting or call Dr. Carol Olson, Director of University Research Compliance (405-744-6501), or Sharon Bacher, IRB Executive Secretary (405-744-5700) in 203 Whitehurst.

The reviewers' comments are listed on the following page. To receive approval, they must be addressed and/or incorporated into the research protocol.

Approvals are valid for one calendar year, after which time a request for continuation must be submitted. Any modifications to the research project approved by the IRB must be submitted for approval with the advisor's signature. The IRB office MUST be notified in writing when a project is complete. Approved projects are subject to monitoring by the IRB. Expedited and exempt projects may be reviewed by the full Institutional Review Board.

**Oklahoma State University
Institutional Review Board**

Date : Friday, November 02, 2001

IRB Application No AS0221

Proposal Title: DIFFERENCES IN NARRATIVE AND PERSUASIVE WRITTEN COMPOSITIONS OF
TWELFTH GRADE ADVANCED PLACEMENT AND REGULAR STUDENTS

Principal
Investigator(s) :

Courtney Peters
212 Hanner
Stillwater, OK 74078

Connie Stout
212 Hanner
Stillwater, OK 74078

Reviewed and
Processed as: Expedited (Spec Pop)

Approval Status Recommended by Reviewer(s) : Pending Revision

You will need to make the following revisions to your research project before approval is granted. Please Submit a revised IRB application incorporating these changes. If you have questions, or wish to discuss the reviewers' comments, please schedule a meeting or call Dr. Carol Olson, Director of University Research Compliance (405-744-6501), or Sharon Bacher, IRB Executive Secretary (405-744-5700) in 203 Whitehurst.

The reviewers' comments are listed on the following page. To receive approval, they must be addressed and/or incorporated into the research protocol.

Approvals are valid for one calendar year, after which time a request for continuation must be submitted. Any modifications to the research project approved by the IRB must be submitted for approval with the advisor's signature. The IRB office MUST be notified in writing when a project is complete. Approved projects are subject to monitoring by the IRB. Expedited and exempt projects may be reviewed by the full Institutional Review Board.

Oklahoma State University
Institutional Review Board

Protocol Expires: 11/1/02

Date: Tuesday, November 13, 2001

IRB Application No AS0221

Proposal Title: DIFFERENCES IN NARRATIVE AND PERSUASIVE WRITTEN COMPOSITIONS OF
TWELFTH GRADE ADVANCED PLACEMENT AND REGULAR STUDENTS

Principal
Investigator(s):

Courtney Peters
212 Hanner
Stillwater, OK 74078

Connie Stout
212 Hanner
Stillwater, OK 74078

Reviewed and
Processed as: Expedited (Spec Pop)

Approval Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved

Dear PI :

Your IRB application referenced above has been approved for one calendar year. Please make note of the expiration date indicated above. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved projects are subject to monitoring by the IRB. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Sharon Bacher, the Executive Secretary to the IRB, in 203 Whitehurst (phone: 405-744-5700, sbacher@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,



Carol Olson, Chair
Institutional Review Board

VITA

2

Courtney Paige Branch

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: DIFFERENCES IN NARRATIVE AND PERSUASIVE WRITTEN
COMPOSITIONS OF TWELTH GRADE ADVANCED PLACEMENT
AND REGULAR STUDENTS

Major Field: Communication Sciences and Disorders

Biographical:

Education: Received Bachelor of Science degree in Communication Sciences and Disorders from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in May 2000. Complete the requirements for the Master of Science Degree from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in May 2002.

Professional Experience: Employed by Oklahoma State University, Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, as a graduate assistant from August 2000 to the present. Completed clinical practicum externships at: 1) LIFE Center, Stillwater, Oklahoma from June 2001 to August 2001, 2) the Guthrie Scottish Rite Clinic for Childhood Language Disorders, Guthrie, Oklahoma, from October 2001 to December 2001, and 3) Stillwater Medical Center Inpatient Rehabilitation, Skilled Nursing Unit, and Acute Care from March 2002 to May 2002.

Professional Affiliations: National Student Speech-Language-Hearing Association (NSSLHA) and Oklahoma Speech-Language-Hearing Association (OSHA).