

Data Sheets for Discourse Analysis #1

In this exercise, you are asked to analyze 7-8 average-length paragraphs from the journal article assigned to your team. Note that you should choose at least two paragraphs from the introduction, two from the conclusion, and the remainder from the body of the article. The paragraphs you choose should have few, if any, equations or lists.

The goal is to generate some data about these representative paragraphs in order to increase your awareness about how they are structured and the language that is used. The analysis criteria are outlined below and in the pages that follow.

I would like to thank Dr. Jim Cavers and Dr. Bill Gruver for allowing us to use their well-written articles for this purpose.

1. Length of Sentences: How long are the sentences used (mean and range of words per sentence)?

Team (Sample)	Total Words	Total Sentences	Mean Words/Sent	Range
Orange (Cavers, 1991)	595	36	16.5	5-32
Green (Cavers, 1999)	855	36	23.8	10-47
Cavers Combined	1450	72	20.1	5-47
Blue (Gruver, 2000)	1156	65	17.7	5-37
Red (Gruver, 2005)	725	37	19.6	9-40
Gruver Combined	1881	102	18.4	5-40

2. Sentence Structures: What types of sentences are used (simple, compound, complex, compound/complex, fragments, run-ons)?*

Team (Sample)	Simple	Compound	Complex	Compound/Complex
Orange (Cavers, 1991)	18 (50%)	3 (08%)	14 (39%)	1 (03%)
Green (Cavers, 1999)	8 (22%)	7 (19%)	12 (33%)	9 (25%)
Cavers Combined	26 (36%)	11 (15%)	26 (36%)	10 (14%)
Blue (Gruver, 2000)	43 (66%)	3 (05%)	12 (19%)	7 (11%)
Red (Gruver, 2005)	15 (41%)	8 (22%)	11 (30%)	3 (08%)
Gruver Combined	58 (57%)	11 (11%)	23 (23%)	10 (10%)

3. Sentence Openers: What types of sentence openers are used (noun/pronoun, adverbs, prepositional phrases, dependent clauses, verbals, coordinate conjunctions, fillers)?*

Team (Sample)	Noun	Pronoun	Adverbial	Prep. Phrase	Dep. Clause	Coord. Conjunction	Verbal Phrase	Fillers
Orange (Cavers, 1991)	15 (42%)	3 (08%)	7 (19%)	6 (17%)	2 (06%)	2 (06%)	1 (03%)	0
Green (Cavers, 1999)	14 (39%)	4 (11%)	3 (08%)	4 (11%)	6 (17%)	3 (08%)	1 (03%)	1 (03%)
Cavers Combined	29 (40%)	7 (10%)	10 (14%)	10 (14%)	8 (11%)	5 (07%)	2 (03%)	1 (01%)
Blue (Gruver, 2000)	41 (63%)	11 (17%)	0	3 (05%)	3 (05%)	0	7 (11%)	0
Red (Gruver, 2005)	20 (54%)	3 (08%)	1 (03%)	7 (19%)	5 (14%)	0	1 (03%)	0
Gruver Combined	61 (60%)	14 (14%)	1 (01%)	10 (10%)	8 (08%)	0	8 (08%)	0

*Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

4. Paragraph Length: What is the length of the paragraphs (mean and range of sentences per paragraph)?

Team (Sample)	Total Sents	Total Paragraphs	Mean Sents/Para	Range
Orange (Cavers, 1991)	36	7	5.1	4-6
Green (Cavers, 1999)	36	8	4.5	1-9
Cavers Combined	72	15	4.8	1-9
Blue (Gruver, 2000)	65	8	8.1	4-22
Red (Gruver, 2005)	37	7	5.3	3-10
Gruver Combined	102	15	6.8	3-22

5. Paragraph Structure: How many levels of generality do the paragraphs have (mean and range)? **NB.** You may need to diagram the paragraph structures below.

Team (Sample)	Mean Levels/Para	Range
Orange (Cavers, 1991)	3.3	3-4
Green (Cavers, 1999)	2.8	1-4
Cavers Combined	3.0	1-4
Blue (Gruver, 2000)	3.1	2-5
Red (Gruver, 2005)	2.3	2-3
Gruver Combined	2.7	2-5

6. Other Issues: Are there many very long or short paragraphs and sentences?

Team Orange (Cavers, 1991): 2, six-sentence paragraphs
1, five-word sentence

Team Green (Cavers, 1999): 1, one-sentence paragraph
2, two-sentence paragraphs
2, nine-sentence paragraphs
1, forty-seven-word sentence

Team Blue (Gruver, 2000): 1, twenty-two sentence paragraph
1, five-word sentence

Team Red (Gruver, 2005): 1, ten-sentence paragraph

Data Sheets for Discourse Analysis #2

In this exercise, you are asked to analyze the type of punctuation, the grammatical person, and the formality of the language used in your assigned article.

The goal is to generate some data about how language is used in professional journals in order to increase your awareness. The analysis criteria are outlined below and in the pages that follow.

I would like to thank Dr. Jim Cavers and Dr. Bill Gruver for allowing us to use their well-written articles for this purpose.

1. Open vs. Closed Punctuation: Does the sample always include commas in lists before the final element (“The ball was red, green and blue.” vs. “The ball was red, green, and blue.”)? Does the sample always include commas after introductory phrases (“Above all you should check your spelling.” vs. “Above all, you should check your spelling.”)?

Team Orange (Cavers, 1991): Almost entirely closed punctuation.

Team Green (Cavers, 1999): Almost entirely closed punctuation

Team Blue (Gruver, 2000): Some inconsistency – open punctuation

Team Red (Gruver, 2005): Almost entirely closed punctuation

2. Semicolons and Dashes: Does the article use any semicolons or dashes for punctuation? How frequently?

Team Orange (Cavers, 1991): 6 dashes and 5 semi-colons

Team Green (Cavers, 1999): 1 dash and 4 semi-colons

Team Blue (Gruver, 2000): 0 dashes and 10 semi-colons

Team Red (Gruver, 2005): 4 dashes and 0 semi-colons

3. Grammatical Person: Does the article use 1st person (“I” or “We”) anywhere? How frequently?

Team Orange (Cavers, 1991): 0 instances of “I” and 4 instances of “we”

Team Green (Cavers, 1999): 0 instances of “I” and many instances of “we”

Team Blue (Gruver, 2000): 3 instances of “I” and 61 instances of “we”

Team Red (Gruver, 2005): 0 instances of “I” and 4 instances of “we”

4. Language Formality: How formal is the language? Does the article use any idioms (e.g., “rule of thumb”) or colloquialisms (e.g., “a lot” and “besides”)?

Team Orange (Cavers, 1991): 0 idioms and 1 colloquialisms (“plus”) – formal language use

Team Green (Cavers, 1999): 0 idioms and 1 colloquialism (“in the hope”) – formal language use

Team Blue (Gruver, 2000): 0 idioms and 0 colloquialisms – formal language use

Team Red (Gruver, 2005): 0 idioms and 0 colloquialisms – formal language use

5. Readability: Please run the paragraphs you selected for Discourse Analysis #1 through the grammar checker in Microsoft word. Record the following statistics: Sentences per paragraph, Words per sentence, Characters per word, Percentage of passive sentences, Flesch reading ease score, Flesch-Kincaid grade level score.

Team (Sample)	Sents/ Para	Words/ Sent	Chars/ word	% Passive Sents	Flesch Reading Ease	Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level
Orange (Cavers, 1991)	6.0	16.8	4.9	16%	40.5	11.7
Green (Cavers, 1999)	4.6	23.0	5.1	24%	27.2	12.0
Blue (Gruver, 2000)	8.3	17.5	5.1	5%	40.4	8.9
Red (Gruver, 2005)	5.3	13.5	5.3	33%	25.1	12.0

6. Other Issues: Did you notice anything else that is distinctive or unusual about the language used?

No issues of major consequence.

Data Sheets for Discourse Analysis #3

In this exercise, you are asked to analyze stylistic issues related to order and connection in your assigned article.

The goal is to generate some data about how language is used in professional journals in order to increase your awareness. The analysis criteria are outlined below and in the pages that follow.

I would like to thank Dr. Jim Cavers and Dr. Bill Gruver for allowing us to use their well-written articles for this purpose.

1. Empty Sentence Openers: Can you find any empty sentence openers (“It is” or “There is/are”) in the article? Do these openers need revision?

Team Orange (Cavers, 1991): 5 empty openers (all could be revised)

Team Green (Cavers, 1999): 5 empty openers (2 could be revised)

Team Blue (Gruver, 2000): 4 empty openers (all could be revised)

Team Red (Gruver, 2005): 2 empty openers (1 could be revised)

2. Embedded Phrases: Can you find any embedded phrases (especially ones separating the subjects and verbs) in the article? Do these need revision?

Team Orange (Cavers, 1991): 5 embedded phrases (3 could be revised)

Team Green (Cavers, 1999): 2 embedded phrases (1 could be revised)

Team Blue (Gruver, 2000): 2 embedded phrases (none could be revised)

Team Red (Gruver, 2005): 4 embedded phrases (3 could be revised)

3. Weak Endings: Can you find any weak sentence endings in the article? Do these need revision?

Team Orange (Cavers, 1991): 1 weak ending (could be revised)

Team Green (Cavers, 1999): 3 weak endings (all could be revised)

Team Blue (Gruver, 2000): 1 weak ending (could be revised)

Team Red (Gruver, 2005): 2 weak endings (all could be revised)

4. Unnecessary Repetition: Can you find any instances of unnecessary repetition in the article?

- Team Orange (Cavers, 1991):** No problematic repetitions
- Team Green (Cavers, 1999):** 1 problematic repetition (2 consecutive questions)
- Team Blue (Gruver, 2000):** 1 problematic repetition (“grasp planning algorithms”)
- Team Red (Gruver, 2005):** Two problematic repetitions (“view maintenance” and “update agents”)

5. Vague “This” Subjects: Can you find any instances of vague “this” subjects in the article? Are any of them especially unclear?

- Team Orange (Cavers, 1991):** 2 vague “this” subjects (1 could be revised)
- Team Green (Cavers, 1999):** No vague “this” subjects
- Team Blue (Gruver, 2000):** 1 vague “this” subjects (no need to revise)
- Team Red (Gruver, 2005):** 2 vague “this” subjects (1 could be revised)

6. Adverbial and Subordinating Conjunctions: Does the article make extensive or limited use of adverbial conjunctions (i.e., “however,” “therefore,” “consequently,” “thus,” “nevertheless,” etc.) or subordinating conjunctions (“although,” “since,” “as,” “because,” “whereas,” etc.)? Would adding more of these improve coherence or clarity?

- Team Orange (Cavers, 1991):** “moreover,” “however,” “as,” “although,” “though”
“nevertheless,” – no need to add more
- Team Green (Cavers, 1999):** “consequently,” “thus,” “however,” “since,” “because.”
“although” – no need to add more
- Team Blue (Gruver, 2000):** “however,” “therefore,” “consequently,” “thus,”
“nevertheless,” “although,” “since,” “as,” “because,”
“whereas” – no need to add more
- Team Red (Gruver, 2005):** “however,” “even though,” “since,” “as,” “although,” –
additional conjunctions might be helpful

Data Sheets for Discourse Analysis #4

In this exercise, you are asked to analyze stylistic issues related to clarity and conciseness in your assigned article.

The goal is to generate some data about how language is used in professional journals in order to increase your awareness. The analysis criteria are outlined below and in the pages that follow.

I would like to thank Dr. Jim Cavers and Dr. Bill Gruver for allowing us to use their well-written articles for this purpose.

1. Noun Strings: Can you find any lengthy noun strings in the article? Do these noun strings need revision?

Team Orange (Cavers, 1991): Noun strings of 3-4 words are used – (no need to revise)

Team Green (Cavers, 1999): Noun strings of 3-4 words are used – (no need to revise)

Team Blue (Gruver, 2000): Noun strings up to 5 words are used – (no need to revise)

Team Red (Gruver, 2005): Noun strings of 2-3 words are used – (no need to revise)

2. Prepositional Phrases: Can you find any lengthy strings of prepositional phrases (especially ones using “of”) in the article? Do these need revision?

Team Orange (Cavers, 1991): 1 string of 6 prep phrases (could be revised)

Team Green (Cavers, 1999): 1 string of 3 prep phrases (could be revised)

Team Blue (Gruver, 2000): No lengthy prep phrase strings

Team Red (Gruver, 2005): No lengthy prep phrase strings

3. General Language: Can you find any instances of general language in the article (“big/little,” “good/bad,” “partly,” “somewhat,” “thing,” “to some degree,” etc.)? Do these need revision?

Team Orange (Cavers, 1991): “somewhat,”(3) “very slight,” “much larger,” “slightly more,” “could well differ”

Team Green (Cavers, 1999): No general language

Team Blue (Gruver, 2000): No general language

Team Red (Gruver, 2005): No general language

4. Nominalizations: Can you find any nominalizations in the article that would benefit from being changed to a more verbal form?

Team Orange (Cavers, 1991): “give no improvement in performance” “the use of” – (no change needed)

Team Green (Cavers, 1999): “a derivation of the optimum,” “a representation of” – (no change needed)

Team Blue (Gruver, 2000): Some nominalizations (no change needed)

Team Red (Gruver, 2005): “by the use of” (no change needed)

5. Talkie Verbs: Can you find many talkie verbs (“make,” “find,” “do,” “come,” “look,” etc.) in the article? Are any of them unclear?

Team Orange (Cavers, 1991): Occasional talkie verb – (none are unclear)

Team Green (Cavers, 1999): Occasional talkie verb – (none are unclear)

Team Blue (Gruver, 2000): “have,” “give,” “see,” “do” (some could be revised)

Team Red (Gruver, 2005): Occasional talkie verb – (none are unclear)

6. Wordy Expressions: Can you find any wordy expressions (“due to the fact that,” “in a great number of cases,” “the reason why is that,” etc.) in the article? Many or few?

Team Orange (Cavers, 1991): “caused by the fact that,” “a variety of”

Team Green (Cavers, 1999): “it can be seen that”

Team Blue (Gruver, 2000): “to reduce the complexity,” the line normal to the surface,” “how much it costs to”

Team Red (Gruver, 2005): “due to the fact that”