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Why analyze older students’ narratives?

- Narrative production is an extremely important component of overall language and communication abilities. Narrative skills are crucial for social and academic success.
- Narrative skills are evaluated from grades 1-12 (Common Core Standards Initiative, 2010).
- By the third and fourth grades, students are expected to "write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, well-chosen details and well-structured event sequences" (Common Core Standards Initiative, 2010).
- It is within the SLP's scope of practice to assess and intervene with respect to all levels of language ability, including discourse (which includes narration)
- It is within the SLPS scope of practice to address written, as well as oral language skills (ASHA, n.d.).
- Language sample analysis (LSA) is considered a best practice for school-based SLPS in the assessment of students

Barriers to Using Narrative Analysis

Although LSA is a best practice according to ASHA, many school-based SLPS are not engaging in this practice with upper elementary students. Recent surveys revealed the following barriers to LSA usage:

- Amount of time needed to obtain, transcribe, and analyze language samples
- Limited access to resources
- Limited training and expertise
- Inconsistency in analysis procedures

Purposes of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the two proposed narrative analysis rubrics to determine:

- which is more time consuming
- which is more easily understood
- what the unique benefits of each individual scoring rubric are

Methods

Participants were four Communicative Sciences and Disorders students. Materials included 58 written narratives produced by students in grades 4 & 5, the INC and NSS scoring rubrics, and a stopwatch. Each narrative was scored twice (once INC & once using NSS) by two raters who were provided training in use of each rubric. Each rater was blinded to other raters' results until all analyses were completed. Raters noted the time in seconds needed to complete each analysis and kept notes about rubric instructions they found to be potentially confusing after scoring each narrative sample. Lastly, information obtained using each scoring rubric was analyzed for unique differences. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to determine interrater agreement for each scoring category.

Narrative Scoring Scheme Rubric (NSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Element</th>
<th>Proficient: 5 pts</th>
<th>Emerging: 3 pts</th>
<th>Minimal/ Immature: 1 pt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Strong use of sensory language and details that the story is comprehensible.</td>
<td>Strong use of sensory language and details that the story is comprehensible.</td>
<td>Strong use of sensory language and details that the story is comprehensible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character/Development</td>
<td>Use of figurative language and word choice that support the story</td>
<td>Use of figurative language and word choice that support the story</td>
<td>Use of figurative language and word choice that support the story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental/Emotional State</td>
<td>Strong use of sensory language and details that the story is comprehensible.</td>
<td>Strong use of sensory language and details that the story is comprehensible.</td>
<td>Strong use of sensory language and details that the story is comprehensible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>Strong use of sensory language and details that the story is comprehensible.</td>
<td>Strong use of sensory language and details that the story is comprehensible.</td>
<td>Strong use of sensory language and details that the story is comprehensible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Strong use of sensory language and details that the story is comprehensible.</td>
<td>Strong use of sensory language and details that the story is comprehensible.</td>
<td>Strong use of sensory language and details that the story is comprehensible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to research questions:

- **Time**: although the difference of 74 seconds between rubric use is statistically significant, it is not clinically significant
- **Ease of use**: although all raters agreed that the INC was slightly more time-consuming to use, all also agreed that it was easier to use, largely due to the numerous examples included in the rubric
- **Unique contributions of each rubric**: INC > more categories, greater detail, emphasis on episodic complexity; NSS > easier to analyze conclusion, flexible rater judgment (5 pt. scale vs 3 pt scale)

In response to SLP's perceived barriers:

- **Time**: not a significant barrier
- **Clinical expertise**: interrater disagreements show this may be a barrier
- **Resources**: not a barrier - both rubrics are available free of charge
- **Analysis procedures**: perhaps a barrier due to interrater disagreements
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