Data Sheets for Discourse Analysis #1

In this exercise, you are asked to analyze 7-10 average-length paragraphs from the journal article assigned to your team. Note that you should choose at least one paragraph from the introduction, one from the conclusion, and the remainder from the body of the article. The paragraphs you choose should have few, if any, equations or lists. Total length of the sample should be 750-1250 words.

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 Drs. John Bird, John Jones, Karim Karim, and Rodney Vaughan 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
Red (Karim, 2003)	1327	56	24.7	7-54
Green (Bird, 2005)	1093	44	24.8	11-51
Blue (Jones, 2005)	1155	45	25.6	7-68
Orange (Vaughan, 2006)	918	53	17.3	6-37

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

Team	Simple	Compound	Complex	Compound/Complex
Red	35 (63%)	4 (07%)	12 (21%)	5 (09%)
Green	20 (45%)	4 (09%)	16 (36%)	4 (09%)
Blue	13 (29%)	13 (29%)	15 (33%)	4 (09%)
Orange	15 (28%)	10 (19%)	13 (25%)	5 (09%)

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

Team	Noun	Pronoun	Adverbial	Prep. Phrase	Dep. Clause	Coord. Conjunct.	Verbal Phrase	Fillers
Red	26 (46%)	0 (00%)	13 (23%)	11 (20%)	3 (05%)	0 (00%)	3 (05%)	0 (00%)
Green	18 (41%)	0 (00%)	12 (27%)	9 (21%)	1 (02%)	0 (00%)	1 (02%)	3 (07%)
Blue	27 (60%)	2 (04%)	4 (09%)	5 (11%)	3 (07%)	0 (00%)	2 (04%)	2 (04%)
Orange	29 (55%)	3 (06%)	10 (19%)	3 (06%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	3 (06%)	5 (09%)

*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	Total Sents	Total Paragraphs	Mean Sents/Para	Range
Red	56	8	7.0	4-12
Green	44	7	6.3	4-9
Blue	45	8	5.6	3-9
Orange	53	7	7.6	5-10

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
Red	3.60	2-5
Green	3.14	2-5
Blue	4.13	3-6
Orange	3.14	3-5

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

Team Red: 1, 12-sentence paragraph
                          1, 7-word sentence
                          1, 54-word sentence

Team Green: 1, 9-sentence paragraph
                          1, 11-word sentence
                          1, 51-word sentence

Team Blue: 4, 1-sentence paragraphs
                          1, 7-word sentence
                          1, 68-word sentence

Team Orange: 2, 2-sentence paragraphs
                          1, 16-sentence paragraph
                          1, 6-word sentence

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 Drs. John Bird, John Jones, Karim Karim, and Rodney Vaughan 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 Red (Karim, 2003):   Entirely closed punctuation

Team Green (Bird, 2005):   Entirely closed punctuation

Team Blue (Jones, 2005):   Entirely closed punctuation

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): Entirely closed punctuation

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

Team Red (Karim, 2003):   0 semi-colons and 0 dashes

Team Green (Bird, 2005):   2 semi-colons and 0 dashes

Team Blue (Jones, 2005):   4 semi-colons and 2 dashes

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): 0 semi-colons and 1 dash

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

Team Red (Karim, 2003):   2 instances of "We" and 0 instances of "I"

Team Green (Bird, 2005):   1 instance of "We" and 0 instances of "I"

Team Blue (Jones, 2005):   1 instance of "We" and 0 instances of "I"

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): 4 instances of "We" and 0 instances of "I"

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 Red (Karim, 2003):   0 idioms and 0 colloquialisms – formal language use

Team Green (Bird, 2005):   0 idioms and 6 colloquialisms ("say," "little") – formal language use

Team Blue (Jones, 2005):   0 idioms and 0 colloquialisms – formal language use

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): 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
Red (Karim, 2003)	7.0	23.9	5.0	30%	29.7	12.0
Green (Bird, 2005)	6.3	24.4	5.3	51%	21.2	12.0
Blue (Jones, 2005)	5.6	25.7	5.0	33%	34.8	14.2
Orange (Vaughan, 2006)	6.5	19.7	5.1	16%	27.3	12.0

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

Team Red (Karim, 2003):   Some minor hyperbole ("extremely challenging"); significant use of adverbials ("fortunately," etc.)

Team Green (Bird, 2005):   Heavy use of passive voice

Team Blue (Jones, 2005):   Some punctuation inconsistencies (variables not enclosed in commas); one inconsistency in graph form

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): References in text not IEEE standard; some units might be simplified

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 Drs. John Bird, John Jones, Karim Karim, and Rodney Vaughan 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 Red (Karim, 2003):   10 empty openers (4 could be revised)

Team Green (Bird, 2005):   8 empty openers (Most could be revised)

Team Blue (Jones, 2005):   8 empty openers (Few could be revised)

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): 8 empty openers (Most 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 Red (Karim, 2003):   3 embedded phrases (3 could be revised)

Team Green (Bird, 2005):   Few embedded phrases (1 could be revised)

Team Blue (Jones, 2005):   4 embedded phrases (none could be revised)

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): 12 embedded phrases (none could be revised)

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

Team Red (Karim, 2003):   2 weak endings (1 could be revised)

Team Green (Bird, 2005):   1 weak ending (1 could be revised)

Team Blue (Jones, 2005):   22 weak endings (some could be revised)

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): 1 weak ending (no need to revise)

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

Team Red (Karim, 2003):   No problematic repetitions

Team Green (Bird, 2005):   No problematic repetitions

Team Blue (Jones, 2005):   No problematic repetitions

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): No problematic repetitions

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

Team Red (Karim, 2003):   5 vague "this" subjects (all could be revised)

Team Green (Bird, 2005):   Few vague "this" subjects (not problematic)

Team Blue (Jones, 2005):   1 vague "this" subject (could be revised)

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): 6 vague "this" subjects (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 Red (Karim, 2003):   "therefore," "however," "thus," "although," "because," "whereas," "since," "as," – a few could be eliminated

Team Green (Bird, 2005):   "however," "since," – no need to add more

Team Blue (Jones, 2005):   "however," "thus," "nevertheless," "though," "since," "as," "because," "while" – no need to add more

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): "however," "consequently," "therefore," "nevertheless," "because" "since," "as," "although," "whereas,"– some could be eliminated

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 Drs. John Bird, John Jones, Karim Karim, and Rodney Vaughan 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 Red (Karim, 2003):   Noun strings of 7 words are used – (2 could be revised)

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

Team Blue (Jones, 2005):   No lengthy noun strings

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): Noun strings of 3-7 words are used – (2 could be revised)

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

Team Red (Karim, 2003):   3 strings of 6/7 prep phrases (could be revised)

Team Green (Bird, 2005):   No lengthy prep phrase strings

Team Blue (Jones, 2005):   No lengthy prep phrase strings

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): 3 strings of 3 "of" prep phases (could be revised)

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 Red (Karim, 2003):   "good," "partly," "excellent," (a couple could be revised)

Team Green (Bird, 2005):   "little" (no need to revise)

Team Blue (Jones, 2005):   No general language

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): "widely," generally" (no need to revise

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

Team Red (Karim, 2003): Few nominalizations – (no change needed)

Team Green (Bird, 2005): "in consideration of" – (no change needed)

Team Blue (Jones, 2005): Few nominalizations (no change needed)

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): Few nominalizations (one 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 Red (Karim, 2003): "get," "made"– (some could be revised)

Team Green (Bird, 2005): Few talkie verbs – (none are unclear)

Team Blue (Jones, 2005): "have," "give," "show," "take" (some could be revised)

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): "find," "do," "look" – (some could be revised)

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 Red (Karim, 2003): "it is evident that," "it is noted that"

Team Green (Bird, 2005): "it can be said that for"

Team Blue (Jones, 2005): "it is noted that," "it is possible that," "it is acknowledged that"

Team Orange (Vaughan, 2006): "it is clear that," "it is evident that"