

# Developing and Validating Expository Progress Monitoring Measures

Emily Koski

Department of Communication

Disorders

University of Wyoming

# Why do we need expository passages?

- Narrative passages:
  - General outcome measure (GOM) for language
  - Monitor a child's comprehension and use of expository.
    - intervention planning
- New common core state standards
  - Emphasis on expository comprehension and production.
- Expository vs. narrative for GOMs
  - More sensitive to language growth over time
  - More sensitive to reading comprehension

# Purpose

- Create 9 benchmark expository passages:
  - Parallel linguistic complexity and content
    - based on common core expectations
    - a review of the literature on developmental expectations of expository child language
    - Interesting and unusual
  - Reflect the higher academic expectations used to monitor language growth
    - Fall, winter, spring
    - Inform of progression

# Requirements for expository passages

- 54-63 words
- Proper name state twice
- Main idea
- 6 supporting details
- 3, Tier 2 vocabulary words
- 1 Tier 3 words
- 2 or 3 single pre-noun adjectives
- 1 double pre-noun adjectives
- 1 causal subordinate clause 'because'
- 1 coordinating conjunction 'and'
- 1 relative subordinate clause with 'that' attached to main clause subject
- 1 relative subordinate clause with 'that' attached to main clause object
- 1 connection between two pieces of information
- 1 connection question
- 2 factual questions

# Example passage

<sup>MI</sup> The sea pig is an unusual animal.<sup>1</sup> It is a type of sea cucumber that dwells in the deep dark ocean.<sup>3</sup> Sea pigs find their food by smell because<sup>4</sup> they do not have eyes.<sup>5</sup> They eat rotten whales that are on the bottom of the ocean.<sup>6</sup> They can be 6 inches long and fit in your hand.

# Methods

- Search for 20 interesting animals
- Research team reduced to 10 animals
- Creation of 9 expository passages
  - The 10<sup>th</sup> passage was not completed due to lack of information on the animal
- Systematic Analysis of Language Transcripts (SALT) to analyze
  - Data from SALT was compared
  - Total number of utterances
  - MLUs: Mean length of Utterance



Dumbo Octopus



Goblin Shark



Blanket Octopus



Thorny Devil



Blue sea slug



Aya-Aya



Mirror Spider



Tarsier



Glaucus Atlanticus



Sea pig

	Total # of utterances	# of MLU (words)	# of different words	# of total words
Sea Pigs	5	11	41	55
Bird-eating spider	5	10.8	41	54
Aya-Aya	6	11	47	62
Blanket octopus	6	10.83	45	63
Blue sea slugs	6	10	43	60
Dumbo octopus	5	12.8	44	62
Goblin shark	5	11.4	38	56
Mirror Spider	6	10	47	60
Pacific Barreleye	5	11.8	47	59
Tarsier	6	10.17	46	61
Thorny Devil	5	11	39	55



# Results

- Total number of utterances: 5 or 6
- MLUs: 10-12.8
  - MLU expected from a kindergartener
- Total number of different words: 38-47
- Total number of words: 54-66

# Conclusion

- The parallel forms looked at suggest that the passages are similar in difficulty and content.
- Total number of utterances varied by 1 across all 11 passages
- MLU difference between passages had a range of 2.8
- Total number of different words differed by 9
- Total number of words ranged by 12.

# Future research/implementation

- Test reliability of passages
  - Split half
  - Item response
- Create more passages
- Expository vs. narrative is more
  - Sensitivity
    - Growth over time
  - Predicative and reflective of reading comprehension

# Special Thanks

- Dr. Douglas Petersen
  - Department of Communication Disorders
- Research team

# References

- Petersen, D.B., Gillam, S.L., Spencer, T., & Gillam, R.B. (2010). The effects of literate narrative intervention on children with neurologically based language impairments: an early stage study. *The Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 53*, 961-981.
- Petersen, D.B. (2011). A systematic review of narrative-based language intervention with children who have language impairment. *Communication Disorders Quarterly, 32*, 207-220.
- Petersen, D.B., & Gillam, R.B. (2013). Accurately predicting future reading difficulty for bilingual latino children at risk for language impairment. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 28*, 113-128.