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ABSTRACT

This investigation attempted to profile the audience awareness of gifted and non-gifted fifth graders. At three writing sessions, students wrote to a friend, a teacher, and an editor, persuading each to go to the park. Compositions were examined for syntactic complexity, according to t-units, and for the kinds and numbers of persuasive appeals used.

A repeated measures design with a 2x3 factorial arrangement of between subject treatments (Group and Sex) and a single repeated factor (Audience at three levels) was used. The dependent variables were examined using ANOVA. Results were tested for significance at the .05 level.

The significant findings were:

1. Students established context for writing and used environmental appeals most when writing to an editor and least when writing to a friend.

2. Boys established context for writing more than girls when writing to a friend and to a teacher. Girls, however, established context for writing more than boys when writing to an editor.
3. Gifted students established context for writing more than girls when writing to a friend and to a teacher. However, non-gifted students established context for writing more frequently than gifted students when writing to an editor.

4. Students used interpersonal appeals most when writing to a friend and least when writing to a teacher.

5. Girls used interpersonal appeals more than boys.

6. Students used simple requests, reservations, and societal appeals most when writing to a friend and least when writing to an editor.

7. Students used imperatives and intensifiers most when writing to an editor and least when writing to a teacher.

8. Boys used a wider range of appeal types than girls when writing to a friend and a teacher. Girls, however, used a wider range of appeal types than boys when writing to an editor.

9. Gifted students used more target oriented appeals and a wider range of appeal types than non-gifted students.
Results showed strong evidence of fifth graders' awareness of audience. Students' compositions also suggest the importance of the assignment topic and the influence of students' previous experiences.
CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Freedman (1981) vividly described the current study of writing as having an "aura and excitement of a discipline in its early stages of growth" (p.1). Not only have research methods and techniques expanded to include case studies (Emig, 1971; Graves, 1973; Sommers, 1980), protocol analyses (Flower & Hayes, 1980), and naturalistic studies (Berkenkotter, 1981), but research topics have also extended far beyond the traditional analysis of written products. Many studies now focus on efforts to better understand the composing process as "a set of distinctive thinking processes which writers orchestrate or organize during the act of composing" (Flower & Hayes, 1981, p.366).

Until Emig's (1971) case study of the composing processes of twelfth grade students, writing researchers had more or less ignored the needs cited by Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer (1963), Parke (1960), and Meckel (1963) which called for more attention toward writers and less toward the procedural-methodological matters which historically received the attention of writing researchers (Graves, 1973, 1975). Moss (1982) reiterated Braddock's (1963) statement of the need to focus on developmental
issues that might provide insight into the composing processes of children. Recognizing that writing research is still relatively meager, Humes (1981,1983) acknowledged a transformation during recent years.

Much of the new emphasis of research on the composing process incorporates what has been learned from the field of cognitive developmental psychology (Kroll, 1977). Moffett (1968) strongly suggested that language evolves naturally through predictable stages of development. Loban (1976) and Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod, and Rosen (1975) have also focused extensively on language development as an aspect of the composing process. Flavell (1974) applied the stages of development introduced by Piaget's developmental learning theory to communication, and Kroll (1977) extended this concept into written composition. More recently, Kirby and Kantor (1981) re-emphasized the need for a developmental theory of the writing process -- one which would incorporate our increased knowledge.

If such a theory is to truly be comprehensive, it must include the developmental aspects of audience. Although this topic, as it relates to written composition, is one with roots in Aristotle's study of rhetoric (Ede, 1984), a thorough understanding of audience is still lacking. Park (1982) described audience as "obvious,
crucial, and yet remarkably elusive" (p.248). Its meanings are both concrete and abstract. According to Park, they...

...tend to diverge in two general directions: one toward actual people external to a text,... the other toward the text itself and the audience implied there, a set of suggested or evoked attitudes, interests, reactions, conditions of knowledge which may or may not fit with the qualities of actual readers... (p. 249).

In the most general sense, audience is considered to be the individual or group for which written communication is intended. A sense of audience, as defined by Britton et al. (1975), is "a writer's interpretation of his reader's expectations as they affect his writing (p. 218)." If a writer is adept at tailoring or adapting a communication to the needs and interests of an audience, he is said to have demonstrated audience awareness (Kroll, 1978a).

Theorists such as Kinneavy (1971), Britton (1975), Moffett (1968), Flower and Hayes (1980, 1981), and Kirby and Kantor (1981) all note the importance of audience in written discourse, and textbooks and writing manuals have traditionally prescribed the writer's attention to audience. While texts, since 1970, have given more attention to the audience component of the writing process, few actually provide a heuristic for audience analysis (Bator, 1980). A major reason that these
strategies and techniques have not been systematically included in the curriculum is a lack of knowledge and understanding of the developmental aspects of audience.

As awareness of the need for a better understanding of audience has grown, the realization that questions about audience analysis outnumber available answers has become apparent. Ede (1984) posed some of the questions for which there are no complete answers:

...How do children acquire awareness of audience? To what degree can awareness of audience be taught, and to what degree does it depend upon accumulated intuition derived from previous experiences? Is there evidence that writers actually do analyze their audience? How? Do they perform conscious and lengthy analyses, or do they quickly locate specific strategic characteristics? How do external features, such as the assignment, influence the writer's ability to adapt discourse to an audience?...

(pp. 144-47).

Researchers have begun to seek answers to questions about the developmental aspects of audience (Kroll, 1978a, 1978b, 1984a, 1984b; Crowhurst, 1977, 1978; Rubin, 1978). Many are convinced that children's writings contain "developmentally significant clues to the processes inherent in growth toward writing competence" (Kirby & Kantor, 1981, p.88). These clues must be identified and used to develop a model of instructional strategies that will guide the students' writing growth and development. One place to begin is by examining the writing skills of
students at each grade level. This would provide the kind of concrete evidence which Kirby and Kantor (1981) cited as necessary for defining the appropriateness of children's assigned writing tasks. It could enlighten educators as to what children are "ready" to do rather than what they "should" do and eliminate the current "fragmented, often futile approach" to teaching writing by narrowing its focus to a "formula or list of discrete skills" (Kirby & Kantor, 1981, p.87).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of three audience conditions, each varying in degrees of intimacy from the writer, on the syntactic complexity and the persuasive appeals used by gifted and non-gifted fifth grade students in written compositions.

The questions of interest were:
1. Are there measurable differences in the syntactic complexity of persuasive compositions written by fifth grade students to a best friend, a teacher, and a newspaper editor?

2. Are differences in the syntactic complexity of persuasive compositions written by fifth grade gifted and non-gifted students independent of audience?
3. Are there measurable differences in the appeals used in persuasive compositions written by fifth grade students to a best friend, a teacher, and a newspaper editor?

4. Are the differences in the appeals used in persuasive compositions written by fifth grade gifted and non-gifted students independent of audience?

As used in this study, syntactic complexity was defined as an index of sentence structure, measured by t-units (Hunt, 1965). Hunt defined a t-unit as one main clause plus the subordinate clauses attached to or embedded within it. (See Appendix A for Segmentation Rules used to measure syntactic complexity.) Syntactic complexity has sometimes been used synonymously with syntactic maturity and misinterpreted as a qualitative description of written composition (Crowhurst, 1979). In this study, syntactic complexity was used only as an objective, quantitative measure for making comparisons among students. It was not equated with syntactic maturity or the quality or maturity of written messages.

Persuasive writing was defined, following the guidelines of Britton et al. (1975, p.218), as "writing which attempts to influence action, behavior, or attitude in cases where compliance cannot be assumed." For this
study, persuasive appeals were considered to be the ways, or strategies, chosen by the writer in his attempts to influence the audience. The appeal categories used were those of Rubin (1978). (See Appendix B for Persuasive Appeal Categories.)

In this study, gifted students were those identified according to the guidelines for Louisiana as stated in the Pupil Appraisal Handbook -- Bulletin 1508 (1982). This publication defines gifted children and youth as "those who possess demonstrated abilities that give evidence of high performance in academic and intellectual aptitude" (p. 51). The guidelines make provision for standardized achievement and intelligence scores to be entered into a standard matrix for determination of classification. Non-gifted students, as defined in this study, were those who had not been identified as exceptional according to the guidelines of the Pupil Appraisal Handbook -- Bulletin 1508 (1982). (See Appendix C for Gifted Student Identification Guidelines.)

Rationale

The Back to Basics Movement in education began in the 1960's with the charge that "Johnny can't read!" More recently, public awareness of Johnny's lack of writing
skills was brought to light by the National Commission on Excellence in Education's publication, _A Nation at Risk_ (1983). This publication stated, among its documented findings, that "...Some 23 million American adults are functionally illiterate by the simplest tests of everyday reading, writing, and comprehension. About 13 percent of all 17-year-olds in the United States can be considered functionally illiterate..." (p. 8). By contributing to a better understanding of literacy skills, this study seeks to contribute toward the improvement of functional literacy within the population.

Another charge made by the National Commission on Excellence in Education stated that, "Over half the population of gifted students do not match their tested ability with comparable achievement in school...." (p. 9). The inclusion of identified gifted students in this study is one way to assess their current performance and possibly identify and promote needed changes within the language arts curriculum which might increase their academic achievement.

Persuasive writing has been found to be the mode which increases a writer's focus on audience (Crowhurst, 1977; Crowhurst & Piche, 1979; Rubin, 1978; Rubin & Piche, 1979; and Kroll, 1984a) and places the greatest cognitive demands on him. Analyzing the appeals used by
children when writing in this mode is one way possibly to detect developmental patterns in their cognitive development, or levels of writing maturity (Odell, 1981), as suggested by Braddock (1963). A better understanding of the composing processes of children could foster changes within the language arts curriculum that may respond to the Commission's charge that, "Many 17-year-olds do not possess the 'higher order' intellectual skills we should expect of them. Nearly 40 percent cannot draw inferences from written material; only one-fifth can write a persuasive essay...." (p.9).

Despite increased knowledge of the importance of developmental considerations which should shape writing instruction within the language arts curriculum, Kirby and Kantor (1981) charged that we have been left "without adequate methodology to observe, catalog, and order the clues" (p. 88) which exist. After looking at the state of the art of teaching writing, Myers (1983) described it as a "hodge podge of gimmicks without a foundation of theory and research and without systematic methods of evaluating student writing" (p. 3). A "subtle, but crucial factor" cited by Richard Graves (1978) as a cause for the decline in writing has been the "preoccupation with skills of grammatical analysis rather than with the skills of composing" (p.227). These charges imply that
what is needed within the field of language arts is an appropriate scope and sequence of the writing curriculum -- one which gives adequate consideration to the development of the learner and eliminates the random assignment of writing tasks. Without such, teachers will be unable to replace the teaching of isolated skills and often meaningless drills which now interferes with the teaching of effective communication.

Before such a communication program can be developed, a fuller understanding of the nature of the composing processes, language learning, and the functions of writing is needed (King, 1978). Researchers must begin to provide at least a description of the developmental behaviors exhibited by students through written expression. The development of audience adapted writing skills is an essential component of effective communication. Currently, most textbooks do not formally introduce audience or persuasive writing until the sixth grade, and even then, on a limited basis (Louisiana State Department of Education, 1981). Without adequate developmental descriptions of the learners' capabilities, curriculum planners cannot be certain that any particular grade level is the most appropriate time for the presentation of specific writing skills. Fifth graders are in their last year of elementary school before moving to middle schools
which alter their classroom organization and place increased demands on their writing ability. Among these demands is audience awareness in written communication. If optimum learning is to occur at this, or any other level, curriculum planners must have access to research findings that provide a description of the writer at each developmental stage.

As with the composing process, research in the field of gifted education has increased in recent years. Most of it, however, has been concerned with identifying the gifted (Renzulli, 1978), understanding of the learning preferences and styles of the gifted (Renzulli & Smith, 1978; Renzulli, Smith, White, Callahan & Hartman, 1976; Dunn, Dunn, & Price, 1975), and developing curriculum models such as those described by Maker (1982) without giving adequate attention to the development of specific academic skills areas. Alexander (1984) cited the need for a more definitive link to theory within the activities of gifted education. This was echoed by Roberson (1984) through a call for structure in selecting curriculum content for the gifted.

By focusing on audience awareness through the persuasive appeals used by gifted and non-gifted fifth grade students in their written compositions, this study responds to the need cited by Alexander (1984) and
Roberson (1984). It also responds to Odell's (1981) suggestion that one way to define mature writing might be to use a combination of theory and intuition in identifying writers that might be classified as mature and immature thinkers to detect differences in their thought patterns through an analysis of their writing. Among the questions posed by Odell were

....Do students at one age level appear to use cognitive processes that are rarely or never used by students at another age? Do some of these students display cognitive processes that are consistent with what psychologists (Flavell, 1977; Piaget, 1968) tell us about mature or immature thought?.... (Odell, 1981, p.109).

The growing public controversy over curriculum maximums and minimums and over academic mediocrity or excellence demands that educators better understand the development of the composing process and the factors which influence it. With added insight into the audience awareness which gifted and non-gifted students bring to a situation before receiving formal classroom instruction in this area, curriculum planners can make better decisions about writing assignments and teaching strategies, and thus align educational expectations with developmental readiness theory.
Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to eight public elementary schools in Calcasieu Parish, Louisiana which had at least two gifted students enrolled in their fifth grade classes. Results of this study can only be generalized to populations similar to the one from which this sample was drawn.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The basis for effective communication, whether oral or written, relies on a proper balance among the speaker/writer, the receiver/audience, and the message/text. Kinneavy (1971) referred to this trinity as the "communication triangle". The importance of its elements can be recognized from the works of Aristotle to the current discourse models which are part of the changes occurring within the field of written composition.

Audience

The topic of audience, an integral and fascinating component of the communication triangle, interests all who seek to better understand effective communication. This topic overlaps into all of the language arts areas and is also related to the disciplines of cognitive psychology and philosophy. Park (1982) credited attention to audience -- or the lack of it -- with making a piece of prose "shapely and full of possibility or aimless and empty" (p. 247). Likewise, Stallard (1974) concluded that "a major behavioral characteristic of the good writer is a willingness to put forth effort to make communication
clearer to the reader (p.216). Acknowledging that the concept of audience is far from straightforward, Park noted that in the past, theoretical discussions on this topic were a rarity.

In a review of audience research, Ede (1984) cited the importance which an understanding of audience has for teachers. She defined audience analysis as "... those methods designed to enable speakers and writers to draw inferences about the experiences, beliefs, and attitudes of an audience" (p. 84). Tracing the history of audience, Ede noted that Aristotle, in Book II of The Rhetoric (Cooper, 1932), emphasized audience analysis as a means of enabling the speaker to choose the right appeal when addressing specific groups. His focus on persuasion and group behavior has significantly influenced research on audience analysis in speech communication. This influence can still be seen in the observational research techniques used in social psychology and speech communication (Ede, 1984).

Within the past decade, researchers have begun to actively seek a better understanding of audience as it relates to writing. Among the methods employed in recent studies are: (1) measures of syntactic complexity (Crowhurst, 1977, 1978; Crowhurst & Piche, 1979; Smith &
Swan, 1978; Rubin, 1978; Rubin & Piche, 1979; Kroll, 1985); (2) appeal strategies (Rubin, 1978, Kroll, 1984); (3) student interviews (Rubin, 1978; Kroll, 1984); (4) protocol analyses (Berkenkotter, 1981; Flower & Hayes, 1981; Monahan, 1984; and Stallard, 1974): and (5) rewriting activities (Kroll, 1985).

The importance of audience is also apparent by the prominence accorded to it by current discourse theorists. Foster (1983) defined a theory of discourse as "a systematic attempt to describe the variables in human communication and the way they interact" (p. 33). As a base for the present study, the theories of Moffett (1968), and Britton (1975) offer the most appropriate concepts of the developmental aspects of audience.

In what he has termed "The Universe of Discourse," Moffett (1968) established a set of relations among I, you, and it -- the informer, the informed, and the information. His developmental model relates to Piaget's theory of egocentrism and describes audience as varying levels of abstraction, increasing in distance from the writer.

Britton (1975) categorized audience as self, teacher, wider audience (known), unknown audience, and additional categories. Also developmental, this model proposes a taxonomy of language development that emphasizes beginning
with personal experience. Language is first expressive, or for oneself. It then extends in either direction, transactional (to inform) or poetic (to interpret). Expressive language is presented as a matrix from which other differentiated forms of mature writing are developed.

Kroll (1977, 1978a, 1978b, 1984a, 1984b, 1985), a leading contributor to the growing understanding of audience, acknowledged the substantial contributions made by the field of cognitive developmental psychology to the understanding of interpersonal communication. The term "cognitive" implies that focus is primarily on the manner in which one perceives or interprets surroundings. Emphasis is on the workings of the mind rather than individual behavior. The term "developmental" implies that cognition emerges gradually, through a series of stages (Myers, 1983). Cognitive-developmental psychology is a theoretical basis from which a research direction and a methodology for the understanding of audience awareness can be developed (Barritt & Kroll, 1978).

Kroll (1984a, 1984b) cited two developmental concepts of audience, differentiation and decentration, which have been used as alternate methods and approaches to study audience. Research examining children's concepts of other persons has shown age related increases in children's
characterizations of others. With age, children conceive others in increasingly more abstract and differentiated ways. These conceptions become better organized and more hierarchically integrated (Barenboim, 1977; Livesley & Bromley, 1973; Scarlett, Press, & Crockett, 1971, cited in Kroll, 1984a). The concept of decenteration has strong roots in the work of the Swiss psychologist, Jean Piaget (1955, cited in Kroll, 1978a) who used the term "egocentrism" to describe the cognitive state in which the individual sees the world only from his point of view, unaware that other viewpoints exist. From his work with six-year-old children, Piaget concluded that they could not adapt a message to a listener and called their messages "egocentric." As children gradually begin to "decenter," they realize that others do not necessarily share their points of view on a particular topic (Kroll, 1978a).

According to Kroll (1978a), later studies by Piaget and Inhelder (1967), which involved the perceptual form of taking another's point of view, concluded that children progress through a series of developmental stages. Gradually, they become able to "decenter," or imagine other viewpoints with increasing accuracy.

Building upon the theoretical framework of Piaget, Flavell and his colleagues (1968, cited in Kroll, 1978a)
employed the term "role taking" to describe one's ability to take the viewpoint of another individual. They found that a definite age-related developmental pattern existed in one's ability to take another's point of view and that this view develops gradually from preschool age through adolescence, where it reaches maximum efficiency.

From this point, Kroll (1978a) proposed the importance of decreasing egocentrism to effective written communication. He (1978b) cited Moffett's (1968) comments that "the majority of communication problems are caused by egocentricity, the writer's assumption that the reader thinks and feels as he does, has had the same experience, and hears in his head, when he is reading, the same voice the writer does when he is writing" (p. 195). According to Kroll, "the crucial factors in an investigation of audience awareness are not the salient characteristics of audiences, but the constructive processes operative in the mind of the writer" (p. 279-280). He proposed two concerns to guide research in this area: (1) the importance of understanding how people construct mental representations of others -- what a speaker or writer does when aware of audience; and (2) the need to chart how this awareness develops.

Kroll (1978a) designed a study to investigate the communicative adequacy of fourth graders and found that
these students demonstrated limited communication skills when adapting messages to either listeners or readers.

Later, Prentice (1980) designed a study which investigated the development of the writing skills of 36 students in grades 3, 5, and 7, and demonstrated students' ability to adapt their descriptive writing for two different audiences -- a first grader and an adult. Even the third graders in this study considered the communicative needs of the intended readers when making writing choices. Kroll (1985) conducted another study, this time, intended to describe the development of audience-adapted writing skills of students in grades 5, 7, 9, 11, and college freshmen. When rewriting a story for a young reader, these students demonstrated a sensitivity to his needs. Earlier, Smith and Swan (1978) had found that sixth graders did not adjust the syntactic complexity of their rewritten texts for audiences.

Crowhurst (1978) and Crowhurst and Piche (1979) reported research that demonstrated age related variations in the syntactic complexity of papers written by sixth- and tenth graders for two audiences. The syntactic complexity of the papers written by tenth graders differed for the two audiences while those written by sixth graders did not. From examining the syntactic complexity of students' writing across three modes of discourse --
narration, description, and argument -- Crowhurst (1977) concluded that argument elicits the greatest demand on students' syntactic resources and cited the need for future research studies to control the mode of discourse in studies of syntactic development. She further proposed establishing developmental norms at each grade level for each of the four traditional discourse modes.

Following these recommendations, Rubin (1978) designed an investigation which demonstrated significant effects exerted by audience intimacy on syntactic complexity and strategies employed in persuasive writing produced by fourth-, eighth-, and twelfth grade students, and experienced adults. The most highly subordinated writing was addressed to the high intimacy audiences and the low intimacy audience messages contained the greatest mean clause length. Age related differences were also found, both in the use of syntactic complexity and repertoires of persuasive strategies of the subjects. Rubin & Piche (1979) later reported research which demonstrated that an assigned writing task could manipulate the sense of audience and enable its manifestation in both syntactic complexity and strategy use.
Summary

Although the importance of audience has been recognized since the time of Aristotle, there is still much to learn about the acquisition and development of audience awareness and audience adaptation skills. During the past decade, efforts to better understand audience have expanded into the field of writing. Writing researchers now incorporate information from the field of cognitive developmental psychology into their studies of audience.

Sex Differences in Writing

Although the belief that girls are more proficient with language than boys generally exists, little conclusive research data support this opinion (Price & Graves, 1980). Research findings on language differences that do exist are inconsistent.

A study by Jespersen (1925, cited in Price & Graves, 1980) indicated that girls learned to talk earlier and more correctly than boys. Similarly, a literature review by Garai and Scheinfeld (1968) indicated that females surpassed males on various language proficiency measures. On the other hand, Price and Graves (1980) noted that several studies (O'Donnell, Griffin & Norris, 1967; Moore,
1967; Blount and Others, 1969; Cani, 1976) observed no significant differences between sexes on the majority of measures used, including language proficiency. After conducting reviews of the literature related to sex differences in language, Fairwether (1976) and Macaulay (1978) concluded that female language superiority had been overstated. They pointed out that most findings claimed in studies they reviewed were slight in comparison to variables due to other factors such as social class or ethnic group (Price & Graves, 1980).

Price and Graves (1980) noted that past language research related to sex differences has focused primarily on differences in the language development of children and on the stylistic differences between sexes of adults. They recognized a lack of existing research data which compared male and female students in middle school grades and sought to examine the oral and written language of such students according to syntactic maturity, as measured by t-units (Hunt, 1965) and an index of adherence to standard English usage. They found no significant differences between sexes on any measure of syntactic maturity.

When Graves (1975) used a case study approach to examine the writing processes of seven-year-old children, he found that girls composed longer writings than boys. Boys also seldom used the first person, especially the I
form, unless they were developmentally advanced. Instead, they wrote more frequently in the third person and about the activities of adult males in sports vocations and national and world events. Girls, however, used the first person and wrote most often about home and school. When asked about their concept of a good writer, boys stressed the importance of mechanics and spelling while girls stressed organization, development of characterizations, and pre-thinking. Sawkins' (1970, cited in Petty, 1978) study of fifth graders had revealed that girls, more frequently than boys, wrote compositions that were judged to be of high quality.

Graves (1975) also found that environmental factors influenced the writing of boys and girls. An informal environment offered greater choices for students. When given choices, students wrote more often and also in greater length than when given specific assignments. An informal environment favored boys even more than girls -- boys wrote more unassigned and assigned work than girls. In a formal environment, the opposite was true -- girls wrote more and to greater length than boys, whether the writing was assigned or unassigned.

Graves concluded that the developmental factors of sex, language use, and problem solving behaviors interact to produce two distinctive types of writers, reactive and
reflective. Reactive writers, who were usually boys, displayed erratic problem solving strategies, used overt language during pre-writing and composing phases, and ideation that evolved in action-reaction couplets. For them, proofreading was at the word unit level and there was a need for immediate rehearsal in order to write. These students lacked audience awareness when writing and were unable to use reasons beyond the affective domain when evaluating their writing.

Reflective writers, who were most often girls, rehearsed little before writing and displayed little overt language when writing. They re-read periodically to adjust small units of writing at the word or phrase level and displayed a growing sense of audience. These students were able to support their evaluations of writing.

Graves acknowledged that all children possess characteristics of reactive and reflective writers to some degree. The characteristics can emerge under different types of writing conditions; however, they are more highly visible when viewed at the high and low ends of a developmental continuum.

Findings by Britton et al. (1975) and Crowhurst (1977) yielded sex differences among written compositions that are more directly relevant to the kinds of measures used in the present study. Britton's study reported
audience and function related differences between the sexes, with girls favoring expressive writing and the audience category of "child to trusted adult." Boys, however, provided more writing within the function category of pseudo-informative and within the audience category of "teacher as examiner." Quantitative differences in the syntactic complexity of writing done by boys and girls resulted from a study by Crowhurst (1977) which found that boys' writing contained significantly longer clauses than girls'.

When studying the effects of three methods of instruction for stimulating creative writing in fourth graders, McNulty (1980) used the t-unit as well as holistic rating to measure students' writing. Results showed that both holistic rating and overall mean scores on t-unit measures favored the girls' writing over boys'.

**Summary**

Research supporting the opinion that girls are more proficient with language than boys is sparse and inconsistent. Recent researchers described differences in the writing behaviors exhibited by boys and girls. They recognized the influence of environmental factors on boys' and girls' writing.
Written Composition and Gifted Students

Little composition research examines writing by gifted students. While many studies compare students of differing abilities, too often distinctions made between subjects who are skilled and unskilled, able and less able, or average and superior writers have been based on teachers' subjective judgments of students' abilities and/or performance. Even fewer studies investigate the writing done by specifically identified gifted students in the elementary grades.

Some earlier studies, such as Hunt's (1966) efforts to establish a quantitative measure of syntactic development, used IQ scores to distinguish between average and superior fourth grade students. Because he found significant differences between these groups in the use of the t-unit and the subordination clause ratio, Hunt concluded that the use of these measures was a significant index in separating fourth grade students of average and superior IQ level. Clause length was not found to be a significant index at this level. Hunt attributed superior students' shorter sentences and fewer t-units per sentence to their better command of punctuation skills than the average students. In a related study, Blount, Johnson and Frederick (1968), also used standardized IQ scores to
define ability groups of students in his study. They, however, found no significant differences between high and average students or between boys and girls on the syntactic measures generally associated with t-units.

When Rucker (1981) used a case study approach to investigate the composing processes of eight gifted and five average sixth grade students, he specifically defined gifted students. These were students who qualified for supplemental educational services by meeting guidelines which included nomination, demonstration of high achievement and divergent thinking as measured by standardized tests, and the recommendation of a building level screening committee. In this study, non-gifted students were called average students. Rucker used frequency tabulations of eight measures of writing performance and claimed findings consistent with those of Hunt (1965) and O'Donnell, Griffin and Norris (1967). Rucker also used holistic scoring procedures and determined that the overall quality of the writing done by the gifted students was better than that by the non-gifted students. Overall, however, he concluded that the gifted and non-gifted students who participated in his investigation exhibited writing behaviors with more similarities than differences and that the amount of
The curriculum in gifted education modifies, extends, and enriches the regular instructional program. Gallagher (1975) suggested that this be accomplished through content, process, and learning environment modifications of the regular curriculum. Activities intended to develop higher levels of thinking, open-endedness, discovery, and thinking/reasoning strategies are among the process modifications generally included within such a curriculum (Maker, 1982).

Evidence of the effectiveness of activities included among the process modifications in the curriculum is suggested by results from Anderson’s (1982) investigation of the reasoning strategies used by students defined as "gifted and average" fifth graders. A protocol study and data obtained from the Gates Mac Ginitie Reading Test were used to measure their performance. Gifted students demonstrated a wider range of strategy use with inferential-type questions and manipulated multiple ideas.

Joseph Renzulli (1977), a prominent theorist in gifted education, added a new dimension to the curriculum for gifted students. In addition to the modifications proposed by Gallagher (1975), Renzulli’s curriculum model, The Enrichment Triad (Renzulli, 1977), also includes
product modifications which place particular emphasis on finding appropriate outlets, or real audiences for student products (Maker, 1982).

Recently, Stoddard and Renzulli (1983) conducted an investigation intended to measure the effectiveness of specific instructional strategies -- sentence combining and creative thinking activities -- on students' writing.

The subjects in this study were broadly defined as "above average ability fifth- and sixth- graders from four Connecticut school districts" (p.22). After using holistic scoring, t-units, and the Moslemi measure of creativity, they concluded that the writing skills of these students could be improved through such activities.

Summary

Few research studies that have examined the writing of elementary students who were defined as gifted, according to specific criteria, are available. In some studies, non-gifted students are referred to as "average students." Existing research indicates that gifted and non-gifted students display similar writing behaviors. Gifted students have exhibited better mastery of writing mechanics and the quality of their writing has been judged as better than that of non-gifted students. Current
studies offer few, if any, answers to questions regarding the developmental stages of writing or the cognitive processes of students.

Gifted education theorists have suggested content, process, environment, and product modifications of the regular instructional program to enhance gifted students' learning. These modifications include activities to promote a variety of thinking and reasoning strategies and emphasis on finding appropriate outlets, or real audiences for students' products. Research indicates that the writing of gifted students can be improved through specific kinds of activities which are stressed in the modified curriculum of gifted education.

Writing Measurement

To assess students' writing properly, educators must make valid and reliable judgments. Methods used have "progressed from direct holistic measures of low reliability and objective indirect measures of questionable validity to direct atomistic measures of which reliability and validity have yet to be adequately addressed in the literature" (Isaacson, 1984, p.96). Educational evaluation and research currently employ both
direct measures -- holistic and atomistic -- and indirect measures of writing skill.

During 19th century education, writing evaluation was considered to be the assessment of a combination of originality of ideas and conformity to standard English conventions for the purpose of assigning merit or worth to a composition (Judy, 1976, cited in Isaacson, 1984) -- a qualitative measure. Later, a more formal, standard evaluation technique, holistic scoring, provided for large scale evaluations for purposes of comparison. Holistic scoring is a procedure which guides the scoring or ranking of written compositions but relies on the subjective judgments of the rater. During the 1920's and 1930's, the essay scale was a type of holistic scoring which was commonly used. Results of several research studies in the 1950's raised serious questions about the validity and reliability of such measures. Also, improvements in multiple choice indirect tests of language achievement resulted in the increased use of indirect standardized measures which soon replaced holistic scoring techniques used by College Board Examinations (Isaacson, 1984).

Atomistic measures are direct, countable measures of written language. According to Isaacson (1984), these measures are useful in diagnostic assessment, grouping, monitoring/decision making, reporting student progress,
and giving feedback to students. However, because direct countable measures are a new development in measurement of written language, evidence of their reliability is harder to find in the literature (Ysseldyke, Thurlow, Wesson, Algozzinek, and Deno (1983, cited in Issacson, 1984). Indirect measures are often administered through the use of norm-referenced tests which require the examinee to recognize correct writing conventions, usually in a multiple choice format. These are considered to be more reliable since they are objective and eliminate the demand for scorers to make qualitative assessments based on personal judgment. Other advantages include allowance for machine scoring and increased reliability. Their major limitation, however, is their lack of validity since several aspects of composition are difficult, if not impossible, to measure by multiple-choice questions (Issacson, 1984). Such measuring techniques promote the teaching of isolated skills which are related to, and necessary for, effective writing but which, when isolated, detract from a comprehensive and integrated approach to language arts teaching. The perceived inadequacies of indirect measures, coupled with the growing public concern for literacy, have renewed the interest in tests that require a writing sample. Various forms of holistic measures have been used in the National Assessment of
Educational Progress (NAEP) writing assessment (Isaacson, 1984).

The t-unit (Hunt, 1965) is the direct measure that has received the most attention by researchers (Isaacson, 1984), many of whose findings attest to the reliability of the use of the t-unit as a syntactic measure (Blount, Johnson & Fredrick, 1969; Bortz, 1969; Bryant, 1970; Burne, 1973; Dauterman, 1970; O'Donnell, Griffin & Norris, 1967; Veal, 1974; Braun & Klassen, 1973; Crowhurst, 1977; Rubin, 1978).

Hunt (1965) searched for better measures of what he called syntactic maturity than those previously proposed by McCarthy (1946, cited in Hunt, 1965). McCarthy had relied on sentence length, clause length, and the frequency of subordinate clauses. Hunt (1965) first examined 1000-word writing samples from 18 children of average IQ, as measured by the California Short Form, in each of Grades 4, 8, 12. He found that average sentence length increased with age, but that the increments were small and failed to discriminate between individuals. Younger students generally wrote longer sentences because they apparently lacked mastery of punctuation skills. Significant increases were found in clause length and subordination ratio from grade level to grade level, with considerable overlapping among groups. As a result, Hunt
devised a measure which would reflect both clause length and subordination ratio, yet not be affected by the excessive main clause coordination typically used by young writers. He called these units of measure "minimal terminable units" -- "minimal" in the sense that they were the shortest units into which a passage could be segmented without residue, and "terminable" because it was grammatically allowable to terminate them. These were formally defined as "one main clause plus the subordinate clauses attached to or embedded within it" (Hunt, 1965, p.49) and referred to as t-units. Five synopsis scores were recommended for use as measurement. These included t-unit length (words/t-units), clause length (words/clause), main clause coordination index (t-units/sentences), subordinate clause index (clauses/t-units) and sentence length (words/sentence).

Subsequently, Hunt (1966) continued his search for quantitative syntactic measures that were significant indicators of the chronological and mental maturity of school children as he compared average and superior fourth grade students and average and superior twelfth grade students with skilled adults. Earlier findings were confirmed and, among his conclusions, Hunt stated that t-unit length was the most valid index of maturity and also a significant index for separating fourth grade
students of average and superior IQ. The subordinate clause index, which had been found to be one of the significant measures of chronological maturity for average students from grades 4 to 12, was also found to be a significant index for separating fourth graders of average and superior IQ. Clause length, which had been found to be a significant measure of chronological maturity for average students from grades 4 to 12, was not found to be a significant index for separating fourth graders of average and superior IQ. Superior fourth graders wrote shorter sentences, apparently because they had better command of punctuation skills.

Although t-unit length was a valid index to separate fourth grade students of superior and average IQ, Hunt (1966) concluded that the subordinate clause index was better. Both indexes increased with mental maturity, as well as chronological maturity.

Recognizing the need for more rigorously controlled writing conditions, Hunt (1968) designed a third study to further test his conclusions. A passage consisting of 32 short sentences of connected discourse, titled "Aluminum," was administered to more than 1000, almost exclusively white, students in grades 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12, representing an approximately normal distribution of academic ability in Tallahassee, Florida public schools.
Standardized test scores were used to further subdivide students into high, average, and low ability groups. Students were asked to re-write the passage in a "better way." As in earlier studies, findings showed that t-unit length increased unmistakably with age and with ability within grade. An increase was shown at every grade interval, and within each grade, there was an increase at every ability level, except the first where middle fourth graders had virtually the same mean scores as low fourth graders.

From this study, Hunt concluded that, when students were saying the same thing, older students used longer clauses which were produced through the use of more sentence combining transformations. Differences were found to be related to both mental age and chronological age.

Although Hunt (1965) consistently referred to the t-unit as a measure of "syntactic maturity," he also consistently described his search as one to find a quantitative syntactic measure. He used the t-unit to designate the observed characteristics of writers in different grades but made no attempt to use it as a measure of style or quality. Crowhurst (1977) proposed the term "syntactic complexity" as a more appropriate one
for the kind of information obtained through the use of the t-unit.

The direction and quantity of normative and experimental research in written composition has been greatly influenced by the use and identification of the t-unit (Hunt, 1965, 1970, 1977). The three principal ways in which it has been used are as a normative measure, as a gauge to determine the effects of writing instruction and writing curricula on writing performance, and to distinguish among texts and to represent different modes of discourse (Witte, 1981).

Results of normative studies (Hunt 1965, 1970; O'Donnell, Griffin, & Norris, 1967; Stewart, 1978a; and Witte & Sodowsky, 1978, cited in Witte, 1981) concluded that the older individuals wrote longer t-units. A number of studies (Blunt, 1968, 1969; Hunt, 1965, 1966, 1968; Loban, 1976; O'Donnell, 1977; O'Donnell et al., 1967; Veal, 1974; O'Hare 1973, Mellon,1969, cited in Crowhurst, 1977) comparing the average number of words per t-unit for the same grades have revealed considerable similarity, resulting in support for the widespread acceptance of mean t-unit length as a simple, valid index of syntactic development (Crowhurst, 1978). Rosen (1969) expressed the view that it might well become the "standard measure" used in future investigations and Van der Geest, Appel, and
Tervoort (1973, cited in Crowhurst, 1977) designated it as the present customary way to analyze children's language. Studies measuring effects of writing instruction (Mellon, 1969; O'Hare, 1973; Combs, 1976; Mulder, Braun, & Holliday, 1978; Daiker, Kerek, & Morenberg, 1978; and Stewart, 1978b) suggested that individuals could be systematically taught to write significantly longer t-units than those normally associated with their age group through the use of particular teaching strategies such as sentence combining (Mellon, 1969) or sentence embedding (Christensen, 1967) exercises. Researchers using t-units to distinguish among texts representing different discourse modes (Bortz, 1969; Veal & Tilman, 1971; San Jose, 1972; Veal, 1974; Perron, 1977; Crowhurst, 1978; Rubin, 1978) generally found that different types of written discourse tended to elicit different mean t-unit lengths (Witte, 1981).

Despite the major role that mean t-unit length has had, as a measure of syntactic manipulation, a number of issues regarding its use still remain. Among these are: (1) questions regarding the procedures used for counting t-units (Schmeling, 1969, cited in Witte, 1981; O'Donnel et al., 1967; Mellon, 1969; Rosen, 1969; O'Hare, 1973; Hunt, 1965); (2) the most appropriate passage length for assuring reliability (Hunt & O'Donnell, 1970; O'Hare,
1973; and (3) its reliability across writing samples (Crowhurst, 1978; Witte & Davis, 1979; 1980). Witte (1981) noted that other issues surrounding the use of the t-unit include its relationship to writing quality, or the lack of it, and its validity as a measure of syntactic features.

After noting that the norms derived from the studies related to the use of t-units as a measure of syntactic development represented a wide variety of writing samples aimed at different purposes, Crowhurst (1977) examined the effect of audience and mode of discourse on the syntactic complexity of compositions written by sixth- and tenth graders. Her findings confirmed the usefulness of the t-unit measure for making certain kinds of developmental comparisons established by previous research. Increases in syntactic complexity scores on the measures of t-unit length, clause length, and ratio of clauses to t-units increased significantly between grades 6 and 10, but not in all kinds of writing. Hence, Crowhurst cited the need to control mode of discourse in studies of syntactic development and determined that grade- or age level norms of syntactic complexity which ignore discourse mode are inadequate and/or misleading. She proposed that focusing on groups of children, rather than on individuals, for the establishment of developmental norms at each grade level
in each of the four traditional modes of discourse might provide a more adequate framework for discussing the development of syntactic complexity.

Two studies by Witte and Davis (1979, 1980) examined the stability of individual and group mean t-unit length across different types of texts and concluded that further research should seek to determine the age level at which mean t-unit length stabilizes in different types of writing done for different purposes such as persuasion, proof, or entertainment. Recommendations made by Witte and Davis included the investigation of the effect which the interactions of discourse purposes and methods of development have on t-unit length stability for different age and ability levels. They also recommended exploring the effect of audience considerations, oral and visual stimuli, and subject matter of the discourse samples on individual and group stability of t-unit length (Witte, 1981).

While the use of the t-unit measure has become widely accepted as a quantitative measure of syntactic complexity, it has not achieved total acceptance. Its limitations have been recognized and a measure which discriminates in ways which the t-unit cannot is still sought. Other measures, most based on or related to the t-unit, have been proposed. These are more complicated
and expensive to use and have not been as widely tested (Crowhurst, 1977).

Although the limitations of the use of the t-unit have been recognized, its use as a measure of student writing in the present study is based on the previously stated advantages. Use of the t-unit is also a way to compare the results of this study with previous findings. Perhaps such comparisons will contribute to the understanding of children's progress through developmental writing stages.

Summary

A valid, reliable, and objective writing measure of syntactic complexity is still being sought. Measurement methods which have been used include qualitative assessment based on originality and writing mechanics, holistic measures for making large scale comparisons, indirect standardized measures, and direct countable measures.

Hunt's (1965) t-unit is a direct measure that has received attention from researchers. Although it has been used in a variety of ways, the t-unit's limitations have been recognized. Despite the controversy over the use of
the t-unit, it is an objective way to measure syntactic complexity.

Persuasive Strategies as a Measure of Audience Awareness

Among the discourse modes -- descriptive, narrative, persuasive, and expository, the one which places the greatest cognitive demands on the writer (Crowhurst, 1977; Crowhurst & Piche, 1979; San Jose, 1972; Perron, 1977; and Fowler, 1982) is the persuasive mode. Persuasive writing has also been found to increase the writer's focus on audience (Crowhurst, 1977; Crowhurst & Piche, 1978; Rubin, 1978; Rubin & Piche, 1979; Kroll, 1984). Attempts to measure the mechanisms of written persuasive message adaptation have been confounded by topics, targets, and the difficulty of isolating distinguishable features (Rubin, 1978).

Researchers have analyzed strategies to measure written persuasive composition (Rubin, 1978; Kroll, 1984). According to King (1978), strategies are related to "the detailed choices, linguistic, stylistic and substantive, that a writer makes in the course of his writing." One factor that could help researchers increase the validity of studies measuring persuasive writing and enhance their comparability is the establishment of a
common content category system for such strategies (Rubin, 1978). However, Holsti (1969, cited in Rubin, 1978) observed that the accomplishment of this task has rarely been possible. Although content analytic schemes are informed by prior findings, Rubin (1978) explained that they tend to emerge during the course of inquiry and therefore, are always in part ad hoc.

After developing a system of 35 persuasive strategy types and eighteen superordinate categories, Rubin (1978) used it to measure audience adaptation skills demonstrated by fourth-, eighth-, and twelfth graders, and expert adults. While age related increases in the use of these strategies were found, fourth graders did not exhibit significant evidence of audience adaptation skills. He attributed this deficiency to the demands of writing task and the topic of their assignment, which was glass recycling.

Later, Kroll (1984) defined (1) a set of four context creating elements: stating a problem, making an explicit request, introducing the writer, and telling the recipient how to respond to the request; (2) descriptive statements: physical and dispositional; and (3) persuasive appeals: flattery, audience directed statements; statements of match-up, appeals for sympathy, and enticements. He used these to measure the strategy content of persuasive
letters written by 49 nine-year-olds (22 boys and 27 girls). Upon examination, these letters contained evidence that students demonstrated audience adaptation skills.

The use of Rubin's (1978) strategy or appeal type categories in the present study will serve as a basis for comparison with his study. Perhaps it can contribute to the establishment of a content category system of persuasive strategies used by elementary students. Such a system could provide valuable assistance to researchers seeking a definition of the developmental pattern of children's writing.

Summary

The teaching of effective communication skills within the school curriculum is multi-faceted and depends on developmental knowledge of the writer. An understanding of the topic of audience and its developmental implications is a major factor contributing to effective communication. Other factors which may provide answers to the developmental question are differences in the writing of boys and girls and differences among writers with varying abilities -- gifted and non-gifted students. In each of these areas, current research is sparse.
One issue which complicates researchers' attempts to define the developmental pattern of young writers is writing measurement. No current measure now used has been recognized as a totally objective, economical, and effective. The t-unit is a widely used quantitative measure of syntactic complexity that has often been used for making research comparisons.

The present study was an attempt to profile the nature of audience awareness of gifted and non-gifted fifth grade students through their written persuasive messages to three different audiences. The audiences -- best friend, teacher, and newspaper editor -- varied in levels or abstraction, or distance from the writer. This study employed two types of measurement. The t-unit was used as a quantitative writing measure and the persuasive appeals were used to assess the strategies used by students. In addition to measuring differences due to audience and ability, this study also measured differences in written composition due to the sex of the writer.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

This study was conducted in Calcasieu Parish, Louisiana, after securing permission from the superintendent of schools. (See Appendixes D and E for letters of request and permission.)

Calcasieu Parish, with a population of 167,000, is located in southwestern Louisiana. Its public school system, the fifth largest in the state, is comprised of 57 schools, 31 of which are K-5 elementary schools. Calcasieu Parish offers special programs for students identified as academically gifted. Approximately 870 gifted students, pre-school (age 4) through grade 12, are enrolled in the Calcasieu SPARK program. SPARK, an acronym for "Seeking Purposeful Analytical Realistic Knowledge," is a resource program which provides differentiated experiences in all curricular areas.

Of the 31 elementary schools in Calcasieu Parish, 25 had fifth grade students who had been identified as gifted. Of these 25 schools, 13 had at least two gifted fifth grade students. For ease of data collection, research was limited to these 13 schools.
Sample

In Calcasieu Parish, 72 fifth grade students had been identified as gifted, according to the Louisiana guidelines in the Pupil Appraisal Handbook -- Bulletin 1508 (1982). (See Appendix C for identification guidelines.) From among the classes in the 13 schools containing two or more gifted fifth grade students, classes were randomly drawn until a minimum of 16 gifted boys and 16 gifted girls were included in the sample rolls. When the random selection was completed, a total of 39 students, 23 boys and 16 girls comprised the gifted sample. These students were from 16 different classrooms. The unequal number of students in each sex resulted because the number of gifted boys was larger than that of gifted girls.

Within each class containing one or more identified gifted students, an equal number of non-gifted students, matched on the basis of sex and race, were randomly drawn. A total of 78 students, 39 gifted and 39 non-gifted, participated in this study.

Procedure

Parental permission was obtained for all students in the randomly selected classes to participate in the study.
(See Appendix F for parental permission letter.) Each class participated in three 40-minute writing sessions during the regularly allotted time for the language classes.

Students each had three different writing assignments, one at each session. Assignment A instructed them to write to a best friend who already had made plans, persuading him/her to change his/her plans and go to the park with the writer, instead. Assignment B instructed students to write to a teacher who was planning to take the class on a one-day trip away from school and had several places in mind, but going to the park was not one of them. Students were to try to persuade the teacher to take the class to the park instead of to one of the places he/she had in mind. Assignment C instructed students to write a letter to the editor of the local newspaper encouraging people in the community to spend a day at the park. Additional information was provided only for the latter assignment and was limited to a description of the responsibility of a newspaper editor and the purpose for writing letters to the editor. (See Appendix G for writing assignment directions.) The order of the assignments was random, and the randomization was carried out independently for each class. Slides of park scenes in the Calcasieu Parish area were used as a visual
stimulus to establish a common background and starting point for the writers. (See Appendix H for description of slides.)

At each writing session, this researcher read the assignment directions aloud while students followed along with the reading. The students then viewed a series of 14 color slides, each depicting outdoor park scenes in the Calcasieu Parish area. After a second reading of the directions, students began their assignments. No additional assistance was given to the students during the writing sessions and their compositions were not subjected to teacher scrutiny or student revision. The students were informed of this apriori. The same set of slides were used for all three assignments. Only the compositions of the students who had been randomly selected were analyzed.

Scoring Procedures

For reference purposes, code numbers were assigned to each of the sample subjects' compositions. To facilitate scoring and also to eliminate any bias which might be created by handwriting and/or appearance, each composition was typed, without changing the spelling or syntactic structure of the students' work. All compositions were
analyzed by two raters, the researcher and an experienced elementary/middle school teacher, who had been trained in the pilot study. (See Appendix I for description of pilot study.)

Compositions were analyzed for syntactic complexity according to the following dependent measures:

Number of Words;
Number of T-units;
• Number of Clauses (dependent + independent);
Number of Logical Adverbial Subordinate Clauses; and
Number of Logical Coordinating Conjunctions.
(See Appendix A for Segmentation Rules for Measuring Syntactic Complexity.)

The content of the compositions was also analyzed to determine the number and types of persuasive appeals used by the students, according to Rubin’s (1978) categories:

Category 1: Context for Writing
Category 2: Interpersonal Relations
Category 3: Simple Requests
Category 4: Imperatives
Category 5: Norms
Category 6: Intensifiers
Category 7: How to Go to the Park
Category 8: Reservations
Category 9: Amount of Park Use
Category 10: Objective Information About the Park
Category 11: Publicity
Category 12: Environmental Appeals
Category 13: Societal Appeals
Category 14: Target Oriented Appeals
Category 15: Writer’s Credibility
Category 16: Thanks
Category 17: Broad Context
Category 18: Transitions

Modifications necessary for adapting Rubin’s categories to the park topic were made. Decisions of the raters, as they analyzed the student writings, were guided by the analysis and classification of persuasive appeals from the pilot study. (See Appendix B appeal categories and specific strategy samples).

The dependent variables related to persuasive appeals were:

Total Number of Persuasive Appeals in Each of 18 Categories;
Total Number of Appeals Used; and
Total Number of Appeal Types Used
Statistical Design

This study was a repeated measures design with a 2x3 factorial arrangement of between subject treatments and a single repeated factor. The between subject factors were group (gifted and non-gifted) and sex (boys and girls). The within subject factor was audience at three levels (best friend, teacher, and newspaper editor). Each of the dependent variables was examined using analysis of variance (ANOVA). Results were tested for significance at the .05 level.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Results of this investigation will be reported in this chapter under two broad categories: Syntactic Complexity and Persuasive Appeals. Due to the large number of analyses, only significant results will be reported. (See Appendix J for ANOVA Tables for results of all measures.) All means reported will be least squares means.

Syntactic Complexity

Questions of interest regarding the syntactic complexity of students' compositions were stated in Chapter I as follows:

1. Are there measurable differences in the syntactic complexity of persuasive compositions written by fifth grade students to a best friend, a teacher, and a newspaper editor?

2. Are differences in the syntactic complexity of persuasive compositions written by fifth grade gifted and non-gifted fifth grade students independent of audience?
Pearson's product-moment correlation was used to measure inter-rater reliability. Correlations ranged from .98 to .99 on measures of syntactic complexity. Overall means and correlations for the dependent variables for syntactic complexity are shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1
Overall Means and Correlations for Measures of Syntactic Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Words</td>
<td>80.14</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-unit Length</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause Length</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All correlations were significant at the .0001 level.

Mean for Total Number of Words

The ANOVA for Total Number of Words resulted in significant effects for audience, sex, and the interaction of the group-sex combination.

The significant audience effect, F(2, 148) = 8.61 p < .001, showed that students wrote longer messages to a best friend (M = 95.52, SE = 4.25) than to a teacher (M = 79.37, SE = 4.25). Their messages to a teacher, however, were
longer than those to a newspaper editor (M = 70.51, SE = 4.25).

The significant sex effect, F(1, 148) = 6.01, p < .05, showed that the average length of the girls' compositions (M = 91.00, SE = 5.77) was longer than that of the boys' (M = 72.60, SE = 4.81).

The significant interaction which resulted between the group-sex combination F(1, 148) = 13.91 p < .01 is as shown in Figure 1. Gifted boys' compositions averaged 9.60 more words than those of gifted girls. However, non-gifted girls, averaging 100.76 words, were almost twice as long as those of non-gifted boys. The means for each of these groups are shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

Means for Mean Total Number of Words for Group-Sex Combinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group-Sex Combinations</th>
<th>Least Squares Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Boys</td>
<td>90.84</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Girls</td>
<td>81.24</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gifted Boys</td>
<td>54.36</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gifted Girls</td>
<td>100.76</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The ANOVA for mean t-unit length showed significant effects resulting from audience and the two-way interaction between the group-sex combination.

The significant audience effect, $F(2, 148) = 5.95$, $p \leq .01$, showed that the longest t-units, ($M = 11.45$, $SE = .36$), were in messages to a newspaper editor. Messages to a teacher contained slightly shorter t-units, ($M = 11.08$, $SE = .36$), but the shortest ones were in messages to a best friend, ($M = 9.73$, $SE = .36$).

Figure 2 shows the interaction between the group-sex combination, $F(1, 148) = 5.66$. In gifted boys' compositions, the mean t-unit length averaged only .31 words longer than that of gifted girls. However, the average length of t-units in the non-gifted girls' compositions was 2.28 words longer than that of non-gifted boys. The means for each of these groups are shown in Table 4.3.

Mean Clause Length

For mean clause length, significant effects resulted from audience, sex, and the interaction between the group-sex combination.
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Table 4.3
Means for Mean T-Unit Length for the Group-Sex Combinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group-Sex Combinations</th>
<th>Least Squares Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Boys</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Girls</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gifted Boys</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gifted Girls</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significant audience effect, $F(2, 148) = 8.93$, $p < .001$, showed that students wrote longest clauses in messages to a newspaper editor ($M = 8.13$, $SE = .24$). Slightly shorter clauses were in messages to a teacher, ($M = 7.41$, $SE = .24$), but the shortest clauses were in messages to a best friend ($M = 6.67$, $SE = .24$).

The significant sex effect, $F(1, 148) = 4.09$, $p < .05$, showed that girls ($M = 7.82$, $SE = .31$) wrote longer clauses than boys ($M = 6.99$, $SE = .26$).

Figure 3 shows the significant two-way interaction between the group-sex combination, $F(1,148) = 10161$, $p < 0.1$. Again, the average clause length difference between gifted boys' and gifted girls' writing was slight, only .51 words. Non-gifted girls, however, wrote clauses that averaged 2.16 words longer than those written by
Significant Interaction Between Group and Sex
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non-gifted boys. These group averages are shown in Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group-Sex Combinations</th>
<th>Least Squares Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Boys</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Girls</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gifted Boys</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gifted Girls</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persuasive Appeals

In Chapter I, questions of interest regarding the persuasive appeals used by students were:

1. Are there measurable differences in the appeals used in the persuasive compositions written by fifth grade students to a best friend, a teacher, and a newspaper editor?

2. Are the differences in the appeals used in persuasive compositions written by fifth grade students independent of audience?
Because the following variables occurred an average of only .01 times, they will not be reported in this chapter:

Category 5: Norms
Category 9: Amount of Park Use
Category 10: Objective Information About the Park
Category 16: Thanks
Total Number of Appeals
(See Appendix J for Anova Tables for these measures.) The only category that was not used by any students was Category 18: Transitions.

Pearson's product-moment correlation was used to measure inter-rater reliability. Correlations ranged from .81 to .99 on the retained measures of persuasive appeals. Overall means and correlations for the dependent variables for persuasive appeal measures are shown in Table 4.5.

Category 1: Context for Writing

The ANOVA for Category 1: Context for Writing produced significant effects due to audience, and the interactions between the audience-group and audience-sex combinations.
Table 4.5.
Overall Means and Correlations for Persuasive Appeals Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1: Context for Writing</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2: Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3: Simple Requests</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4: Imperatives</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 6: Intensifiers</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 8: Reservations</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 12: Environmental</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 13: Societal</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 14: Target Oriented</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 15: Writer's Credibility</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Appeal Types</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All correlations were significant at the .0001 level.

The significant audience effect, $F(2, 148) = 8.02$, $p < .01$, showed that students established context for writing more frequently for a newspaper editor, ($M = .10$, .01) than for a teacher ($M = .06$, $SE = .01$), or a best friend ($M = .02$, $SE = .01$).
A significant interaction, shown in Figure 4, resulted between audience and sex, $F(2, 148 = 4.23, p < .05$. Girls' use of the context for writing category averaged .01 times more than boys' when writing to a best friend, also when writing to a teacher. When writing to an editor, however, boys used this category an average of .10 times more than girls'. Table 4.6 shows the means for these groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience-Sex Combinations</th>
<th>Least Squares Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend x Boys</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Boys</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor x Boys</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend x Girls</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Girls</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor x Girls</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was another significant interaction for Category 1: Context for Writing which resulted between audience and group is shown in Figure 5. Gifted students used this category an average of .02 times more than non-gifted students in messages to a friend, and .03 times more in messages to a teacher. Non-gifted students,
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however, used this category an average of .06 times more than gifted students in messages to a newspaper editor. These means are shown in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7

Means for Category 1: Context for Writing for the Audience-Group Combinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience-Group Combinations</th>
<th>Least Squares Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend x Gifted</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Gifted</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor x Gifted</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend x Non-Gifted</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Non-Gifted</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor x Non-Gifted</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category 2: Interpersonal Relations

For the Interpersonal Relations Category, significant main effects resulted from audience and sex. The significant audience effect, $F(2, 148) = 9.04, p \leq .001$, showed students used the Interpersonal Relations category more when writing to a best friend ($M = .07, SE = .01$) than to a newspaper editor ($M = .03, SE = .01$). Students used this category least when writing to a teacher ($M = .02, SD = .01$).

The significant sex effect, $F(1, 148) = 7.54, p \leq .01$, showed that girls ($M = .06, SE = .01$) used the
Interpersonal Relations Category an average of .04 times more than boys, (M = .02, SE = .01).

Category 3: Simple Requests

ANOVA results showed that, for Category 3: Simple Requests, there were significant effects which resulted from audience and group.

The significant audience effect, F(2, 148) = 3.78, p < .05, showed that students used simple requests most in their messages to a best friend (M = .12, SE = .02). Messages written to a teacher (M = .08, SE = .02) contained more simple requests than those to a newspaper editor (M = .06, SE = .02).

Group results, F(1, 148) = 6.89, p < .01, indicated that non-gifted students (M = .12, SE = .02) used simple requests an average of .04 times more than gifted students (M = .06, SE = .02).

Category 4: Imperatives

For Category 4: Imperatives, audience produced the only significant effect, F(2, 148) = 5.39, p < .01. Students used imperatives most when writing to a newspaper editor (M = .06, SE = .03). When writing to a friend (M = .03, SE = .03), they used imperatives an average of .02
times more than when writing to a teacher ($M = .01, SE = .03$).

**Category 6: Intensifiers**

Audience also produced the only significant effect which resulted from students' use of Category 6: Intensifiers. Students used intensifiers most when writing to a newspaper editor ($M = .06, SE = .01$). Students' messages to a best friend ($M = .05, SE = .01$) contained more intensifiers than those to a teacher ($M = .02, SE = .01$).

**Category 8: Reservations**

The only significant effect which resulted from use of the Reservations Category, again, was due to audience, $F(2, 148) = 9.27, p < .001$. Students used this category most when they wrote to a best friend ($M = .09, SE = .00$). Higher use of reservations was shown when they wrote to a teacher, ($M = .08, SE = .00$), than to a newspaper editor ($M = .01, SE = .00$).

**Category 12: Environmental Appeals**

Audience was also the only variable which significantly influenced students' use of the Environmental Appeals Category, $F(2, 148) = 22.59, p <$
ANOVA showed that students used this type of appeal most when writing to a newspaper editor (M = .25, SE = .02). They also used environmental appeals an average of .07 times more often when writing to a teacher, (M = .09, SE = .02) than to a best friend (M = .07, SE = .02).

Category 13: Societal Appeals

A significant audience effect was, again, the only one produced as a result of students' use of Category 1: Societal Appeals, F(2, 148) = 15.16, p = .0001. Appeals within this category appeared most in students' messages to a best friend (M = .30, SE = .02), and a teacher (M = .29, SD = .02). Students used these kinds of appeals least in their messages to a newspaper editor (M = .13, SE = .02).

Category 14: Target Oriented Appeals

A significant group effect resulted from the use of Category 14: Target Oriented Appeals, F(1, 148) = 10.17, p < .01. Results showed that gifted students (M = .13, SE = .02) used target oriented appeals an average of .07 times more frequently than non-gifted students (M = .06, SE = .02).
Total Number of Appeal Types

Regarding the number of appeal types used by students, significant findings resulted from the interaction between audience and sex and also from group. The significant two-way interaction which resulted between audience and sex, \( F(2, 148) = 3.94, p < .05 \), is shown in Figure 6. Boys' use of different appeal types averaged .98 more than girls' when writing to a teacher. When writing to a friend, boys used an average of .22 times more types of appeals than girls. However, girls' use of a wider variety of appeal types averaged .63 more than boys' when writing to a newspaper editor. Table 4.8 shows these group means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience-Sex Combinations</th>
<th>Least Squares Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend x Boys</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Boys</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor x Boys</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend x Girls</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Girls</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor x Girls</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6

Total Number of Persuasive Appeal Types

Significant Interaction Between Audience and Sex
Group results, $F(1, 148) = 5.35, p \leq .05$, showed that gifted students ($M = 5.07, SE = .30$) used a wider range of appeals than non-gifted students ($M = 4.07, SE = 30$).

Summary

In Chapter I, the questions which guided this investigation centered around (1) whether measurable differences could be found in the syntactic complexity and persuasive strategies used in compositions which gifted and non-gifted fifth grade students wrote to a best friend, a teacher, and a newspaper editor, and (2) whether these differences were independent of audience.

According to statistical analyses, significant findings resulted from audience (best friend, teacher, and newspaper editor), the interactions between the audience-sex and audience-group combinations, sex (boys and girls), group (gifted and non-gifted), and the interaction of the group-sex combination.

The significant findings which resulted from the measures of syntactic complexity were:

1. Students wrote the shortest messages to a newspaper editor. However, these messages contained the longest T-units and clauses.
2. As a group, girls wrote longer compositions containing longer t-units and longer clauses than boys. Students wrote the longest messages to a best friend. These contained the shortest t-units and clauses.

3. Gifted boys wrote longer compositions containing longer t-units and longer clauses than gifted girls. Non-gifted girls, however, wrote longer compositions with longer t-units and longer clauses than non-gifted boys.

The significant findings which resulted from the persuasive appeals measures were:

1. Students established context for writing and used environmental appeals most when writing to a newspaper editor and least when writing to a best friend.

2. Boys established context for writing more than girls when writing to a friend and to a teacher. Girls, however, established context for writing more than boys when writing to a newspaper editor.

3. Gifted students established context for writing more than girls when writing to a friend and to a teacher.
However, non-gifted students established context for writing more frequently than gifted students when writing to a newspaper editor.

4. Students used interpersonal appeals most when writing to a best friend and least when writing to a teacher.

5. Girls used interpersonal appeals more than boys.

6. Students used simple requests, reservations, and societal appeals most when writing to a best friend and least when writing to a newspaper editor.

7. Students used imperatives and intensifiers most when writing to a newspaper editor and least when writing to a teacher.

8. Boys used a wider range of appeal types than girls when writing to a friend and a teacher. Girls, however, used a wider range of appeal types than boys when writing to a newspaper editor.

9. Non-gifted students used more simple requests than gifted students.

10. Gifted students used more target oriented appeals and also a wider range of appeal types than non-gifted students.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The present investigation was an attempt to profile the audience awareness of gifted and non-gifted fifth graders. Students wrote persuasive messages to three different audiences -- best friend, teacher, and newspaper editor -- representing varying distances, or levels of abstraction from the writer. Measures of syntactic complexity and persuasive appeals used by the students were employed to determine the nature of these students' audience awareness.

The findings which resulted clearly indicate that fifth grade students in this investigation have a sense of audience awareness. Among the dependent measures used to assess the syntactic complexity and persuasive appeals used by these students, the most prominent effects resulted from audience. These audience results reflected Moffett's (1968) concept of audience development through the patterns produced by the students' responses to the three different audiences. The students' written compositions to these audiences also reflected their responses to relevant previous experiences (Britton, 1975).
In this chapter, the present investigation will be discussed according to the significant findings which resulted from the two broad categories — Syntactic Complexity and Persuasive Appeals — which were used to measure the students' writing.

Syntactic Complexity

The measures of syntactic complexity used in the present study (Hunt, 1965) produced significant findings which resulted from audience, the interaction of the audience-group combination, and sex.

Audience

Britton (1975) proposes a hierarchy of kinds of writing, with personal writing being first which a child uses effectively. The last kinds which are used effectively are those related to scientific and social uses of language — the impersonal kinds. These different kinds of writing can be viewed in terms of their distance — increasing levels of abstraction — from the writer (Moffett, 1968). Personal writing is more egocentric (Kroll, 1977, 1978a) and is written from the child's point of view. The scientific and social kinds of writing are those addressed to someone who is absent, unknown, or maybe even imaginary. Remoteness requires the writer to
create or represent a situation to himself, and this demands detachment from the situation at hand (Vygotsky, 1962). The writer must be able to "...call out in himself the responses which his gestures evoke from others" (Britton, 1975, p.62). For this, even minimal development requires a high level of abstraction (Vygotsky, 1962).

Significant audience effects resulted from mean total number of words, mean t-unit length, and mean clause length.

Mean Total Number of Words

One would expect fifth graders to have more to say to a best friend, with whom they had shared experiences, than to a newspaper editor, whom they probably had never met. Students demonstrated this by writing longest compositions to the intimate audience (friend) and shortest ones to the remote audience (editor). Such a response reflects the concept of audience development proposed by Moffett (1968) and Britton (1975), as each of these audiences represents a more distant relationship with the writer. The frequency of the students' responses to each of the audiences produced a sequential, progressive pattern which clearly demonstrates these fifth graders' audience awareness.
Mean T-unit Length/ Mean Clause Length

Although the longest messages were written to the intimate audience, these messages contained the shortest t-units and shortest clauses. This response suggests the type of language that one would probably use in less formal situations. When communicating with a friend who has shared the writer's experiences, it is usually not necessary to supply as much background information as when communicating with a stranger, whom the writer has never met. By contrast, the students' messages to the remote audience (editor) contained the least number of words, the longest t-units, and longest clauses. Such a response suggests the type of language that one might use in formal situations.

These findings correspond with those of Jensen (1973) who found that fifth graders differentiate their oral language between two styles of what she termed "casual" and "careful" speech. Careful speech was more syntactically complex, with longer clauses and a higher subordination ratio. The casual speech suggested by the compositions which students in the present investigation wrote to the intimate audience (friend) also reflects Britton's (1975) proposal that personal, or expressive writing is the first to be used successfully by students.
When Rubin (1978) examined the persuasive writing of fourth-, eighth-, twelfth graders, and expert adults to three different audiences, he found the same syntactic patterns as those found in the present investigation. Likewise, Crowhurst (1977) found this pattern of syntactic complexity for the total sample when she compared the writing of sixth- and tenth graders across three modes of discourse -- narration, description, and argument. Like Jensen (1973), Crowhurst interpreted these findings as being related to the formality of the relationship between the writer and the audience.

The present findings differ from those of Crowhurst, however, who found no evidence that syntactic complexity in the writing by sixth graders alone varied significantly for different audiences. Perhaps these differences resulted because Crowhurst measured writing across three discourse modes, whereas the present investigation limited students' writing to the persuasive mode.

Although Rubin's (1978) study, like the present one, also limited students' writing to the persuasive mode, the syntactic complexity of fourth and eighth graders and that of twelfth graders and expert adults exhibited different audience adaptation patterns. The present findings correspond with the pattern projected by the responses of the expert adults in Rubin's study. One apparent reason
can be attributed to the differences in the writing topic used in the two studies. Since the age range of his subjects (fourth grade to expert adults) was so broad, Rubin faced the difficult -- if not impossible -- task of choosing a topic that was relevant to the writers in each age group. After consulting several elementary and secondary teachers, Rubin chose the topic of glass recycling, one which may have had limited appeal to fourth- and eighth graders. Fifth grade students in the present investigation addressed a topic centered around a park, a more familiar one than glass recycling. Langer (1983) noted that a strong and consistent relationship exists between topic-specific background knowledge and the quality of students' writing. According to Britton (1973) the writing topic is important since it is directly related to the manner in which the writer expresses a relationship with the reader.

What appears to be of greatest significance in the present findings is the progressive sequence of the pattern of audience awareness that was projected by the students' writing. Students wrote compositions that became progressively shorter as the target audience increased in distance from the writer. Because of their previous experiences, students had more to say to a friend than to a teacher, and, more to say to a teacher than to a
than to a newspaper editor. With increasing distance, students' written language also became more syntactically complex, having longer t-units and longer clauses. This increased complexity is more representative of the language that one might use in formal situations (Jensen, 1973; Crowhurst, 1977) and it corresponds with the distance from the writer, or increased level of abstraction, which is suggested by the remote audience. Such responses clearly indicate the students' audience awareness.

**Sex**

The significant findings which were a result of sex differences were due to total length of words and mean clause length. Because of the consistent pattern produced by these measures, the results will be discussed simultaneously.

**Mean Total Number of Words/ Mean Clause Length**

As a group, girls in this investigation wrote longer compositions containing longer clauses than those written by boys. Surface level examination could imply that girls exhibited greater fluency and language that was more syntactically complex than boys. If interpreted in light of Rubin's (1978) findings of age related increases
on all measures of syntactic complexity, the present results seem to support such a generalization. However, this is inconsistent with Price and Graves (1980) who found no significant differences on any of the syntactic complexity measures which they used to examine the written samples of eighth grade males and females. When Blount (1969) compared the writing of eighth- and twelfth grade students, he also found no differences between boys and girls on any measure of syntactic complexity. Similarly, Herman (1975) reviewed male-female achievement on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, and also found little difference in the performance of males and females. From the present results, the generalization that the girls' language was more fluent and more syntactically complex is also inconsistent with Maccoby and Jacklin (1963) who found that girls and boys do equally well on measures of verbal performance until the age of 10 or 11 years. Fairwether (1976) and Macaulay (1978) reviewed the findings from studies on sex differences and each concluded that the findings of linguistic superiority by females were largely overstated. Considering these conclusions by researchers, and the fact that the present study limited students' writing to the persuasive mode -- one with which fifth graders have had
limited experience (Louisiana State Department of Education, 1981) — another interpretation may be more valid.

Moffett (1968) and Britton (1975) both theorized that written fluency is a readiness stage which precedes abstraction and is necessary before writers can control written language. Kirby and Kantor (1981) identified three measurable components of fluency -- vocabulary content, vocabulary knowledge, and syntactic fluency -- which are necessary before the writer gains authority of the task. As some students strive harder than others to overcome the obstacles and complexities related to transcription, content generation, and fluent writing, their writing may exhibit "rambling," which interferes with getting the job done and signifies an overall lack of rhetorical purpose (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1981). Such students, preoccupied with content generation, may write more, and actually say less. Jensen (1973) made a similar observation in her examination of the oral language of fifth graders regarding what she termed "careful" speech. She observed that the careful speech of these students, which produced longer clauses and a higher subordination ratio, also contained a higher incidence of garbles.

While no attempt was made to measure the "rambling" effect described by Bereiter and Scardamalia (1981), this
characteristic was observed in the present investigation, especially among the girls' compositions. Three of the non-gifted girls' longest compositions occurred when the writers strayed from the topic and used few, if any persuasive strategies. This was not a striking characteristic among the boys' compositions. However, observation of the students' papers indicated that six of the non-gifted boys wrote extremely short compositions.

Crowhurst (1978), Flower and Hayes (1981) and Ede (1984) all stressed the increased demands which the persuasive mode places on the writer. This factor alone increased the complexity of the writing task in the present study and could have introduced obstacles which some students had not yet learned to overcome. The observations made among the students' compositions suggest that the increased demands of persuasive writing may have caused some girls to lose sight of their purpose and "ramble." However, it appears that some boys may have responded to these increased demands by avoiding the task as much as possible -- writing very little. Graves (1973) described reactive writers, most of whom were boys, as those who exhibited erratic problem solving strategies. The different responses of the boys and girls in the present investigation suggest differences in the ways that boys and girls approach writing tasks (Graves, 1973).
These differences could simply reflect the way previous experiences affected students' ability to handle persuasive writing. Perhaps the present findings, like Crowhurst's (1977), would have been different if other writing modes had been measured.

Students' different responses to the persuasive writing may also have caused the extreme differences in the length of some boys' and girls' compositions. Such extremes could have significantly influenced the overall means for these groups of students. With this consideration, it appears that only slight, if any, differences may actually exist between boys' and girls' writing on the measures of syntactic complexity used in the present investigation.

Group-Sex Combination

The interaction of the group-sex combination resulted in significant findings for total number of words, mean t-unit, and mean clause length measures. Because of their consistent pattern, these findings will also be discussed simultaneously.
Mean Total Number of Words/ Mean T-Unit Length/
Mean Clause Length

The pattern produced by the interaction of the group-sex combination for the mean total number of words, mean t-unit length, and mean clause length of students' written compositions can be seen in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1
Means and Differences for the Total Number of Words, T-Unit Length, and Clause Length for the Group-Sex Combinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group-Sex Combination</th>
<th>Mean Total Number of Words</th>
<th>Mean T-unit Length</th>
<th>Mean Clause Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Boys</td>
<td>90.84</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Girls</td>
<td>81.24</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gifted Girls</td>
<td>100.76</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gifted Boys</td>
<td>54.36</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the length of gifted boys' compositions was longer, and also contained longer t-units and longer clauses than those of gifted girls, these differences were slight and the pattern they produced was consistent. This
suggests only slight, if any, actual difference between the performance of gifted boys and gifted girls.

Since the literature seldom addresses specific differences between gifted males and females, Callahan (1981) stated that generalizations must often be made from characteristics of the general population. The conclusion that there is little difference in the syntactic complexity of gifted boys' and gifted girls' written persuasive messages matches previous research findings. Fairwether (1976) and Macaulay (1978) concluded that the findings of linguistic superiority by females had been overstated when they reviewed the literature on sex differences. No significant differences in the syntactic complexity of boys' and girls' writing was found by either Price and Graves (1980) or Blount (1969). According to Maccoby and Jacklin (1963), boys and girls do equally well on verbal measures until they reach age 11. Herman (1975) reached a similar conclusion after examining the results of the National Assessment of Educational Progress. He, however, found that males and females did not differ significantly in writing performance between the ages of 9-17. Therefore, the present findings suggest that the writing of gifted boys and girls in this investigation is more alike than different.
As shown in Table 5.1, much larger differences were found between the syntactic complexity non-gifted boys' and non-gifted girls' compositions, but again, these results showed a consistent response pattern. Non-gifted girls wrote considerably longer compositions with longer t-units and longer clauses than non-gifted boys. These students' performance was previously discussed with the findings that resulted from the sex variable in the present investigation. As previously stated, their responses appear to be the result of the different ways that boys, whom Graves (1973) defined as reactive writers, and girls responded to the persuasive writing task in this investigation. Some of the non-gifted girls exhibited the "rambling" behavior described by Bereiter and Scardamalia (1981), as they tried to gain command of the persuasive writing mode. Non-gifted boys, however, appeared to exhibit problem solving behaviors similar to those found by Graves (1973). Unlike some of the non-gifted girls, whose compositions became excessively wordy, some of the non-gifted boys avoided the task as much as possible by writing extremely short compositions. The extreme lengths of some of the non-gifted boys and non-gifted girls could have significantly influenced the overall means on the measures of syntactic complexity for these two groups of students. It appears reasonable to conclude then, that as
a group, non-gifted boys and non-gifted girls also exhibit writing behaviors that are more alike than different.

Persuasive Appeals

As with the measures of syntactic complexity, the persuasive appeal measures used in the present investigation also produced strong evidence of fifth graders' audience awareness. Significant findings resulted from audience, the interactions of the audience-sex and audience-group combinations, sex, and group. In the following discussion, the persuasive appeal categories will be grouped according to the patterns which resulted from the frequency with which the students used them. As with the measures of syntactic complexity, the students' responses, again, produced a sequential, progressive pattern which can clearly be identified in terms of distance from the writer (Moffett, 1968; Britton, 1975).

Audience

Significant audience findings resulted from students' use of simple requests, reservations, societal appeals, interpersonal appeals, context creating appeals, environmental appeals, imperatives, and intensifiers.
Category 3: Simple Requests/Category 8: Reservations/
Category 13: Societal Appeals

The three audiences addressed by students in the present investigation represent varying distances, or levels of abstraction (Moffett, 1968), as they progress from an intimate (best friend), to an intermediate (teacher), to a remote (newspaper editor) relationship with the writer. Students' use of three appeal categories [Category 3: Simple Requests ("Please come."); Category 8: Reservations ("You can go...another time."); and Category 13: Societal Appeals ("We can...")] clearly reflected this progressive distance pattern of audience awareness. For each of these categories, student use was highest in compositions written to a best friend (intimate audience) and lowest in compositions written to a newspaper editor (remote audience).

Simple requests, reservations, and societal appeals included the types of appeals that suggest a more intimate relationship with the writer. Simple requests suggest the casual, informal, and unelaborated language that is often used among friends. Jenson (1973) found that fifth graders differentiate significantly between "casual" and "careful" speech. Similarly, Britton (1975) proposed that personal or expressive writing is the first kind that
young students use effectively. The use of reservations implies that the writers' familiarity with the audience enabled them to anticipate their readers' responses or objections, and respond accordingly. The writer's use of societal appeals suggests a common base, or set of values shared with the reader -- one to which both can relate. Considering these interpretations, one can readily understand why a young writer might use these kinds of appeals more to persuade a friend, with whom he had shared experiences, than with a newspaper editor, whom he had probably never met. That these types of appeals were used to some degree when writing to each of the audiences -- friend, teacher, and editor -- can be interpreted as further evidence of audience awareness demonstrated by these fifth graders.

Category 2: Interpersonal Relations

Moffett's (1968) audience theory is also supported by the students' use of Category 2: Interpersonal Relations (Ex. "I won't be your friend if...") since it includes strategies that also imply a more intimate relationship between the writer and reader. Students used appeals in this category for each of the audiences -- friend, teacher, and editor -- but they used them most when writing to intimate audience (best friend). Students'
lowest use of interpersonal appeals, however, was not when writing to the remote audience, but when writing to the teacher. This response could be interpreted as evidence of Britton's (1975) observation that the "pupil to examiner" audience is the one to which most classroom writing is directed (p.187). Britton explained that messages which flow from such a relationship are influenced by the extent to which the pupil and teacher share common cultural assumptions and the pupil's awareness of how matters stand. It should be noted, however, that the difference (an average of .01 times) in the frequency of students' use of interpersonal appeals when writing to a teacher and an editor was slight.

**Category 1: Context for Writing/Category**

**12: Environmental Appeals**

In the present study, students' use of broad appeal types -- those which a writer might use in more formal situations with persons unfamiliar to him -- produced a pattern that was the reverse of that produced by the more intimate appeal types. This pattern, however, also reflects a developmental sequence for the concept of audience (Moffett, 1968; Britton, 1975).

Category 1: Context for Writing (Ex. "I'm writing to...") is broad and appeals included in it imply a more
distant relationship with the writer. A writer might use such appeals with persons whose experiences are unknown to him since they tend to set the scene for the reader. Fifth graders in this study used context creating appeals most when writing to the remote audience (editor) and least when writing to the intimate one (friend).

Another broad category, which includes appeals that might focus on establishing a common reference for the writer and the reader was Category 12: Environmental Appeals (Ex. "There are shady trees."). Like the context creating appeals of Category 1, environmental appeals might be more appropriate for persons who had not shared common experiences with the writer. Students used these appeals considerably more when writing to the remote audience (editor, M = .25) than when writing to the intermediate (teacher, M = .09), or intimate (friend, M = .07) audiences. These two broad categories -- Context for Writing and Environmental Appeals -- exhibited the same pattern of audience awareness. This pattern sequence reflects decreasing levels of intimacy between the writer and the reader (Moffett, 1968; Britton, 1975).

Category 4: Imperatives/Category 6: Intensifiers

The students' use of Category 4: Imperatives (Ex. "Go to the park today.") and Category 6: Intensifiers (Ex.
"It's the best!") may also suggest Moffett's (1968) concept of audience awareness in terms of distance from the writer. These categories included appeals are general, unelaborated, and containing no explicit reason for the reader to respond favorably. With this interpretation, such appeals seem more appropriate for a remote audience. Students' use of these general categories -- intensifiers and imperatives -- was highest when writing to the remote audience (editor). Although no distinct effort was made to measure the style or quality of the students' writing, the scorers noted that some students wrote their letters to the editor more in the style of a commercial. Highest use of imperatives and intensifiers for a remote audience could, then, be a reflection of students' experiences with such appeal types from media. This response suggests the influence of previous experiences that were relevant to the writers (Britton, 1975).

With imperatives and intensifiers, the sequential pattern which was apparent by the students' use of other broad categories was interrupted. While students used imperatives and intensifiers most for the remote audience (editor), they also used these appeals least for the intermediate audience (teacher). The present investigation did not provide for student interviews,
which might have supported a specific interpretation of their responses. Therefore, one can only speculate what could have influenced the change in the students' pattern of audience awareness to occur only for these two categories.

Perhaps these fifth graders did not perceive imperatives and intensifiers in the general way that was previously described. These young writers may have considered imperatives to be more like commands. And, a less general interpretation of intensifiers (Ex. "It's great!") implies the casual language that students might use with their peers. With these more specific interpretations, students may have felt that neither imperatives nor intensifiers were appropriate for them to use when addressing an authority. It is possible that the students' lowest use of intensifiers and imperatives to a teacher was again, a reflection of the "pupil-examiner" audience relationship noted by (Britton, 1975). In such a relationship -- one which can be described as formal -- students might be reluctant to use imperatives or intensifiers. The students' frequent use of intensifiers when writing to a friend ($M = .05$), which was almost the same as when writing to the editor ($M = .06$), suggests the possibility that some of them may have perceived these types of appeals in a more specific way.
While the students' uses of imperatives and intensifiers lend themselves to different interpretations of their responses, both appear reasonable. Regardless of which interpretation one chooses, each implies discrimination by the students. Each suggests that students made choices and adjustments for the different audiences (Britton, 1975). Therefore, the students' responses demonstrate their awareness of audience.

**Audience-Sex Combination**

Significant findings resulted from the interaction of the audience-sex combination for Category 1: Context for Writing and also for the total number of appeal types used by the students.

**Category 1: Context for Writing**

Boys in this investigation used appeals in Category 1: Context for Writing significantly more (.10 times) than girls when writing to the newspaper editor. Girls, however, used context creating appeals only slightly more than boys (an average of .01 times) when writing to a teacher and to a best friend.

The boys' more frequent use of context creating appeals than girls when writing to the remote audience (editor) suggests possibly that the assignment topic could
have influenced their responses. When Herman (1975) examined the results of the National Assessment of Educational Progress, in the context of sex differences, he found that males generally preferred topics where the content included masculine activities and interests. In fact, he noted that nine-year-old boys performed better than girls only when they wrote about kites. Similarly, Graves (1973, 1975) concluded that the boys' territorial range in writing extended to topics that dealt with the surrounding metropolitan area and included national, world, and historical events. Considering these factors, the assignment topic (park) used in the present investigation and the distance, or extended territory suggested by the remote audience (editor) were both within the boys' interests. Graves also found that boys wrote more frequently in the third person than girls. A park topic and writing in the third person are both traits which lend themselves to writing in the descriptive mode -- one which is more familiar to fifth graders than the persuasive mode (Louisiana State Department of Education, 1981). These factors -- boys' interests, preference for writing in the third person, and park topic -- combined with the descriptive nature of context creating appeals, could have significantly influenced the boys' response to this category. This seems reasonable since Melas (1975)
concluded that descriptive themes appear to form the introductory background for students' writing.

Graves (1973, 1975) found that girls preferred a territorial range that referred more to home and school. Similarly, Melas (1975) found that girls, more frequently than boys, wrote about themselves in compositions related to everyday experiences. The more intimate audiences used in the present investigation -- friend and teacher -- represent what both Graves and Melas found to be the girls' preferences. However, although girls used context creating appeals more than boys when writing to a friend and to a teacher, the difference between these two groups was slight -- an average of only .01 times.

Although boys and girls in the present investigation responded differently in their use of the Context for Writing category, their responses reflect the same inconsistencies found by Herman (1975). Herman found that boys outperformed girls when writing about masculine topics and girls outperformed boys when writing personal messages. Perhaps the different responses of the boys and girls in the present investigation to the use of context creating appeals reflects the students' interests and the assignment topic. If so, there is little, if any, actual difference between the writing behavior of boys and girls at this grade level.
Boys used a wider variety of appeal types than girls when writing to the teacher and to a best friend. Girls, however, used more different types of appeals than boys when writing to an editor. The use of a wide range of appeal types suggests fluency, the ability to generate many different ideas or solutions and flexibility, the ability to shift one's thinking and draw from a wide variety of experiences. The boys' and girls' different responses could also imply influences which environmental factors may have had on the students' choices. That boys would use more different types of appeals to a teacher could suggest more of a "teacher to examiner" response (Britton, 1975). Since formal writing environments, which are characteristic of most elementary classrooms, often favor girls (Graves, 1973), previous experiences may have led boys to feel a need to show the teacher how much they knew. The boys' use of a wider variety of appeals than girls when writing to a friend suggests that the park topic may have been one which reflected many of the boys' common experiences.

Girls generally prefer topics that reflect home and school (Graves, 1973, 1975; Melas, 1975) -- primary territory (Graves, 1973). Since a park topic and writing
to a remote audience both imply extended territory, the girls also may have responded according to their interests. Unfamiliarity with topics related to extended territory (Graves, 1973) could have led them to use less discrimination in their approach when writing to the remote audience. This could have prompted them to use any and every possible appeal type. It is also possible that the girls viewed the writing task as another of their classroom assignments and responded according to the teachers' expectations (Britton, 1975) by showing how many ideas they could produce.

Each interpretation suggests the influence which environmental factors and previous experiences can have on students' writing (Graves, 1973; Britton, 1975). Each also suggests that these factors could have caused boys and girls to respond differently to each of the audiences. That these students did respond differently to these audiences can be viewed as further demonstration of their awareness of audience.

**Audience-Group Combination**

The interaction of the audience-group combinations produced significant results only for Category 1: Context for Writing.
Gifted students ($M = .03$) used context creating appeals more than non-gifted students ($M = .01$) when writing to the teacher. Gifted students ($M = .07$) also used these kinds of appeals more than non-gifted students ($M = .04$) when writing to a friend. These differences, however, were not very large. Non-gifted students ($M = .13$) used these types of appeals significantly more than gifted students ($M = .07$) when writing to the editor. This response appears inconsistent with the product modifications which emphasize audience and are characteristic of the gifted education curriculum (Renzulli, 1977). However, the non-gifted students' responses could also reflect their limited experience with real audiences. If this was the case, unfamiliarity with a remote audience may have led the non-gifted students to response with general, familiar, descriptive appeals that more closely resemble descriptive than persuasive writing. Melas (1975) found that descriptive writing seems to form the introductory background for 7 to 9 year-old students' written compositions. The writing behavior of the students in the present investigation, then, could then be interpreted as a reflection of their previous experiences (Britton, 1973), since fifth graders,
generally, have had more experience with descriptive than with persuasive writing (Louisiana State Department of Education, 1981). That the students did respond differently to each of the audiences can be interpreted as evidence of their audience awareness.

Sex

As a result of sex, there were significant findings only for Category 2: Interpersonal Relations.

**Category 2: Interpersonal Relations**

Results showed that girls used interpersonal appeals .04 times more frequently than boys. This appears consistent with Graves' (1973) conclusions that boys seldom used the first person form, especially I. It is also consistent with Melas (1975) who found that girls wrote about themselves and personal experiences more frequently than boys. Graves also concluded that girls preferred to write about topics more closely related to home and school. These preferences suggest the use of personal appeals, such as the kinds that might be included in Category 2: Interpersonal Relations. The students' different responses also suggest the important role of student interests in the choice of topic assignments (Melas, 1975).
Gifted/Non-Gifted

Significant findings for the group variable (gifted/non-gifted) resulted from the students' use of Category 3: Simple Requests, Category 14: Target Oriented Appeals, and for the Total Number of Appeal Types. Because the implications of each of these findings are related, the results of these measures will be discussed simultaneously.

**Category 3: Simple Requests/Category 14: Target Oriented Appeals/ Total Number of Appeal Types**

Non-gifted (M = .12) students used twice as many simple requests as gifted students (M = .06). Gifted students' use of more target oriented appeals (M = .13) was more than double that of non-gifted students (M = .06). Gifted students (M = .5.07) use of a wider range of appeal types was 1.0 times greater than non-gifted students (M = 4.07).

The higher frequency of non-gifted students' use of simple requests (Ex. "Please." or "Please come.") demonstrates less language elaboration, fluency, and flexibility. Conversely, the gifted students' use of a wider range of appeals denotes a greater degree of these characteristics. The use of target oriented appeals
suggests the writer's ability to use inference skills. Each of these characteristics requires mature thinking. Together, they may illustrate the "accumulated intuition derived from previous experiences" which Ede (1984, p. 145) recognized as an essential element of audience analysis.

The gifted students in this study participate in a resource program which provides a differentiated curriculum. The typical gifted education curriculum emphasizes content, process, environmental, and product modifications of the regular instructional program (Maker, 1982). The types of thinking skills required for the characteristics displayed by gifted students in this investigation are among the process modifications recommended by Gallagher (1975). The same characteristics were demonstrated in Anderson's (1982) investigation, where gifted students used a wider range of inferential-type strategies and a displayed greater ability to manipulate multiple ideas than non-gifted students. Stoddard and Renzulli's (1983) findings also provided evidence that the creative thinking abilities of gifted students could be enhanced through specific training activities.

The responses of the gifted students in this investigation suggest a behavior that is related to
previous experiences which may have been relevant to them (Britton, 1975). The only variables that produced significant group results appear to be directly related to the curriculum modifications which are characteristic of typical gifted education programs. Therefore, one should not assume that the non-gifted students might not have responded more like the gifted ones if they, too, had participated in classroom activities designed to develop creative thinking skills. Because of this, it seems reasonable to conclude that the present findings, like those of Rucker (1981), suggest that gifted and non-gifted students display writing behaviors that are more alike than different.

Conclusions

Within the limits of the present investigation, the following conclusions appear warranted:

1. Fifth grade students have a sense of audience awareness.

2. Fifth grade students demonstrated their audience awareness by the syntactic complexity of their written persuasive compositions to a best friend, according to the following measures: total number of words; mean t-unit length; and mean clause length. The remote
audiences attracted shorter messages containing language which may be described as more syntactically complex, or formal. Intimate audiences attracted longer messages containing language which may be described as less syntactically complex or more abbreviated and casual.

3. The syntactic complexity of the persuasive messages written by fifth graders to a best friend, a teacher, and a newspaper editor exhibited more similarities than differences between: boys and girls; gifted boys and gifted girls; and non-gifted boys and non-gifted girls.

4. Fifth grade students demonstrated their audience awareness by their written persuasive messages to a best friend, a teacher, and a newspaper editor, by their use of simple requests, reservations, societal appeals interpersonal appeals, context creating appeals, environmental appeals, intensifiers, and imperatives. The students used appeal types which suggest a more intimate relationship with a reader most when writing to the intimate audience (friend). They used the broad or general types of appeals most when writing to the remote audience (editor).
5. The persuasive messages written by boys and girls to a best friend, a teacher, and a newspaper editor, showed differences in their use of interpersonal appeals, context creating appeals and the range of appeal types used for these three audiences. Their responses suggest influence from environmental factors and previous experiences.

6. According to their written persuasive messages to a best friend, a teacher, and a newspaper editor, gifted and non-gifted students demonstrated differences by their use of simple requests; target oriented appeals; and the total number of appeal types used for these audiences. The frequency of gifted and non-gifted students' use of context creating appeals in their messages to each of these audiences also differed. Their responses suggest influence from previous experiences.

Implications

Results of the present investigation offer implications with regard to the syntactic complexity and persuasive appeals used to measure students' writing. The
significant findings also have implications for the writing performance of gifted and non-gifted students.

**Syntactic Complexity**

In the present study, Hunt's (1965) t-unit was used to measure the syntactic complexity of students' compositions. Although controversies surround its use (Witte, 1981), the t-unit is considered to be an objective, quantitative measure of writing (Issacson, 1984) which yields results that can be compared with other research studies.

In the present investigation, results obtained for mean t-unit length, $M = 10.66$, are consistent with those of Hunt (1965) who found a mean of 8.60 for fourth graders and 11.50 for eighth graders. They are also consistent with the findings of San Jose (1972) who found a mean of 10.40 for fourth graders and Crowhurst (1977) who found a mean of 11.75 for sixth graders. Since the present study limited students' compositions to the persuasive mode, as suggested by Crowhurst (1977), its results might best be compared with those of Rubin (1978) who also limited his subjects to writing in the persuasive mode. Rubin found that the mean t-unit length in the persuasive writing of fourth- and eighth graders, when averaged across three audiences, was 8.89 and 11.58. From this observation, one
might conclude that use of the t-unit appears to be a reliable measure of the syntax of written product. However, the consistency of the present findings with previous ones (Hunt, 1965; San Jose, 1972; Crowhurst, 1977; and Rubin, 1978) raises another issue. These figures suggest reliability of the t-unit, despite differences in the length of the writing samples, writing modes, writing purposes, or targeted audiences in the studies.

Differences in syntactic complexity among the three modes of discourse examined by Crowhurst (1977) led her to cite the necessity of controlling discourse mode in studies of syntactic complexity. As a result, she also proposed the establishment of developmental norms at each grade level in each of the four traditional modes of discourse -- narration, description, exposition, and argument. Rubin's (1978) study, like the present one, controlled the discourse mode by limiting students' writing to persuasion, as suggested by Crowhurst. Despite this similarity, the audience results of these studies were inconsistent. Rubin found no significant audience differences for sixth-, eighth-, or twelfth graders. Significant audience differences for fifth graders did, however, result from the present investigation.
The stark contrast between the Rubin's findings and the present ones may be explained by the importance of an appropriate assignment topic. When his study failed to produce significant audience findings for younger subjects, Rubin speculated that one influencing factor may have been the assignment topic -- glass recycling. The strong display of audience awareness demonstrated by students in the present study, where the assignment topic centered around a park, appears to confirm the influence that the assignment topic can have on students' writing performance, specifically on audience awareness.

Langer (1983) found that a strong and consistent relationship existed between the topic-specific background knowledge and the quality of tenth graders written samples. Audience awareness is recognized as being closely related to writing quality. Moffett (1968) and Britton (1975) both stress the importance of this relationship. Park (1982) credited audience awareness -- or the lack of it -- with making a piece of prose "shapely and full of possibility or aimless and empty" (p.247). Emphasis on the important role which audience, purpose, and topic play in shaping the language product was also stressed by Courts (1977). Herman (1975) found direct evidence of the influence of the writing topic on students' writing performance when he examined the results
of the National Assessment of Educational Progress. According to Britton (1975), the topic is directly related to the way a writer expresses his relationship to the reader. Familiarity with content was a factor stressed by Hilgers (1982) when he suggested ways to improve the quality of research in composition. If the topic is within a writer's realm of experiences, he can then freely attend to the writing task. This reduces bias and provides more assurance that an experiment will measure what it is intended to measure -- writing ability, audience awareness, audience adaptation, etc. Emphasizing the importance of such a variable, Hilgers stated his opinion that, in an experiment, "the influence of degree of knowledge is likely to be stronger than the influence of a particular training program -- or of any research variable, be it ethnicity, previous education, or sex" (p. 385). The present findings strongly suggest that the assignment topic should receive consideration that is equal to that given the writing mode or grade level variables proposed by Crowhurst (1977).

**Persuasive Appeals**

When discussing the present findings, the context creating and environmental appeals were described as similar because of their broad scope. Another similarity
between these appeals might be noted in relation to the students' use of these categories. The appeals in each of these categories are descriptive in nature, since they provide background information for the reader. Therefore, the students' use of these types of appeals might reflect their past writing experiences which, as fifth graders, focused more on descriptive than persuasive writing (Louisiana State Department of Education, 1981). Moffett (1968) and Britton (1975) both stress the importance of meaningful language experiences to students' writing. The descriptive nature of context creating appeals may explain the fact that more significant findings resulted for Category 1: Context for Writing than for any of the other persuasive measures.

Although the appeal categories used in the present investigation were those also used by Rubin (1978), the results of these investigations produced striking differences. In Rubin's study, the only group for whom significant audience differences resulted was that of the expert adults. The topic differences which may have contributed to this outcome have already been discussed. In addition to this, procedural differences between Rubin's study and the present one were noted. Students in Rubin's study wrote in their individual classroom settings within time limitations, after receiving oral
instructions. They also viewed a film titled "Recycling our Resources" (Oxford Films, 1972, cited in Rubin, 1978). However, the expert adults, for whom significant audience differences resulted, timed their own writing sessions, wrote privately with written directions, and did not view the film. By contrast, the present study controlled the length of the writing sessions for all students. All sessions were also conducted by the experimenter, thus providing greater assurance that all students would receive equal information about the writing tasks.

A similar lack of situational control was noted in studies by Crowhurst (1977) and Kroll (1984a) where directions had been carefully prepared, but were administered to subjects by a variety of teachers. In these cases, personal variables could have significantly affected the results of the investigations. Kroll's subjective method of sample selection also produced an interesting difference when compared with the method used in the present investigation. In Kroll's study, where teachers were asked to choose students ranging in ability from good to average, girls outnumbered boys. In the present study, however, where students were identified according to specific, objective criteria, boys outnumbered girls. This difference reflects Graves'
(1973) observation that situational factors in elementary classrooms more often favor girls.

While composition research now includes a variety of methods, techniques, and procedures -- case studies, naturalistic studies, protocol analyses -- researchers who conduct experimental studies to measure children's audience awareness should carefully consider situational variables. The extent to which such variables could significantly affect the outcome of an investigation -- its reliability -- should not be ignored when designing experiments or when drawing conclusions. Hilgers (1982) recognized such factors as an influence on an experiment's power, or ability to answer the questions which the experiment was intended to answer.

Researchers who attempt to measure writers' audience awareness often have limited contact with their subjects. Therefore, they must often rely on the use of visual or auditory stimuli -- films, stories, recordings, etc. -- to provide background information for the writer. When this is the case, the writing stimulus must be carefully selected. In addition to the interest and content considerations related to topic choice, the results of the present investigation strongly suggest that another important consideration is variety. When the writing stimulus offers a range of information from which a writer
may select appropriate items, it allows for individual differences among the subjects. The ability to choose permits each writer to respond from his previous experiences.

Written Composition and Gifted Students

One might expect that the gifted/non-gifted factor in this investigation would have produced more significant findings than actually resulted. However, Rucker (1981) also found that gifted and non-gifted students exhibited more similarities than differences. When comparing the use of word associations by gifted and non-gifted students, Williams and Tillman (1968) concluded that these students' performance levels did not differ significantly.

The assumption that all gifted students can write is a false one. This is not to say that many, if not most, of these students do not have the potential to become good writers. But learning to write is not "analogous to learning to walk" (Flynn, 1981, p. 1). A common misconception about gifted students is that "teaching is not necessary and that the gifted can be self-taught" (Kaplan, 1981, p. 354). The present findings suggest the importance of content considerations for specific "core experiences" (Roberson, 1984, p.137) that
give appropriate attention to the scope and sequence of basic skill development within the gifted curriculum. The persuasive writing mode used in the present investigation is one which had not yet been introduced to fifth graders (Louisiana State Department of Education, 1981). A comparison of the creative writing of gifted and non-gifted students may have produced more contrast between these groups. Since creative thinking skills are among the major process modifications included in the gifted education curriculum (Maker, 1982), many teachers of the gifted also focus on creative writing strategies with their students. Perhaps the results of the present investigation would have shown more differences if other writing modes had been measured.

The present investigation made no attempt to measure writing quality, nor did it attempt to measure the students' mastery of mechanical, or surface level skills, such as punctuation. Hunt (1966) found that mastery of these skills appeared to be a major cause of differences in the writing of superior and average students in his study where sentence length was one of the measures used. But Hunt, also, did not measure quality. Further examination of the compositions written by students in the present investigation may also have shown that gifted students, like the superior students in Hunt's
study, had a better command of the punctuation than non-gifted students. However, this still would not mean that all gifted students were good writers. Although mastery of these skills contributes to effective writing, it does not guarantee that one will be an effective writer.

Another common misconception about gifted students is that they are equally gifted in all academic areas (Zaffrann, 1981). Butler-Adams (1982), who studied the language ability in children of high measured intelligence, expressed the fact that children who speak standard English and perform well on IQ tests may still display a wide range of scholastic achievement and linguistic proficiency. She added that students with high academic potential are often noted for their poor achievement in both the mechanical skill of writing and the quality of their written products.

There are "numerous and countless definitions of giftedness" (Renzulli, 1981, p.55). Like the definition used in the present investigation, giftedness can be limited to performance areas, such as academic achievement, that are considered for special programs or it can be expanded to include liberal interpretations (Witty, 1958, cited in Renzulli, 1981) of the degree or level of excellence that one must attain (Renzulli,
Perrone (1983) perceives giftedness as situationally determined and defined and believes that all assessments should be viewed contextually. Davidson and Sternberg (1982) expressed the opinion that gifted students are probably above average, but not necessarily gifted. They proposed that the distinctive characteristic of intellectual giftedness is insight. While the procedural guidelines used to identify gifted students in the present investigation consider creativity, intelligence, and academic performance, they do not dismiss the possibility that some students could have been classified as gifted without evidence of significant language achievement (reading). These identification guidelines in Louisiana's Pupil Appraisal Handbook — Bulletin 1508 (1982) also make no provision for the consideration of a students' writing ability. The differences between the written compositions of gifted and non-gifted students in this investigation appear to reflect something other than differences in the students' writing ability. Among the 20 persuasive measures used in this investigation, only three categories produced significant group (gifted/non-gifted) effects. Since the characteristics of the appeals in each of these three categories typify elements of the gifted education curriculum, the present findings seem to strongly reflect
the gifted students' experiences in the gifted program. Perhaps the non-gifted students would have responded more like the gifted ones if they were exposed to the process modifications included in the gifted education curriculum.

Since the typical gifted education curriculum is one which focuses on product modifications that emphasize real audiences (Renzulli, 1977), one may wonder why the compositions written by the gifted students did not produce more significant audience differences. The current findings suggest that the resource program in which these gifted students participate may not give equal emphasis to product and process modifications.

Recommendations for Further Research

The findings of the present investigation suggest the following areas for further research:

1. Future researchers should determine the extent to which the patterns of syntactic complexity and persuasive appeals exhibited by fifth graders in the present investigation are characteristic of particular age groups.

2. Future researchers who study gifted and non-gifted students might make an effort to specifically identify
students according to verbal aptitude and explore their abilities in different writing modes.

3. Future researchers might explore the extent to which the performance of non-gifted students might be improved by the kinds of modifications included in the gifted education curriculum.

4. Students in the present investigation demonstrated audience awareness when writing to audiences that represented a peer and two adults -- one known and one unknown. Future studies of audience awareness might consider whether finer degrees of audience awareness can be detected by examining students' writing.

5. Future researchers who investigate the extent to which writing mode, purpose, intended audience, and length of writing sample influence findings that result from the use of the t-unit as a writing measure should also consider the influence of the assignment topic.

Summary

The results of the present investigation reflect important aspects of Britton's (1975) and Moffet's (1968)
theories which emphasize the role of students' previous experiences in their acquisition of effective communication skills. These theorists stress the importance of an environment which centers on students and relies on skillful teachers to provide appropriate learning experiences that direct, but do not stifle, students' natural tendencies. In this kind of environment, written communication becomes a natural outgrowth of students' experiences and reflects their encounters with a wide variety of experiences.

The present investigation also offers evidence of the importance of students' interests, variety, and content considerations which should be given to writing assignment topics. Familiarity with a topic enables students to respond according to their present levels of development. Appropriate background and readiness have been recognized as important pre-requisites for decoding language (reading). These factors are pre-requisites which are equally important for encoding language (writing).

As with the other language arts, writing teachers must understand and recognize developmental differences among their students, identify the students' strengths and weaknesses, and determine the most appropriate instructional levels for the students' success. From this point, they should proceed with instructional strategies
that are compatible with students' stages of development, interests, and experiences. These factors are particularly important when activities are intended to enhance students' audience awareness. Unless the young writer can first respond from his own perspective, he should not be expected to project from another's point of view.
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APPENDIX A

SEGMENTATION RULES FOR

MEASURING SYNTACTIC COMPLEXITY
RULES FOR SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS*

(* Rubin (1978) pp. 136-137; Supplementary to those given in Crowhurst, 1977)

Counting Words

1. Contractions (she's, I'll) are counted as two words.

2. Numbers, whether presented in numerals or words, count as single words.

3. Compound words are tallied as a single word if usually rendered as a single word (e.g. bedroom, but count as two words if hyphenated or usually rendered as distinct words, e.g. thank you).

4. Proper names whose minimal designation requires more than one word, count as one single word (e.g. Lindberg Senior High School", "Eden Prairie"). But if further designated, count as two or more (e.g. Hopkins’ Lindberg Senior High School = 2 words.

5. When a word is repeated as an intensifier, tally only the first mention plus the first repetition (e.g. "Please, please, please come to the park with me. = 5 words). Cross out additional repetitions.

6. When a single word seems to have been accidentally omitted, supply the missing word and include it in the word count. (e.g., "If you don’t want to go/ you don’t have --/= 12 words.)

7. Delete and cross out all sentence fragments as well as any word strings which are so illegible as to be unintelligible.

8. "Thank you" is not to be considered a fragment, but rather an independent clause.

9. Similarly, "Please, please" should be attached to an adjacent sentence as a free modifier if it's at all reasonable to do so.

10. Delete from analysis salutations, whether introduced
by "Dear ..." or not. (e.g. "Mrs. Smith, I was wondering / if ...".)

11. Delete from analysis all closings and signatures (e.g., Sincerely, Tony, your next door neighbor.)

12. Include any part of the message which might be placed after a signature, but do not tally "P.S."

13. Some word counting conventions:
   a. Count "etc." as a word. No need to inflate T-unit lengths by counting repetitions, though.
   b. Count "alot" as one word; "a lot" as two.

Counting Clauses and T-units

1. In defining a T-unit, consider as a clause only units which contain explicit subject and finite verb.  
   e.g. Desirous of relief, Wayne took refuge in delusion// is one main clause.
   His mystical demeanor was a shell to hide in// consists of one main clause, but-
   His mystical demeanor was a shell// that Wayne hid in// consists of a main and a subordinate.

2. Mark the end of a T-unit with a double stroke (///).  
   Mark with a single stroke (/) any clause ending within a T-unit.

3. T-unit is defined as one independent clause with all subordinate clauses attached, as well as free modifying phrases. Punctuation is of no concern.

4. "Therefore", "but", "however", and "for" are coordinating conjunctions. They introduce independent clauses.

5. "Because", "although", "if", "whereas" are subordinating conjunctions. They introduce subordinate clauses.

6. Relative pronouns ("that", "who", "which") are frequently deleted in English. Nonetheless, subordinate clauses which they might have introduced can be discerned.  
   e.g. He is the one / I want/  
       Go to the same store / we went to yesterday.
7. The word "so" can be either a coordinating or a subordinating conjunction, depending on context. If you can substitute "therefore" in its place, treat "so" as coordinating. e.g. Go to the store / so we can eat. He went to the store // so I think // he will return shortly //

8. Coordinate imperative constructions
e.g. Go to the store and buy some more erasers. Since imperatives contain no explicit subject-noun anyhow (the "You" is understood). Code what seems to be conjoined imperatives this way:
   Save your bottles and bring them to a recycling center//
Treat coordinate imperative constructions the same way you'd treat any other compound verbal.
e.g. He went to the store but forgot the erasers/
   Frank went to the store and thought/ he was supposed to buy apricots/

9. "That is"
In common usage, this tag doesn't really serve as a clause. It predicates nothing. Do not treat it as a T-unit or clause. Simply attach "that is" to the nearest convenient clause and just count the words.

10. Tag Questions
e.g. (a) It's a beautiful day, isn't it?
   (b) Recycle your glass, won't you?
   (c) We should recycle glass, don't you think?
   (d) We should recycle glass. And why not?
These are tough. Put the tags in sentence initial position and seeing what would happen. In example (b), it seems that this is all one independent clause, a form of request. Code it the same as 
   (b') Won't you recycle your glass/
In examples (a) and (c), putting the tags in sentence initial position makes it appear that we have complex sentences of this type
   (a') Isn't it/ (that) it's a beautiful day//
   (c') Don't you think / (that) we should go to the park//
They get coded as one T-unit, but two clauses. Example (d) is simply an example of a sentence fragment. Cross out "And why not."
SEGMENTATION RULES*


1. A T-unit consists of one independent clause with all the subordinate clauses attached to it.

2. Mark the end of a t-unit with a double stroke (//); mark with a single stroke (/) any subordinate clause which falls within the t-unit.
   e.g. As Tom got dressed for the show that afternoon/ he felt nervous.// The feeling was not unusual/ because there is something about working with a killer whale/ that makes you nervous.//
   2 t-units, 5 clauses.

3. Ignore mispunctuation in analyzing into t-units.
   e.g. Just think/ how much fun we could have staying back here. Being obnoxious and having a ball.//

4. Eliminate (i.e. strike out):
   a. garbles, i.e. unattached sentence fragments and unintelligible word strings;
   b. interjections (Hey! Hi, Jane!);
   c. tag questions (won’t you, isn’t he);
   d. parenthetical expressions (I guess, I think, you see).
   e.g. It’s a kind of skinny tree, I guess.
      And there’s a bush, I think, about five or ten feet from the tree. You see, I like him.

5. Retain:
   a. fillers like now, well;
   b. exclamatory words that introduce a longer expression,
      e.g. Boy, was he surprised.

6. Consider contractions (she’s, they’re) as two words.

7. Count compound words as one word if normally written as one word (bedroom, breakfast), as two words if hyphenated (fox-catcher).

8. Count as one word dates (October 1) and proper names consisting of more than one word (New York, Clear Lake National Park); but Tuesday, October 1, 1975 = 3 words; St. Paul, Minnesota = 2 words.
9. Count numbers as one word whether written in digital form (171) or in words (one hundred seventy-one).

10. Treat so as either a coordinate or a subordinate conjunction according to context. Is so is equivalent to "in order that," treat it as a subordinate conjunction; otherwise it will be equivalent to "and so" or "and therefore" and is to be treated as coordinate conjunction.

11. Treat for as a coordinate conjunction whether it occurs at the beginning of a sentence or between two clauses within a sentence.

12. Analyze direct discourse as follows:
   a. Discard syntactically incomplete expressions (e.g., answers to questions which lack the repetition of the question elements), and one- or two-word answers to questions (yes, all right) unless they occur before/after he said or unless they introduce a longer expression (e.g. All right, let's go). Treat as a direct object the first expression before/after he said; this is to be done whether that expression is a sentence or some smaller fragment.

   b. Analyze subsequent words in the direct discourse into t-units according to the regular rules.

   e.g. John said, /"I really like Minneapolis.// But Chicago is my home// and most of my friends are there."//
   "All right," I said happily.//
   "Well, Sara," George drawled,/ "You take the canoe."//

13. Supply any single word (or two words contracted) accidentally omitted, and count in the total.

Recording the Tally

In the blanks provided on the tally sheets, report counts of the following items, in the following order:
1. Number of words (after deletions and additions)
2. Number of T-units
3. Total number of clauses (dependent + independent)
4. Number of logical adverbial subordinate clauses
5. Number of logical coordinating conjunctions
APPENDIX B

PERSUASIVE APPEAL CATEGORIES
DIRECTIONS FOR CLASSIFYING APPEALS
EXAMPLES OF PERSUASIVE APPEALS
PERSUASIVE APPEAL CATEGORIES*

(*Categories 1-18 are from Rubin, 1978)

Category 1: Context for Writing
Category 2: Interpersonal Relations
Category 3: Simple Requests
Category 4: Imperatives
Category 5: Norms
Category 6: Intensifiers
Category 7: How to Go to the Park
Category 8: Reservations
Category 9: Amount of Park Use
Category 10: Objective Information About the Park
Category 11: Publicity
Category 12: Environmental Appeals
Category 13: Societal Appeals
Category 14: Target Oriented Appeals
Category 15: Writer's Credibility
Category 16: Thanks
Category 17: Broad Context
Category 18: Transitions

Total Number of Appeals

Total Number of Appeal Types
INSTRUCTIONS FOR CATEGORIZING

PERSUASIVE STRATEGIES*

(*Rubin, 1978)

1. The basic unit of analysis is the T-unit. Every T-unit must be coded at least once. This guarantees that every finite prediction will be coded once.

2. There are two principles which guide the categorization of assertions. Frequently an assertion may seem to fit into more than one content category. First, ask first what is the dominant mode of appeal? Second, what is the most specific category that this statement may fall into? What category will define it most precisely?

4. Some T-units contain compound predicates and therefore contain distinguishable themes. Where each theme seems to fall into a distinct content category, such T-units may count as more than one appeal.

5. Questions, when they function as veiled assertions, should be coded as if they were the corresponding assertion.

6. Clauses containing "unless" conditionals signal that the main clause describes a benefit.

Some Clarifications of Category Definitions

Category 1: Context for Writing.
Context for message categories simply express what it was that initiated this communication. They legitimize the opening of the channel. By themselves, they are not intended to make requests or to offer arguments.

Category 2: Interpersonal Relations. These statements are concerned with establishing a mood, maintaining interpersonal links. By themselves, they do not offer reasons for going to the park.

Statements should be classified as stylistic devices only as a last resort. The critical question is,
considered in context, does this statement offer some basis for going to the park or for a generally positive mindset, or is its sole function to "set up" or prepare the way for some statement which does function to argue. Such stylistic devices should be distinguished from Asides and Scene Setting (Category 12- Environmental Appeals). The latter do not serve to link statements within the text as do simple requests.

Statements of encouragement either provide not rationale, or else very circumscribed or nonelaborated rationales. On the other hand, they are definitely and directly related to encouraging going to the park.

The polite marker "please" or "would you..." are grounds for qualifying an appeal as a request rather than an imperative. An imperative is imperative form i.e., has then pronoun subject "you" deleted.

Differences between imperatives and non-evaluative statements of "how to do it" may be subtle, and are probably best discerned by grammatical markers. e.g., You can save them in a box and bring them in each month.

Save them in a box and bring them in each month.

Norms are appeals which attempt to regulate behavior by reference to absolute standards. They state regulative rules without any rationale for their applicability.

Statements which assert that it can/can't make a difference are really rebuttals to the anticipated objection, "My effort won't really matter."

Intensifiers usually refer back vaguely to the recycling solution or pollution problem as a whole.

Statements describing ways to be involved specify kinds of actions that can be taken, as opposed to just requesting or demanding that the person act. Note that these categories do not distinguish between actions appropriate for the target and those true of people, in general.

Note also that these suggestions for involvement usually don’t include the consequences of going to the park.
Sometimes there is only a subtle difference between environmental and societal appeals.

For a statement to qualify as target-oriented, it must contain some explicit second person marker. e.g., You won't have to spend your money at the park. This holds true, even when the audience is the newspaper readership.

The difference between norms and "others want you to do it/ will regard you positively" lies in the amount of elaboration and the specific mention of second person.

Personal appeals may frequently look like requests. By convention, include in this category, any appeal which expresses the writer's desire for compliance explicitly.

Thanks should be easy to spot. Personalized thanks have been distinguished from others because these, too, reflect the use of ethos.

The category of "objective facts" should be used only when some benefit of going to the park is not implicated more or less directly, but the statement still concerns the venture.
SPECIFIC EXAMPLES* FOR
PERSUASIVE APPEAL CATEGORIES

(*Taken from papers written by students in pilot study.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Context for Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a. Channel Opening | -I'm writing to ask...
| | -I would like for you to put this...
| | -I would like to tell you about...
| | -I would encourage you to go...
| | -I'm writing about the field trip...
| | -I know you're still thinking about where you want to take us
| | -I'm sure all of you know about the park called...
| | -I have an idea for our field trip...
| | -Have you thought of going to the park? |
| b. Assignment | -In our class, we have to write...
| | -In our class, we're writing to ask... |
| 2. Interpersonal Relations | Includes target's relations with writer and with others.
| -I hope you go more often. |
| -I really want you to go with me. |
| -Biggest reason I want you to come is so I'll have someone to hang around with. |
| -If you have other plans and can't come, I won't have anyone to play with. |
| -See you there! |
| -We'll probably see other kids. |
-I promise we'll have fun.
-I need someone to play with.
-If I don't have someone, I might get bored.
-It's not my fault if we're going to be mad.

3. Simple Requests
-Please come...
-Please change your mind.
-Let us go.
-Would you like to go?
-Could we go?
-Do you want to go or not?
-Why can't we go to the park?
-It's just an idea, please think about it.
-Please take consideration into going to the park.
-Wouldn't you like to go to the park today?
-I'm asking you please.
-Please consider this idea.
-Since I've wanted to... and it's only today, why don't you come with me?
-Do you want to go see a movie about animals or do you want to go see animals alive and free?
-Please don't turn me down.

4. Imperatives
-Say yes.
-So spend the day at the park.
-Tell people to get off their rear ends and stop working and go to the park today.
-Just spend one day, or one afternoon or a morning at.....
-Listen people, come to the park.
-Just go and have some fun at...
-Put this in your newspaper.
-Go to the park today.
-Get out and go.
-Come on.

5. Norms
-We should spend a day at... Usually marked linguistically by
I feel the community needs to go...

6. Intensifiers
   a. Possibility of Impact
      - Maybe you would enjoy it and come more often.
      - People will know what it's like and then go regularly.
      - Then everybody will know about the park.
      - Then the park will be filled and everybody will have fun.
   b. Other Intensifiers
      - It'll be a blast!
      - It's a great opportunity so try not to pass it up.
      - We'll have lots of fun.
      - It's a fun place.
      - It's nice.
      - It's a good place to go when you want to have fun.
      - It will make everybody happy.
      - Some people say it's the greatest park ever made.
      - Everybody has fun...even you.
      - It's fantastic!
      - It's the best park in the world.

7. How to go to the park
   - You can get there by water in a boat.
   - All you do is drive out there.
   - Go on I-10 and follow the signs.

8. Reservations
   A. Drawbacks
      - It'll be better than...
      - We'll have more fun than...
      - It doesn't cost as much as...
      - At the game, you just have to sit there...
      - At the zoo, you can't feed the animals without permission.
      - The fair will last one and a half months and the park is
only open on Saturday.
-We won't be as tired as ...
-It's time to get away from
  brother and sister and kids
to babysit.

B. Refutations
-You can go to the movies
  another time.
-I know you have...., but
  try to break/change...
-Are you sure you don't want
to go?
-Wouldn't you rather go to...?
-...Now do you still want
to go to...
-You can go with friends
  another day...
-You can change your schedule,
can't you?
-You can skip this time.
-Doesn't that sound a lot better?
-But what if nobody wants to go to...
-If you don't want to see the deer,
  we can fish and crab.
-Why go to the movies to see animals
  when we can see real ones at the park?
-Doesn't that sound better than going
  shopping with your mother?
-Why do we have to go to the art gallery?
-Probably your dad will make you do
  some work bringing him tools and
telling you to do this and that.
-You'll just miss one game.
-You'll just be watching the
game and not playing.
-If your dad is at work, then ask
  your mom before she goes to work.
-If you still don't want to go, then
  let's have a vote.
-I know you don't want to argue about
  that, so...
-Come on, admit it, you'd like the park.
-We like your ideas, but...

9. Amount of Park Use
-People aren't really going places like
the park anymore.
-I hope people take advantage of this opportunity and use our park and all the things in it.
-Many people don't know about it.

10. Objective Information About the Park Offers no problem/solution orientation.
-Location, e.g. It's on...
-Date of an event.
-Hours/Days open
-Cost of Admission
-Area/Size
-Specific Features, e.g.,
    There is/are...
    -Boat Launch
    -Events, e.g., Critter Crawl
    -Contents, e.g., Picnic tables, restrooms, etc.
    -Restrictions/exclusions, e.g.,
        No hunting, No guns allowed...
    -Kind of Park, e.g., Wildlife Park

11. Publicity
-Tell about going and having more fun than other places.
-If you've been, write a letter to the editor, like I did...
-Publish an article that might tell about...
-Everybody's been talking about the park...

12. Environmental
A. Specific
    -Shady trees/kinds of trees
    -Bike Trail
    -Specific kinds of animals
    -Places to swim and fish

B. General
    -Educational
    -Wide open spaces
    -Smells wonderful
    -Clean and refreshing
    -Cool Air
    -Gives taste of nature
    -So much to do
    -Place to enjoy sunshine and
enjoy what God gave us
- Undisturbed forest

13. Societal
A. Specific
   You/We/Others can...
   - specific examples e.g.,
     food, activities, enjoyment,
     nature, meet people.
   Democratic
   - If we had a vote...
   - Why don’t you ask everybody...
   - Why don’t you ask the class...
   - We took a vote...
   - How about if we vote...
   - Ask what we’d rather do...

B. General
   You/We/Others can...
   - examples: learn

C. Other Benefits
   - I’ll give you the sticker
     you wanted.
   - We’re old enough not to be
     left behind.
   - We wouldn’t disturb others.
   - ...get away from sisters
     and stress.
   - It will be nice to have hotdogs
     one night and hamburgers the next.
   - We’ll be nice
   - We would behave
   - We won’t fight or get dirty.
   - We wouldn’t give any trouble.

14. Target Oriented
A. Money
   - Specific events are free
   - Free food
   - Don’t have to buy the
     drinks...
   - You get a penny a pound for
     every fish you catch.
   - No admission
   - Everything is free
   - Only $1.00 per person

B. Gratification
   Includes most
- Adults feel like a kid again.
- You’ll feel happy all day.
- You’ll have more fun instead of working.
- You’ll enjoy the beautiful/peaceful...
- You can relax.

C. Home Environment
- You can bring your girlfriend, because it’s open to everybody.
- You can bring your mom and dad (or other family members)
- You can have a reunion.
- We could walk Dutchess...
- We can bring my puppy and...

D. Specific Benefits
- Swimming lessons
- Escape the rush of the city
- Wilderness Awareness Programs
- Doesn’t take long
- Old people can get the young out of themselves.
- We’ll ask the principal if you can have the day off.
- We can have a treasure hunt.
- If we do good on our test...

E. Other General Benefits
- Might learn something
- Make everyone happy
- Won’t hurt a thing
- Fun for the whole family
- Won’t b close to home
- Get to do more things
- Won’t be squished up in school room...
- Short drive
- Not far

F. Costs
- I won’t be your friend.
- I’ll be disappointed.
- You’ll miss a lot of fun.
- You’ll miss the deer.
- Can’t shoot...
- I’ll be mad.
- I would have to stay home.
-I'll cry.

15. Writer's Credibility
A. Expertise
   -I think the class/you/community would like it.
   -I guarantee you, we'll have fun.
   -I know we won't be bored.
   -I know you value my opinion.
   -I have one park in mind.
   -I feel that the park is a good place to go.
   -I know you can make good decisions, but I feel...
   -I think you like animals, don't you...
   -I think it's a wonderful park.
   -And, if you like the outdoors, it's the place to go.
   -I think the park would be better for education, etc.
   -More than that, I'm a student and you're a teacher, so I know their personality and what they like to do better than you do.
   -I would advise...
   -Take my advice and...
   -I bet even you would like it.

B. Cooperation
   -Mom said you could spend the night.
   -Mom will take us.
   -I'll get Jason to come.
   -I was excited about Mom saying you could come.
   -I could bring my go-cart and you could bring yours.
   -We could ride in my dad's boat.
   -Dad will take us in his boat to fish.
   -I talked to everyone in the class and...
   -Since the class wants to go...
   -I talked to them and they want to come.
C. Participation
   - Since I go there a lot...
   - I've been there and it's terrific.
   - My cousin went there.
   - Me and my family went...
   - I recently went...
   - I had my party there.
   - I've been there many times.

D. First Person Appeal
   - It would mean a lot to us.
   - Do it for the class.

   Third Person Appeal
   - The park wants you!

16. Thanks
    - Thank you.
    Thanks...

17. Broad Context
    - If you want to go to a peaceful place, go to the park.
    - You'll always meet nice, generous, and helpful people.

18. Transitions
APPENDIX C

GUIDELINES FOR IDENTIFYING
GIFTED STUDENTS
GUIDELINES FOR IDENTIFICATION OF GIFTED STUDENTS*

(*Pupil Appraisal Handbook -- Louisiana Bulletin 1508, pp. 51-54.)

GIFTED
I. DEFINITION

Gifted children and youth are those who possess demonstrated abilities that give evidence of high performance in academic and intellectual aptitude.

NOTE: Gifted at the preschool level and in grades K-3 means the possession of high intellectual and academic potential.

II. PROCEDURES FOR SCREENING

A. Sensory screening shall be conducted whenever vision or hearing problems are suspected.

B. Each school system shall develop and implement procedures for screening students suspected of being gifted. The screening criteria shall not exceed the criteria for eligibility.

C. At least two regular school staff members such as the principal or designee, teachers, counselors, pupil appraisal personnel, and other professional staff shall conduct a review of the screening information with the student's teacher.

III. CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY

A. High Potential: Preschool and Kindergarten. A student at the preschool or kindergarten level must meet Criterion 1 and 2. The student shall:

1. Obtain a score of at least three standard deviations above the mean (SFL or ELP) on an individually administered test of intellectual abilities appropriately standardized on students of this age and administered by a psychologist, or

2. Obtain a combined score of at least 10 when scores are entered into the cells of the Standard Matrix, at least four points of which are earned on the aptitude/intelligence test.
B. **High Potential:** Grades 1, 2, and 3. Criterion 1, 2, 3, or 4 must be met. The student shall:

1. Obtain a score at least two and a half standard deviations above the mean (SFL or ELP) on an individually or group administered test of intellectual abilities appropriately standardized on students of this age and administered by a psychologist, or

2. Obtain a combined score of at least seven when scores are entered into the cells of the Standard Matrix, at least three points of which are earned on the aptitude/intelligence, or

3. Obtain a combined score of at least six when scores are entered into the cells of the Standard Matrix and a recommendation for classification as gifted from the pupil appraisal personnel who conducted an individual evaluation of the student in accordance with the evaluation procedures, or

4. Have been previously classified as high potential at the preschool or kindergarten level according to the criteria specified in this section for preschool and kindergarten level students.

C. **GIFTED:** Grades 4-12. Criterion 1, 2, or 3 must be met. The student shall:

1. Obtain a score at least two standard deviations above the mean (SFL or ELP) on an individually or group administered test of intellectual abilities appropriately standardized on students of this age and administered by a psychologist, or

2. Obtain a combined score of at least seven when scores are entered into the cells of the Standard Matrix, at least two points of which are earned on the aptitude/intelligence test, or

3. Obtain a combined score of at least six when scores are entered into the cells of the Standard Matrix and a recommendation for classification as gifted from the pupil appraisal personnel who conducted an individual evaluation of the student in accordance with the evaluation procedures.
NOTE: Prior to entry into the fourth grade, students identified as gifted must be re-evaluated according to the eligibility criteria for Grades 4 through 12 in order to qualify for continued classification as gifted. However, if a student is initially identified as gifted in the third grade, this re-qualification is not required.

IV. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION


   The individual evaluation shall include at a minimum:

   1. An individual evaluation of intellectual abilities administered by a psychologist using nondiscriminatory assessment procedures and an instrument or instruments appropriately standardized for students this age.

   2. An individual evaluation of reading and math skills using an achievement test standardized at the first grade level.

   3. An interview with the student’s parent(s).

B. High Potential and Gifted: Grades 1 through 12.

   individual evaluation shall include at a minimum:

   1. An evaluation in the areas listed below, individually or group administered, by a qualified pupil appraisal personnel. Tests used shall be adequately standardized and appropriate for the cultural background of the students being evaluated. The regular district-wide test score shall not be used in the Standard Matrix as part of the individual evaluation.
   a. Total Reading
   b. Total Math
   c. Aptitude or Intelligence

   2. For students who obtain at least six points in the matrix, further evaluation shall be conducted by pupil appraisal personnel which shall include, at a minimum:
   a. A review of the student's educational performance and all screening data with the student’s teacher.
   b. Observation of the student’s behavior during and performance on at least one structured
normed or criterion referenced, individually administered test such as, but not limited to:
(1) Intelligence
(2) Aptitude
(3) Problem Solving
(4) Creativity

NOTE: Few, if any standardized assessment instruments adequately control for the effect of such factors as environmental impoverishment, cultural differences, or the lack of opportunities to learn. It is imperative that such factors be closely attended to in any individual or group assessment of students suspected of being gifted, and given serious consideration by pupil appraisal and special education personnel when determining whether or not a student is gifted. Any significant discrepancies between formal test results and the student's customary behaviors and daily activities, or any discrepancies among test results, should be examined closely during the evaluation and addressed in the evaluation report.

The recommendation of the pupil appraisal staff as to whether or not the student should be classified as gifted should be based on a thorough evaluation of the student's abilities.

STANDARD MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptitude/Intelligence</td>
<td>1.0-1.5 SD</td>
<td>1.5-2.0 SD</td>
<td>2.0+ SD</td>
<td>2.5+ SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement/Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. RE-EVALUATION

A. The re-evaluation of students classified as gifted shall consist at a minimum of a review of the student's IEP and progress in the gifted program conducted by the evaluation coordinator with the student's teacher(s). If, based upon this review, it is suspected that the student is not gifted, the student shall receive an evaluation as specified under the Procedures for Evaluation section. In such cases, the student shall meet the current eligibility criteria for classification as gifted.

B. Students classified as High Potential (gifted) at the preschool, kindergarten, first, second, or third grade level shall be re-evaluated prior to entry into the fourth grade according to the Procedures for Evaluation for grades 4 to 12 in order to determine their eligibility for continued classification as gifted. However, if a student is initially identified as gifted in the third grade, this requalification is not required.
APPENDIX D

LETTER TO CALCASIEU PARISH SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

REQUESTING PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH
Mr. Billy Moses, Superintendent  
Calcasieu Parish School Board  
1724 Kirkman Street  
Lake Charles, LA 70601

Dear Mr. Moses:

I am requesting permission from the Calcasieu Parish School Board to conduct research in selected schools for my dissertation pursuant to a doctoral degree from Louisiana State University.

The study will investigate the effect of audience awareness on the syntactic and strategic aspects of persuasive writing by gifted and non-gifted fifth grade students. The schools will be randomly selected from among those having at least two identified gifted fifth grade students enrolled. Classes selected will participate in three writing sessions, each lasting forty minutes. I plan to conduct each of these writing sessions. A copy of the proposal for this study is available for your reference.

Once your permission is given, I will contact the principals of the selected schools to make arrangements for scheduling the writing sessions. All students in the chosen classes will be required to get parental permission to participate. A copy of the letter to parents is enclosed.

Please contact me if there are any questions, or if I have omitted any items pertinent to this request. I may be reached at my home phone number, 477-5938.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jean G. Mancuso
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LETTER FROM CALCASIEU PARISH SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

GRANTING PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

167
May 2, 1984

Mrs. Jean G. Mancuso
1209 Inverness Drive
Lake Charles, LA 70605

Dear Mrs. Mancuso:

Your request to conduct a research in selected schools for your dissertation pursuant to a doctoral degree from Louisiana State University is granted.

Sincerely,

Billy J. Moses, Superintendent
Calcasieu Parish Schools

BJM:mjb
cc: Charles A. Honore
Leroy Sanford
Peggy Pugh
J. Smith
APPENDIX F

LETTER TO PARENTS OF STUDENTS IN RANDOMLY SELECTED CLASSES REQUESTING PERMISSION FOR STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT
Dear Parents,

Your child's class has been selected to participate in a research study on written composition. I have obtained permission from the Calcasieu Parish School Board to conduct this study.

My interest is in the effect of audience awareness on the students' writing. All students in the class are being asked to participate. A limited number of compositions from each class will be randomly selected for analysis. The identity of each writer will be confidential and no assessment will be made of any child as an individual.

If you have any questions, please call the school and leave a message saying where you can be contacted. I will be happy to return your call and answer any questions you may have.

Please indicate your permission by signing the form below and returning it to your child's teacher as soon as possible.

Thank you,

Jean Mancuso

___________________________________________

Dear Mrs. Mancuso,

_____ YES  ____ NO  My child, ____________________________

may participate in your research study on written composition.

Date________________________ Signature_________________
APPENDIX G

WRITING ASSIGNMENT DIRECTIONS
Assignment A

You would like to go to the park to spend the day. You would like for your best friend to go with you, but he/she has made other plans.

Write what you might say if you were writing to your best friend to get him/her to change his/her plans and go to the park with you, instead.

Assignment B

Your teacher is planning to take the class on an all day trip away from school. She has several ideas, but going to the park is not one of them. You really believe that the class would enjoy going to the park to spend the day.

Write what you might say if you were writing to your teacher to get her to take the class to the park to spend the day instead of going to one of the other places which she has in mind.
NOTE: Assignment C was the only one preceded by a brief discussion where information was provided. The discussion was limited to the following:

Investigator: Does anyone know what the job of a newspaper editor is? (Allow any students who may know to respond.)

Provide the following information:

A newspaper editor is the person who is responsible for all that goes into the newspaper. Sometimes, when people like us have something they want a lot of people to know, they write a letter to the editor of the newspaper. These letters are printed in a special place in the newspaper. They may be printed on any day, but in the Lake Charles American Press, they are usually printed on in the Sunday paper. If you or I were to write a letter to the editor that was printed in the Sunday paper, then everyone who read the paper that day could receive our message.

Assignment C:

This park is located near your city. Your have been there before with your family and friends. Since you have enjoyed going to the park, you feel that other people in your community would enjoy going there, too.

Write what you might say if you were writing a letter to the editor of the local newspaper encouraging people in the community to go out and spend a day at the park.
APPENDIX H

WRITING STIMULUS

SLIDES DEPICTING PARK SCENES IN CALCASIEU PARISH AREA
Slide #1  Wooded Landscape

Slide #2  Camper Approaching Park Entrance
Slide #3  A Good Place for a Picnic

Slide #4  A Shady Playground
Slide #5 At the Boat Launch

Slide #6 Young Children Catching Minnows
Slide #9  Fishing from the Bank

Slide #10  Family Mealtime Fun
Slide #11  Fun with a Frisbee

Slide #12  Ducks in a Pond
Slide #13  Bridge over a Bayou

Slide #14  Going Back Home
APPENDIX I

PILOT STUDY
A pilot study was conducted in April, 1984, at a parochial school in Lake Charles, Louisiana. A total of sixty students (two classes) participated in the pilot. These classes contained a total of six gifted students, four boys and two girls. On three different days, students participated in three writing sessions, each lasting forty minutes. Each student wrote three times, once under each level of A, the treatment variable. The order of exposing the students to the treatment levels was random, and the randomization was carried out independently for each student.

At each writing session, the experimenter read each of the assignment directions aloud and the students were instructed to follow along with the reading. The students then viewed a series of fourteen color slides which had been taken at different parks in the Calcasieu Parish area. No explanation of the slides was given. After viewing the slides, the experimenter read the directions again before the students were directed to begin their writing. Student questionnaires were administered after the final writing session.

Observations during the writing sessions and a preliminary examination of student compositions indicated that students had no difficulty writing to the three audiences on the topic of going to the park. They were also able to complete their compositions within the forty minute time limit which was regularly allotted for their language classes.

From the responses given by the students on the questionnaires and a preliminary examination of their compositions, indications were that:
1. The stimulus was appropriate (slides).
2. The topic was appropriate (park).
3. The audiences were appropriate (best friend, teacher, newspaper editor).
4. The directions were clearly stated.
5. The time limit of forty minutes was adequate.

The pilot data was examined again in order to develop, modify, or adapt the persuasive content strategies for the study and to train scorers.
### ANOVA TABLE J.1

ANOVA Table for Total Mean Number of Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4266.81</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19164.69</td>
<td>6.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44385.03</td>
<td>13.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12146.21</td>
<td>8.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>551.65</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2399.61</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1574.56</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1411.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001

### ANOVA TABLE J.2

ANOVA Table for Mean T-Unit Length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97.06</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.04</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>168.35</td>
<td>5.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61.80</td>
<td>5.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001
ANOVA TABLE J.3

ANOVA for Mean Clause Length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.43</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.74</td>
<td>4.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.50</td>
<td>10.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.38</td>
<td>8.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001

ANOVA TABLE J.4

ANOVA Table for Subordination Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001
ANOVA TABLE J.5

ANOVA Table for Category 1: Context for Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>8.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>4.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001

ANOVA TABLE J.6

ANOVA Table for Category 2: Interpersonal Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>7.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>9.04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001
### ANOVA TABLE J.7

ANOVA Table for Category 3: Simple Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>6.89*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>3.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001

### ANOVA TABLE J.8

ANOVA Table for Category 4: Imperatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>5.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001
## ANOVA TABLE J.9
### ANOVA Table for Category 5: Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>3.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05      **p < .01      ***p < .001

## ANOVA TABLE J.10
### ANOVA Table for Category 6: Intensifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>5.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05      **p < .01      ***p < .001
### ANOVA TABLE J.11

**ANOVA Table for Category 7: How to Go to the Park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001

### ANOVA TABLE J.12

**ANOVA Table for Category 8: Reservations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>9.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001
ANOVA TABLE J.13

ANOVA Table for Category 9: Amount of Park Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>5.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05  **P < .01  ***P < .001

ANOVA TABLE J.14

ANOVA Table for Category 10: Objective Information About the Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05  **P < .01  ***P < .001
### ANOVA TABLE J.15

ANOVA Table for Category 11: Publicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001

### ANOVA TABLE J.16

ANOVA Table for Category 12: Environmental Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>22.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001
## ANOVA Table J.17

ANOVA Table for Category 13: Societal Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>15.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001

## ANOVA Table J.18

ANOVA Table for Category 14: Target Oriented Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>10.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001
### ANOVA Table J.19

**ANOVA Table for Category 15: Writer's Credibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001

### ANOVA Table J.20

**ANOVA Table for Category 16: Thanks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>5.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001
### ANOVA Table J.21

ANOVA Table for Category 17: Broad Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001

### ANOVA Table J.22

ANOVA Table for Category 18: Transitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group x Sex: THIS CATEGORY WAS NOT USED BY ANY STUDENTS IN THIS STUDY.
### ANOVA TABLE J.23

ANOVA Table for Total Number of Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56.97</td>
<td>5.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>3.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05    **p < .01    ***p < .001

### ANOVA TABLE J.24

ANOVA Table Total Number of Appeal Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G/NG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>264.74</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B/G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.97</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.99</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48.88</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>24.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05    **p < .01    ***p < .001
APPENDIX K

STUDENTS' WRITING SAMPLES
You would like to go to the park to spend the day. You would like for your best friend to go with you, but he/she has made other plans.

Write what you might say to your best friend to talk him/her into changing his/her plans and going to the park with you, instead.

You ought to go with me. They have some deer and I know you like wild animals. Their best is a chlorinated swimming pond and great hiking trails. They have bike trails with fabulous jumping mounds. We can also go mud-riding on the bike trails. I know the owner and he let me and a guest go free. For my birthday he gave me a golf cart. Hope you can come!
You would like to go to the park to spend the day. You would like for your best friend to go with you, but he/she has made other plans.

Write what you might say to your best friend to talk him/her into changing his/her plans and going to the park with you, instead.

Carla, I know you have other plans for tomorrow but I would like for you, if possible, to change your plans for tomorrow and get to be together except for at church. The only time we are together is at church and the few times I spend the night with you. It would be very exciting to spend a day together alone with no one to tell us where or where not to go. We'll be able to do anything we want for a whole day! If we wanted, we could ask if you could spend the night with me. We would have the time of our lives! We could even fish in the little ponds. So PLEASE change your plans.
Assignment A

You would like to go to the park to spend the day. You would like for your best friend to go with you, but he/she has made other plans.

Write what you might say to your best friend to talk him/her into changing his/her plans and going to the park with you, instead.

Dear David:

Please change your plans. I want you to see the park across from my house. It has a twenty foot slide. You will have a better time at the park than at the mall. I will pack our lunches and I will pick you up. We'll have fun.

Your Friend
Aaron

P.S. Don't forget your soccer ball.
You would like to go to the park to spend the day. You would like for your best friend to go with you, but he/she has made other plans.

Write what you might say to your best friend to talk him/her into changing his/her plans and going to the park with you, instead.

Dear Virginia, I know you want to go to your uncle's house. But I want you to come to the park with me. If you say yes, I'll let you ride my bike and come over for two whole weeks. I must go now. Bye

Bye

Bye

Bye

Bye
Your teacher is planning to take the class on a one day trip away from school. She has several ideas, but going to the park is not one of them. You really believe that the class would enjoy going to the park to spend the day.

Write what you might say to your teacher to get her to take the class to the park to spend the day instead of going to one of the other places which she has in mind.

Mr. Jones, may I make a suggestion about where we can go to the park. I do not think the best way to save time and lives, money and the hassle of going to those other places. For an example the swimming pool is a no-good idea because you could swim at the park. We could eat hot dogs, marshmallows, and play all sorts of games. I also think the class feels strongly about this so, could we please take a vote on this and the whatever wins we do. In the class voted and we went to the park.
Your teacher is planning to take the class on a one day trip away from school. She has several ideas, but going to the park is not one of them. You really believe that the class would enjoy going to the park to spend the day.

Write what you might say to your teacher to get her to take the class to the park to spend the day instead of going to one of the other places which she has in mind.

Dear Mrs. Thompson,

Since I know that you are considering taking us on a field trip, I think you should take us to the Sam Houston Park. I've been there before, but I would like to go again. I'm sure that everyone who has gone would enjoy going again and those who have never been would enjoy it even more. We could go in canoes, fish, and we could have a picnic lunch. Please think again about taking us to the park.
Your teacher is planning to take the class on a one day trip away from school. She has several ideas, but going to the park is not one of them. You really believe that the class would enjoy going to the park to spend the day.

Write what you might say to your teacher to get her to take the class to the park to spend the day instead of going to one of the other places which she has in mind.

"Mrs. Banks, would you let our class vote on going to the park and if the class wants to go to the park we could finish our work ahead of time. When we get back we could have a test on the things in the park. I think everybody even you would have a better time. I think the park would be more pleasant. There is probably more things in the park. We could pick the various leaves that we are studying. We could have a picnic under a big tree."
Assignment B

Your teacher is planning to take the class on a one day trip away from school. She has several ideas, but going to the park is not one of them. You really believe that the class would enjoy going to the park to spend the day.

Write what you might say to your teacher to get her to take the class to the park to spend the day instead of going to one of the other places which she has in mind.

Mrs. Park please let us go to the park I really think will enjoy ourselves. We can go to the lake and have a picnic, look at all the animals and go walking on the trails. We can bring our bus fee for gas to get us there and back. It wouldn’t need no money to get in the park can just get some bus fee. We will really have lots and lots of fun.
This park is located near your city. You have been there before with your family and friends. Since you have enjoyed going to the park, you feel that other people in your community would enjoy going there, too.

Write what you might say if you were writing a letter to the editor of the local newspaper encouraging people in the community to go out and spend a day at the park.

Dear Editor,

My family and I enjoyed a day at the park. I would like to say it was a wonderful place. I think other people would enjoy it too. Thank you.
This park is located near your city. You have been there before with your family and friends. Since you have enjoyed going to the park, you feel that other people in your community would enjoy going there, too.

Write what you might say if you were writing a letter to the editor of the local newspaper encouraging people in the community to go out and spend a day at the park.

If you are looking for a place to relax, play with the children and have fun, you should go to a local park. It is a great place. It has been said that you can feed ducks, it has a nature trail, and places to eat and play. I really think it is a family type place! Just try it, you'll like it!

Your park friend

[Signature]
This park is located near your city. You have been there before with your family and friends. Since you have enjoyed going to the park, you feel that other people in your community would enjoy going there, too.

Write what you might say if you were writing a letter to the editor of the local newspaper encouraging people in the community to go out and spend a day at the park.

Dear Mr. Editor,
I have been to the park several times and it is a beautiful place. I noticed that there weren't many people. I would like to inform people that the park is a nice place to spend the day. The city will tear it down and put up two buildings and some readers if nobody goes. Please go because it is too beautiful to tear down.
This park is located near your city. You have been there before with your family and friends. Since you have enjoyed going to the park, you feel that other people in your community would enjoy going there, too.

Write what you might say if you were writing a letter to the editor of the local newspaper encouraging people in the community to go out and spend a day at the park.

Dear Mr. Editor,

Would you please print the following in your newspaper?

Go to the city park! There is lots to do. You can fish, swim, get a tan, play on the equipment, or do just about anything. There are tennis and racquet ball courts.

GO TO THE CITY PARK
SAMPLES FROM THE PILOT STUDY
Michael

A

Dear James,

Could you come to the park with me?

If you can't come, please call me.

Could you please come to the park with me

Ask your mom or dad if you could come with me to the park instead of going to Houston.

If you can, I could play football, baseball, fishing or frisbee.

P.S. We could go to my house and go swimming.
Janice

Shelby, will you please come to the park with me? We are going to have a picnic. I really want you to come.

There are lots of things to do like going swimming and fishing. Feel free and bring a story.

If you still want to go to the movies you can go tomorrow. Please call me if you can go. We can pick our sisters there if you want to and on the way we can stop and get an ice-cream cone. I really want you to go with me.

Your friend

Janice
Kim will you please come to the park with me and not go to the movies? We could do a lot of things. We could go fly kites, ride our bikes, and feed the ducks. We could also have a fish and we are walking on the nature trail and have a barbecue. We could do so many things. We could go to the park and swing and see the swings and slide. I will bring some corn and we can feed the deer. We could also bring my camp and stay all night and there will not be anyone to bug us. I called your mom and she said you could come. We could have so much fun. Please come. Oh and it won't be as boring as the movies.
And we will stay longer than two hours. We will stay three days. And the best thing is that we won't be close to home.

Your friend,
Kristie
Miss Lemoines I have an idea
for our field day. Why don't we go to
the park? It would be really fun. There
is plenty to do for everyone. Since
I go there last I know the Dave would
like it there. Why don't you ask the
dave. The park isn't on your list but
I know you would enjoy it and so
would everybody else. Thank you for
listening.

Jeff

B
Dear Mrs. Lemoine,

I am writing to you about the field trip. I asked some of the class if they would like to go to the park. Almost everyone of them said yes. Everyone would enjoy the park. The park has no admission fee. The park is clean. And almost everyone's favorite is the slide. There are fields to play football on. We would all have so much fun! Please, can we go to the park for our field trip?

Sincerely,
Margaret

P.S. There is also fishing and swimming.
Mrs. Brady,

Our class really wants to go to the park, there's so many things to do. You can ride bikes, feed ducks, play baseball it would be very fun. Please let our class go to the park. We can even eat together on the benches. Ask anybody in the class if they would want to go to the park, I bet you they'll say sure. It may be hard getting nurses to take us there, but we can handle it. I hope you will let us go. I know you'll let us go. I think next Friday would be a good day to go to the park.
Mrs. Brady, please take us to the park for our field trip. We could learn a lot more about nature and have a real fun time. We would all enjoy going to the park rather than one of the places you have in mind. If we could go to the park we would behave very well and feed the ducks and fed the deer. If we rent a boat we could go boating or fishing, or we can go on the nature trail and look at all the beautiful flowers. Everybody can pack themselves a pack lunch and we could get together with our friends and have a big picnic.
Dear Editor,

I think everyone in the community would enjoy this park. It has animals, camping areas, a river, and a beautiful forest. You can go canoeing in a swamp, see ducks, and feed them. Play many games because they have many grassy places. Or just have a picnic beside the river. Many people who have kids can let them play on the slide or other things. The nature walk has many different kinds of trees, some are very educational. They also have boating launches; you can take your boat and go boating in the river. It is a very fun and exciting park.

Stephy
Everything a park could possibly offer they have just about. How to escape the rush of the city, just miles out of the city is beautiful. The Indian River located about 1/2 hour from my area.
L. Darnell
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