

Characteristic	Proficient (5)	Emerging (3)	Minimal/Immature (1)
<p>Introduction Score based on the presence, absence, and qualitative depiction of character and setting components.</p>	<p>Setting: General setting includes outside at a park, daytime, and mentions that frog and turtle are in bucket/pail</p> <p>Characters: boy, dog, frog, and turtle are introduced with description</p> <p>EXAMPLE <i>A little boy went to the park one day. He had his pets with him. The little frog and turtle were in a pail, and the dog was walking next to the boy.</i></p>	<p>Setting: <i>One or two</i> portions of the general setting (outside at a park, daytime, and mentions that frog and turtle are in bucket/pail) are mentioned <i>without</i> adequate detail</p> <p>Characters: <i>Two</i> characters are mentioned (boy, dog, frog, and turtle) OR characters mentioned without adequate detail</p> <p>EXAMPLE <i>The boy and his dog were outside.</i></p>	<p>Launches into story with no attempt to provide the setting or introduce the characters</p> <p>EXAMPLE <i>The boy was walking.</i></p>
<p>Character Development Score based on the acknowledgment of characters and their significance throughout the story.</p>	<p>Main characters: frog and boy are mentioned consistently throughout story <i>with</i> description</p> <p>Supporting characters: turtle, bee, cat, woman, man, baby, little boy and his mother are mentioned</p> <p>Narration in first-person with character voice</p> <p>EXAMPLE <i>And then the little boy said, "You leave my frog alone, you mean cat!"</i></p>	<p>Main characters: frog and boy are mentioned <i>without</i> description</p> <p>Several supporting characters mentioned: turtle, bee, cat, woman, man, baby, little boy and his mother</p> <p>Little difference in the description between main and supporting characters</p> <p>Minimal first-person narration</p> <p>EXAMPLE <i>The boy saved the frog from the cat and yelled.</i></p>	<p>Main characters: frog and boy are not consistently mentioned in the story</p> <p>Missing supporting characters: bee, cat, woman, baby, critical to advancing the plot</p> <p>No first-person narration</p> <p>EXAMPLE <i>The boy helped his frog.</i></p>
<p>Mental and Emotional States Score based on the vocabulary used to convey character emotions and thought processes.</p>	<p>Use of mental and emotional state words when necessary to advance the plot for main and supporting characters</p> <p>Emotional State examples: angry, happy, bad, sad, worried</p> <p>Mental State examples: knew, think, decide, liked, recognize</p> <p>Use of varied mental and emotional state words</p> <p>EXAMPLE <i>The boy didn't even notice the frog was gone. The woman was shocked. She hated that frog. He was relieved that the boy found him.</i></p>	<p>Use of emotional and mental state words used in some of the story events</p> <p>Mental and emotional state words used only for main characters</p> <p>Little variation of mental and emotional state words</p> <p>Some use of evident mental state words to develop character(s)</p> <p>EXAMPLE <i>The cat was mad. The lady was mad.</i></p>	<p>Minimal or no use of mental and emotional state words</p> <p>EXAMPLE <i>The boy saw the cat had the frog squished.</i></p>
<p>Referencing/Listener Awareness Score based on the consistent and accurate use of antecedents and clarifiers throughout the story. Use of correct pronouns and proper names should be considered when scoring.</p>	<p>Use of correct character names (boy, frog, dog, bee, man, woman, baby, cat)</p> <p>Correct pronoun use throughout narrative</p> <p>Listener can easily understand who speaker is referring to in the story</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provides necessary antecedents to pronouns -References are clear throughout story <p>EXAMPLE <i>The boy didn't notice that the frog jumped out of the pail. The cat scratched at the frog while the baby was crying.</i></p>	<p>Few errors in character names (e.g., bug for bee)</p> <p>Most pronouns are correct</p> <p>Listener may have to infer who the speaker is referring to in the story</p> <p>Inconsistent use of referents/antecedents</p> <p>EXAMPLE <i>The bug bit him. He yelled at him.</i></p>	<p>Excessive errors in character names</p> <p>Listener is not able to discern who the speaker is referring to throughout the story</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Excessive use of pronouns -No verbal clarifiers used -Speaker is unaware listener is confused <p>EXAMPLE <i>They left. She grabbed him and squished him.</i></p>
<p>Conflict/Resolution or Event/Reaction Score based on the presence/absence of</p>	<p>Clearly states the major conflict/event of the story with detail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Frog jumps out of pail and leaves the boy/other pets and causes trouble 	<p>Major conflict/event of the story is mentioned but <i>without</i> adequate detail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Frog jumps out of pail and leaves the boy/other pets and causes trouble 	<p>Missing the major conflict/event OR conflict is missing resolution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Frog jumps out of pail and leaves the boy/other pets and causes trouble

Characteristic	Proficient (5)	Emerging (3)	Minimal/Immature (1)
conflicts or events and resolutions required or character reaction to express the story as well as how thoroughly each was described.	<p>All supporting story elements necessary to advancing the plot are covered with appropriate amount of detail</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Frog catches a bee on his tongue/gets stung 2. Woman reaches in picnic basket/surprised when she grabs the frog 3. Frog jumps onto sailboat/boy is upset that boat sinks 4. Frog jumps into buggy and tries to drink from bottle/baby is upset 5. Cat catches the frog/frog is rescued by the boy 	<p>Only 3-4 supporting story elements necessary to advancing the plot are covered. Lacks detail or too much detail is provided</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Frog catches a bee on his tongue/gets stung 2. Woman reaches in picnic basket/ surprised when she grabs the frog 3. Frog jumps onto sailboat/boy is upset that boat sinks 4. Frog jumps into buggy and tries to drink from bottle/baby is upset 5. Cat catches the frog/frog is rescued by the boy 	<p>Only 1-2 supporting story elements necessary to advancing the plot are covered. Lacks detail or too much detail is provided</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Frog catches a bee on his tongue/gets stung 2. Woman reaches in picnic basket/surprised when she grabs the frog 3. Frog jumps onto sailboat/boy is upset that boat sinks 4. Frog jumps into buggy and tries to drink from bottle/baby is upset 5. Cat catches the frog/frog is rescued by the boy
<p>Cohesion Score based on the sequence of, details given to, and transitions between each event.</p>	<p>Events follow the order of the story</p> <p>Minimal or no revisions/reformulations of utterances</p> <p>Use of smooth transitions between events with varied transitional vocabulary (then, next, finally)</p> <p>EXAMPLE <i>The boy and his pets went out to the park one day. The frog jumped out of the pail. Then he waved to the boy and the pets, but they didn't even notice he was gone.</i></p>	<p>Events follow the order of the story</p> <p>There is too much detail on supporting events or lacks detail of main events of the story</p> <p>Some revisions/reformulations are present throughout the story</p> <p>Lacks smooth transitions between events with little variety in transitional vocabulary</p> <p>EXAMPLE <i>The frog jumped out. (And uh um) And the frog got stung by a bee and jumped in a basket.</i></p>	<p>Events <i>do not</i> follow the order of the story</p> <p>Revisions/reformulations are prevalent throughout the story</p> <p>No use of transitions between events of the story</p> <p>EXAMPLE <i>(The frog, the frog um) The frog jumped out. (Th* uh um) The frog got stung by a bee and jumped in a basket.</i></p>
<p>Conclusion Score based on the conclusion of the final event as well as the wrap up of the entire story.</p>	<p>Story is clearly wrapped up with <i>all three</i> components</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The boy found the frog 2. The boy scares away the cat 3. The frog was happy to go home with the boy and the other pets <p>EXAMPLE <i>The boy saw the frog and rescued him from the cat. He scared the cat away. The boy carried the frog and went home. The frog was happy.</i></p>	<p>Story is wrapped up with <i>two of the three</i> components</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The boy found the frog 2. The boy scares away the cat 3. The frog was happy to go home with the boy and the other pets <p>EXAMPLE <i>The boy saved the frog. And then they went home.</i></p>	<p>Listener may not know the story has ended</p> <p>Story ends abruptly with mention of <i>one</i> of the concluding components</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The boy found the frog 2. The boy scares away the cat 3. The frog was happy to go home with the boy and the other pets <p>EXAMPLE <i>They walked home.</i></p>
<p>Scoring: Each characteristic receives a scaled score 0-5. Proficient=5, Emerging=3, Minimal/Immature=1. Scores between (e.g., 2, 4) are undefined; use judgment. Scores of 0 and NA are defined below. The composite is the total of the characteristic scores. Highest score=35.</p> <p>* A score of 0 is given for TARGET SPEAKER errors (i.e., telling the wrong story, conversing with examiner, not completing/refusing task, abandoned utterances, unintelligibility, components produced via imitating, absence of characteristic).</p> <p>* A score of NA (non-applicable) is given for MECHANICAL/EXAMINER/OPERATOR errors (i.e., interference from background noise, issues with audio recording, examiner quitting before target, examiner not following protocol, examiner asking overly specific or leading questions vs. open-ended questions/prompts).</p>			

The Narrative Scoring Scheme was developed by Jon Miller and the Bilingual Language and Literacy Project staff for the grants HD39521 "Oracy/Literacy Development of Spanish-speaking Children" and R305U010001 "Biological and Behavioral Variation in the Language Development of Spanish-speaking Children", funded by the NICHD and IES, David Francis, P.I. It is based on an earlier version, Rubric for Completing a Story Grammar Analysis, developed by the Madison Metropolitan School District SALT working group, 1998, to create an objective narrative structure scoring system following the work of Stein and Glenn, 1979; 1982.