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ABSTRACT

The assessment and evaluation of the literacy achievements of ESL learners is emerging as a contentious issue in Australian schools. However, at this time no studies appear to be completed that focus on the identification of features of ESL children’s writing and the processes involved in using the frameworks available in Western Australia to assess and evaluate ESL students.

In this study, a qualitative research design was employed. Data were collected from one Year Five ESL student over a three week period in order to determine: a) which features of his English writing were identified by each evaluative framework available in Western Australia; b) which features were not identified and; c) how the frameworks differ as heuristic tools. The frameworks available for the study were the First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum, the Student Outcome Statements, the ESL Scales and the ESL Bandscales. Features of the student’s writing were identified by descriptive analysis using the four evaluative frameworks.

The results showed that the evaluative frameworks identified a range of features of the student’s writing, but some features were not identified by any framework. It was also found that there were differences between the frameworks as tools for evaluating and assessing the writing of an ESL child.

It is suggested that, while the results of this study cannot be generalised to the ESL population at large, it seems that all of the frameworks used in this study could be used to identify many of the features of one ESL student’s writing. However, it was found that for most of the frameworks the features of the child’s writing were distributed over several phases or
It was concluded that the frameworks may be useful for helping teachers identify features of ESL children's writing in order to plan appropriate learning activities (evaluation), but that using them for accountability (assessment) does not appear to be appropriate.

Finally, it is suggested that the frameworks should be carefully chosen according to purpose and, where appropriate, should be modified to suit the needs of the school, teacher and student.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Background to the Study

In 1992, approximately one quarter of children attending Australian schools were from language backgrounds other than English (Gibbons, cited in Derewianka, 1992, p. 283). This means that a large number of school children in Australia may not be conventional users of the English language. Gibbons (cited in Derewianka, 1992, p. 297), asserts, “Without competence in English, children do not have full access to education or to the structures of the dominant society, and their life choices will remain limited”. As a result, it is essential that teachers have knowledge of, and are able to plan for, the literacy development of children from all backgrounds, including those for whom English is not their first language. In order to identify and cater for the literacy needs of these individuals, knowledge of appropriate and effective assessment and evaluation procedures and the ability to implement them are essential for all teachers, regardless of their status as ESL specialists or mainstream classroom teachers.

At this point, it is useful to distinguish between assessment and evaluation. According to Shaw and Dowsett (cited in McKay, 1993, p. 115), assessment refers to “the practices of and procedures for measuring individual student performance in an educational activity”, whereas Woolfolk (1993, p. 589), identifies evaluation as “decision-making about student performance and about appropriate teaching strategies”. In other words the emphasis in assessment is measurement of student behaviour, whereas in evaluation the emphasis is on observation of student behaviour in order to plan for students’ future development. It seems that the evaluative frameworks currently available in Western Australia aim to do both. There appears to be some overlap between the two terms and both
will be used in this thesis. The following four frameworks are used in this study to examine the writing of one ESL child. These frameworks are: First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994), Student Outcome Statements (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994), ESL Scales (Australian Education Council, 1994) and ESL Bandscales (McKay, 1994).

There are two main nationally developed frameworks that have been developed in recent years, with the specific purpose of evaluating ESL learners and they are being used to some extent within Australia in both Intensive Language Centres and in mainstream classrooms. These are the ESL Bandscales and the ESL Scales, both of which were completed by 1992 and were adopted to varying degrees by the states and territories (Breen, 1996, pp. 1-2). However, the completion in 1993 of the National Profile in English led to the development of various other frameworks at a state level which were not developed specifically for ESL learners.

As of May 1995, the states and territories of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia and the Northern Territory had implemented their own versions of the English Statement and Profile. However, teachers in the Australian Capital Territory were still trialling the national document and Tasmania was committed to using the document for the next five years (Meiers, 1995, p. 90).

Frameworks which are currently used by teachers for assessing and evaluating ESL children’s language in Western Australia include the ESL Bandscales, and the First Steps Developmental Continua. It was found however, by teachers in the Highgate Project, which was conducted in Western Australia and examined teachers’ use of the First Steps Writing
and Spelling Developmental Continua, that some indicators needed to be modified to make their use appropriate for ESL children. The Student Outcome Statements, Western Australia's version of the English Statement and Profile is being used in an increasingly large number of Western Australian schools for assessing and evaluating children, many of whom are ESL. The ESL Scales as frameworks for assessing and evaluating ESL children are available in Western Australia, but are used by only a few teachers in this state.

**Significance of the Study**

The assessment and evaluation of the literacy achievements of ESL learners are emerging as contentious issues which are currently being considered by various writers (Meiers, 1994; Constable, 1995; Campagna-Wildash, 1995; Koch, 1995; McKay, 1996). For example, Constable (1995) states:

> Through its Social Justice in Education Policy the Education Department of WA is committed to the achievement of optimum educational goals for all students. Thus it is a principle of equity that the same educational goals be established for ESL and ESD students as for other students. That being so, the way those goals are formulated and how students' achievement of the goals is evaluated is crucial. (p. 129)

It is at this point that writing should be introduced as the focus of this study. The ability to write effectively could certainly be considered as an important educational goal: as children progress through the educational system, they are increasingly assessed across the curriculum in the written mode. However, Dufficy and Gummer (1993, p. 105) assert, "Second language learners who are not taught how to write effectively across subject boundaries, will perform below their potential". It seems, therefore, that in order to fulfil their potential, ESL children need teachers who are
competent at assessing and evaluating their individual needs in order to plan appropriate experiences.

The focus of the frameworks used in this study is ESL children's writing in English rather than in their first language.

**Purposes of the Study**

Understanding methods of assessing and evaluating ESL children’s learning outcomes in literacy, particularly in writing, is extremely important for teachers. Thus, it is intended that the following study will provide an insight into the processes of using the various frameworks available in Western Australia to assess and evaluate the English writing of one ESL child. The study should also provide an insight into which particular features of that child’s writing are recognised within each framework.

**Definition of Terms**

Children for whom English is not their first language are referred to by a number of terms. The following two terms are often used:

*Bilingual* “refers to the fact that such children are operating in two language domains, not that they are fluent in two languages” (Gibbons, 1991, p. 284).

*ESL* “those students who speak English as a second (or third, or fourth) language and who, because of this, might be experiencing some difficulty meeting the demands of the curriculum” (McKay, 1996, p. 13).

Since ESL is the term used in two of the frameworks, this is the term that will be used in this study to refer to children in Western Australian schools whose first language is other than English.
Outline of the Study

Chapter II contains a review of literature related to the topic of the evaluative frameworks used in Western Australia to assess and evaluate ESL children's writing. During this review, the terms literacy and writing are defined, ESL children's writing development is discussed in terms of existing studies, the purposes of assessing and evaluating ESL children's writing are explored and each of the frameworks examined in this study is reviewed.

Chapter III documents methodology used in this study. Some research methods used in related studies are reviewed and the research questions for this study are stated. The research design is presented and the sample used in this study is described along with how it was obtained. The procedure for accessing the sample and data collection procedure are also explained.

Chapter IV documents the methods of analysis used and outlines the data analysis procedure.

Chapter V introduces the child whose writing is analysed in this study. The writing samples collected during the data collection period are presented and an initial analysis of the writing samples is performed. Analysis of the features of the child's writing according to the four evaluative frameworks used in this study is also presented, followed by a summary of the features of the child's writing according to the evaluative frameworks. Research Questions 1 and 2 are discussed in terms of the findings.

Chapter VI documents general discussion, revisits the purposes and aims of the study and answers Research Question 3. A summary of the findings is
made and these findings are interpreted with particular reference to current literature.

In Chapter VII, possible limitations of the study are examined and some implications for future research and classroom practice are reported.

**Research Questions**

The study was designed to answer the following research questions:

- Which features of an ESL middle primary student's English writing are identified by each evaluative framework available in Western Australia?

- Are there any features of the student's English writing that are not identified by the frameworks?

- What are the differences between the frameworks as heuristic tools?

**Summary**

This introductory chapter has provided the background to the study. The terms *assessment* and *evaluation* were defined. An overview was presented which explained how the particular evaluative frameworks examined in this study were nationally developed. The importance of assessing and evaluating ESL children’s writing was discussed and the specific purposes of the study were introduced. Some other terms used in this study were defined and an outline of the study was presented. Finally, the research questions were stated.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Introduction

In order to introduce the frameworks used in Western Australia to evaluate ESL children's writing, it is necessary to explore the literature in different areas. Firstly, writing and its place as an important part of literacy will be considered. Next, as the frameworks are developmental, there will be a discussion of ESL children's writing development in terms of existing studies. Then, some purposes of assessing and evaluating ESL children's writing will be explored. Finally, some literature related to current frameworks for evaluating ESL children's writing, both at a national and a local level, will be reviewed.

Literacy and Writing

A link has already been made between literacy and writing in the previous chapter. However, it is important that these terms are explored in more detail before ESL children's writing development is reviewed in the following section. First, the notion of literacy and what it means to be literate in the late twentieth century will be considered. Olson and Astington (cited in Baker, 1991, p. 107), assert that "to be literate ... is to be competent to participate in a certain form of discourse". Garton and Pratt (1989, p. 1) elaborate on this assertion when they define literacy as "the mastery of spoken language and reading and writing".

In support of the notion that literacy is more than just being able to read and write, Heath (1991) asserts that literacy is a set of behaviours learned in a socio-cultural context. She states, "Being literate depends on an essential harmony of core language behaviours and certain critical supporting social relations and cultural practices" (p. 6).
Literacy has also been seen as an evolving social phenomenon. Christie (1990, pp. 2-3) claims, "Changes in literacy ... are in themselves measures of the constantly changing nature of society". Rapid technological advances seem to be important in such societal changes, "The new technology, as well as the complex society it has helped create, demands a greater degree of conscious reflection upon its ways of working - particularly its ways of working in language - than have earlier periods of history" (Christie, 1990, p. 22).

It thus seems that current ideas about literacy present it as being much more than the ability to read and write. It appears to be a set of language behaviours that are embedded in the society and culture of the context in which they are being used. Further, it seems that literacy evolves in response to changes in society and technology. As the focus of this study is writing, current ideas about what writing actually is and the place of writing as a part of literacy will now be outlined.

There are various definitions of writing, ranging from the physical act of handwriting through to composition of a written text (Sulzby and Teale, 1984, p. 738). Flower and Hayes (1981, p.928) define writing from a cognitive information processing perspective. They believe writing consists of three recursive phases. The first phase is **planning**, in which writers set goals and make plans. The second phase is **translating**, in which writers transcribe ideas into written form and the third phase is **reviewing**, in which writers test their plans and translations. The authors also emphasise the importance of the task environment and the writer's long term memory in the writing process.

This definition of writing focuses on the internal, cognitive processes an
individual carries out while writing. However, Edelsky (1991) recognises the social aspect of writing and comments on the social, psychological and linguistic processes involved in writing.

The ‘Context Pyramid Model of Writing’ (Mosenthal, 1983, pp. 30-33) elaborates on these social, psychological and linguistic processes. This model contains the five contexts of ‘writer’, ‘materials’, ‘task’, ‘situation organiser’ and ‘setting’. The writer can be described in terms of age, sex, IQ and so on; materials can be defined as “some physical stimulus that serves as input”, for example, paragraphs in books; task includes instructions or directions given to the writer, for example, ‘write a short story about flowers’; the situation organiser is defined as the ‘person responsible for having the writer write’ and ‘the audience for whom the writer is writing’; and finally, the setting is defined as ‘where the writer writes and where the situation organiser prompts and evaluates the writer’s writing’.

It will be seen that the definitions of writing which have been considered focus on the process of writing. Others, for example Juel, Griffith and Gough (1986), have focused upon the products of writing, which they see very simply as ‘spelling’ and ‘ideation’. A more comprehensive focus on the products of the writing process may be found in Hansen (1996). Hansen suggests that while many facets of writing are important, recent research has meant that it is the content of written text that teachers concentrate on (Hansen, 1996, p. 189). Furthermore, she emphasises, “the importance of finding value in the content(s) of a piece of writing” (Hansen, 1996, p. 189).

The frameworks currently being used in Western Australia to assess and
evaluate ESL children’s writing each emphasise different facets of writing, with varying emphases on process and product. This topic is explored later in the chapter when each framework used in this study is reviewed in detail.

**ESL Children’s Writing Development**

The notion of language acquisition as a developmental process has been widely accepted. Specifically, research into literacy acquisition of first and second language speakers has informed what we know about ESL children’s writing development. Hudelson (cited in Genesee, 1994, pp. 134-137), has pulled together the outcomes of several studies into this area in order to outline the general stages of development that native English speakers go through during early childhood when learning to write. She documents how children move from using scribbles to express themselves in the early years through to producing letter-like forms that resemble ‘letters of the alphabetic system that surrounds them’. Hudelson (1994) believes that this process indicates that learners are “struggling to figure out how the written language works” (p. 134).

Hudelson (1994) also outlines stages of spelling development, before summarising the similar developmental processes that speakers of languages other than English go through when they are learning to write in their native languages.

Hudelson (1994) concludes that “research has demonstrated that the processes of reading and writing for children in a first and a second language are more alike than different” (p. 151). Whilst this may be true, the degree of difference in the processes may well depend on the nature of the script (alphabetic or logographic) and the cultural background of the
learner. Further, it was the development of emergent literacy in early childhood that was documented by Hudelson, whilst the literacy development of older children, which may well be different, was not considered.

Peregoy and Boyle (1993) have also reviewed research that documents second language writing and they support Hudelson's view that similarities exist in the writing development of first and second language learners. They suggest that the writing development of these two groups is likely to be similar because they are faced with similar problems when writing, for example, "conventions of written English, such as spelling, grammar, and rhetorical choice", or "more general aspects of the writing process, such as choosing a topic, deciding what to say, and tailoring the message to the intended audience - elements that go into writing in any language" (p. 64). However, it is not clear if the authors' conclusions have been developed as a result of reviewing a number of research studies, or if these comments are their own subjective viewpoints.

Hudelson (1994) believes that central to the process of native and non-native speakers of English becoming literate is the notion that they are "creative constructors of their language or languages" (p. 137). Evidence from various studies support this claim. Edelsky (1982) and Hudelson (1994) show that children often use what they know about their first language to create hypotheses to help them construct written texts in the second language. Also, Edelsky (1982, p. 214) states that "what the child tacitly knows about writing . . . is applied to, rather than interferes with writing in another language". This view is supported by work conducted with children in a Khmer-English bilingual program who seemed to be able to transfer knowledge of genre from one language to the other (Rohl &
Barratt-Pugh, 1996, p. 171). Furthermore, children "are in control of the processes [of hypothesis creation and testing] as they use information from the environment... in their construction of meaning" (Hudelson, cited in Genesee, 1994, p. 137).

It is, however, important to recognise research in ESL children's literacy development which appears to contradict these findings. Clarke (1988), refers to studies that suggest that ability in the first language will only be transferred to the second language if a certain level is reached in the second language: "limited control over the language 'short circuits' the good reader's system causing him/her to revert to poor reader strategies when confronted with a difficult or confusing task in the second language" (p. 120). Nevertheless, this research focused on reading rather than writing. These two modes of written language appear to involve somewhat different cognitive processes.

It seems therefore, that the degree to which bilingualism may help or hinder literacy development is a somewhat contentious issue in the area of second language research, and one that may need further investigation.

The Highgate Project (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994) provides a comprehensive view of ESL children's writing development. Although this project set out to discover "the extent to which the First Steps [spelling and writing] materials are appropriate and useful as a means of evaluating and supporting the development of ESL learners" (p. 2), the document also provides an insight into the development of ESL children's writing. This project outlines the following features of writing development which were observed in ESL learners:
Some children were able to convey complex meanings in English using simple forms (p. 8).

Some children relied on visual strategies rather than phonemic strategies due to differences in phonological systems of different languages (p. 8).

Code mixing and switching appeared to be important for many children (p. 6).

Risk-taking was problematic for some children (p. 8).

Some children used familiar patterns of language rather than experiment with new structures and forms (p. 8).

Some children displayed the same level of development as native speakers (p. 7).

Unlike many other studies, the Highgate Project (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994) recognises the diverse nature of ESL children as a group and outlines some factors that may influence the development of English for such children (p. 2). Some examples are: ‘the age and personality of the learner’; ‘the oral and written conventions of the learner’s first language and his or her level of oracy and literacy’; and ‘individual learning styles and needs’. This project also considers ESL children across the primary age range, rather than focusing as Hudelson did, on early childhood development.

Assessing and Evaluating ESL Children’s Writing

It is important to recognise the purposes for assessing and evaluating ESL children’s writing and the frameworks currently being used by teachers to achieve these purposes.

The evaluative frameworks available in Western Australia are the products of a recent shift towards outcomes-based assessment and evaluation. Indeed, descriptions of student achievement known as ‘standards’, ‘benchmarks’, ‘attainment targets’, ‘Bandscases’ or ‘competencies’, have become the cornerstone of assessment and reporting systems in the U. K.,
Canada, Australia and New Zealand" (Brindley, 1995, p. 1).

These statements of outcomes or achievements serve many purposes in the educational context. Brindley (1995) cites Routledge (1993), Curriculum Corporation (1994) and McKay (1995), in claiming that these purposes including the following:

To provide system-wide reference points to assist teachers in assessing individual progress.

To provide more comprehensive information for reporting to interested parties outside the classroom, such as parents, employers and educational authorities.

To support teachers in their implementation of curriculum objectives. (p. 5)

In order that teachers may make decisions about ‘implementation of curriculum objectives’ and ‘individual progress’ and select appropriate teaching strategies, it seems that there is a need to evaluate students’ literacy development. Such decisions regarding ESL children’s literacy are important and have formed the basis for the evaluative frameworks currently available in Western Australia. These frameworks include First Steps (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994) and Student Outcome Statements (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994) designed for all students; and the ESL Scales (Australian Education Council, 1994) and the ESL Bandscales (McKay, 1994) for ESL students specifically. These four frameworks and other associated documents will now be examined.

First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum

The First Steps project was initially conceived in 1988 by the Western Australian Education Department, before being trialled in 1989/90. Due to
the project's success and popularity in government schools throughout the state, the First Steps materials have subsequently been modified and published by Longman Cheshire for marketing interstate and overseas (Hunter, n.d., pp. 2-3).

First Steps was based upon many beliefs about language learning, but particularly the belief that children are active learners who learn most effectively when they interact with others and when learning activities are targeted to their level of development (thus implying that the individual needs of all learners are catered for). The holistic nature of language and literacy learning is emphasised and the writers of the document believe that language and literacy development can be mapped, but because each child is a unique individual with different life experiences, no two developmental pathways are the same (Barratt-Pugh & Rivalland, 1994, p. 2). As children display behaviours indicative of their phase of development in each of four macro-skills (reading, writing, spelling and oral language), these behaviours, or indicators as they are called, are then recorded on the appropriate continuum of development.

The First Steps Developmental Continua have been developed in the areas of reading, writing, spelling and oral language. As this study focuses on writing, it is the Writing Developmental Continuum that will be examined. This defines six phases of development: Role Play Writing, Experimental Writing, Early Writing, Conventional Writing, Proficient Writing and Advanced Writing. Each phase consists of a list of descriptors of behaviour, or indicators as they are called. Among these indicators are minor indicators and key indicators which "describe behaviours that are typical of a phase" (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994, p. 2). It is the key indicators that are used to place students within a
particular phase: “beyond the Role Play phase children are said to be working in a phase when they exhibit all the Key Indicators of that phase” (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994, p. 18).

Although the First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum does not explicitly define writing, the indicators in each writing phase are grouped under the headings ‘Content, Organisation and Contextual Understandings’, ‘Word Usage’, ‘Editing’, ‘Language Conventions’, ‘Strategies’ and ‘Attitude’. Spelling phases of development are also outlined in this document. These headings and the inclusion of spelling phases, within the Writing Continuum, appear to represent those aspects of writing which the authors of this document consider to be important. This document also outlines some principles of writing, some differences between oral and written language and ways in which teachers can facilitate children’s development in writing.

The First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum gives some consideration to teaching ESL learners. A range of recommendations is made regarding those factors teachers need to consider when teaching these students, for example, difference in cultural background for students and the teacher and the need for ESL learners to be given opportunities to use their own languages (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994, pp. 4-5). As a result of recent action research, effective teaching strategies are also suggested.

This leads to the documentation of the action research in the Highgate Project, which set out to discover “the extent to which the First Steps [spelling and writing] materials are appropriate and useful as a means of evaluating and supporting the development of ESL learners” (p. 2). As a
result of this research, conducted by a team of teachers at Highgate Primary School, it was found that the First Steps materials could generally be used for monitoring the spelling and writing development of ESL learners. However, differences seemed to exist when children were learning their native language and when they were learning other languages, and the Highgate Project makes several recommendations regarding the use of the First Steps materials with ESL learners. Such recommendations include examples of ways in which teachers can support linguistic and cultural diversity in their classrooms, such as the use of appropriate teaching strategies to support ESL learners.

Although the latest version of the First Steps materials (1994) suggests teaching strategies that are appropriate for use with ESL learners, the key indicators and minor indicators in each phase still do not take into account the extent to which ESL learners are literate in their first language. Specifically, “the indicators were extracted from research into the development of literacy in English-speaking children” (Barratt-Pugh & Rivalland, 1994, p. 2).

English - A Curriculum Profile for Australian Schools (National Statement and Profile)

Statements and profiles in eight learning areas including English have been worked on by the States, Territories and the Commonwealth since 1989 and were completed in their current forms in 1993. “The English profile is built on the description of English as an area of learning provided in A statement on English for Australian Schools” (Australian Education Council, 1994, p. 1).

There is a number of key assumptions that underlie the English profile,
including, “Teachers adopt sound pedagogical principles in their teaching” (Australian Education Council, 1994, p. 3). Specifically, this means that teachers need to construct:

“teaching and learning programs that recognise the learning needs of individual students and groups of students in order to make the learning outcomes described in the profile as achievable as possible by all students. This is particularly important for students recognised as having been disadvantaged by the Australian education system - girls, Torres Strait Islander and Aboriginal students, students in poverty, students with disabilities, students from non-English-speaking backgrounds, and students in isolated situations.” (Curriculum Corporation, 1994, p. 3)

This seems to suggest that the Federal Government considers that all ESL children may be disadvantaged in the Australian education system. However, in a recent overview of issues and research into ESL teaching and learning, the Education Department of South Australia (1992) emphasises that, “Assumptions should not be made that having a non-English speaking background equates with disadvantage, or constitutes a deficit for which the school needs to compensate” (p. 3). Indeed, Rohl and Barratt-Pugh (1996, p. 163) cite a report in The Australian on March 13, 1996 which suggests that “children from particular non-English speaking backgrounds are high achievers when compared with those from other language backgrounds”.

To address the issue of inclusivity, several projects were conducted in 1992 to meet the needs of such ‘disadvantaged’ students. In the case of ESL students, the national ESL Scale (to be reviewed later), was developed and the ‘Towards Level I’ section was included in the profiles “and helped ensure that these students had access to the profiles” (Curriculum Corporation, 1994, p. 160).
Although this national document provides 'key assumptions underlying the English profile', for example, "teachers ... need to make judgements about students' achievement over time and across a range of tasks and activities involving differing purposes, audiences and types of text" (Australian Education Council, 1994, p. 3), there were, at the time of publication, no specific guidelines provided to explain how teachers should use this document for assessment and evaluation purposes. These guidelines are now being developed.

Also, the English Statement and Profile does not explicitly define writing. Nevertheless, each level of each English strand is organised under four headings or strand organisers. The strand organisers are 'Texts', 'Contextual understanding', 'Linguistic structures and features' and 'Strategies'. It should be noted that these strand organisers are the same for each strand (speaking and listening, reading and viewing, and writing). This implies an integrated approach towards assessing and evaluating children's literacy achievements.

Student Outcome Statements

Another framework available in Western Australia which has been designed for all students in the state are the Student Outcome Statements, Western Australia's version of the English Statement and Profile. Student Outcome Statements were first developed in 1990, in order to "establish concisely and effectively, a curriculum framework for the work of Government schools in Western Australia" (Education Department of WA, 1994, p. 5). Specifically, an outcomes based assessment framework was considered desirable due to the recent shift towards "developmental approaches to teaching and learning" (Education Department of WA, 1994, p. 8), as in the First Steps materials previously reviewed, where
students are placed on Developmental Continua according to their individual achievements. The topical issues of devolution and school accountability have also contributed to the need for a focus on individual achievement as a way of setting standards for schools, and for reporting on what students are learning (Education Department of WA, 1994, p. 8).

The place of writing within the *English Student Outcome Statements* is not explicitly described. However, the structure of the document gives some indication of the authors' view of writing. The document is organised into three strands: reading and viewing; speaking and listening; and writing. Each strand is organised into sub-strands. These sub-strands are 'Texts', 'Contextual understanding' and 'Linguistic structures and features'. This version of the *English Profile* omits the sub-strand 'Strategies', but includes a separate section 'Processes and Strategies' at each level for each strand. In the introduction to the English strands (1994, p. 2) it is stated that, “while the Processes and Strategies offer valuable support for teachers, they are not themselves outcomes in the same way as those behaviours described in the Reading and Viewing, Writing and Speaking and Listening strands”. Each level (there are eight which describe student progress) documents an outcome which “represent[s] the essential elements of the curriculum” (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994, p. 10). Listed under each outcome are examples of pointers that are “signals of the achievement of an outcome” (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994, p. 10).

Despite the document's explanation of how the 'Student Outcome Statements publications work', exactly how teachers should use it for assessment and evaluation purposes is not detailed. However, as the pointers are described as “typical examples and are not listed
exhaustively” (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994, p. 10), this seems to indicate that the document offers teachers some degree of flexibility and implies that there is not one specific way of using it.

With reference to the extent to which this framework takes account of ESL learners, the Working Edition document (1994) states that “Student Outcome Statements reflect the knowledge, skills and processes that the Western Australian Government school system considers to be essential for all students” (Education Department of WA, 1994, p.5). This seems to indicate that an aim of the Student Outcome Statements is to cater for the needs of all students in the Western Australian Government School system. Indeed there is a section entitled “Students with disabilities” and at Level I there are pointers for “students in an Educational Support setting”. This inclusivity is further endorsed by the recognition that ‘English’ can include ESL programs and that “students come from diverse socio-cultural and language backgrounds and the school curriculum must recognise this diversity” (p. 1). However, when the assumptions underlying the Student Outcome Statements are examined, it would seem that this aim is not carried into the outcomes themselves. For example, there is an assumption that students’ experiences in using English and other languages outside the classroom must be considered, but the document asserts that “the Student Outcome Statements, however, focus on outcomes and experiences typically available to all students within the classroom and school.” But, what are “typical experiences” and “outcomes”, and more importantly, who has them and can experiences outside and within the classroom be separated? This seems to indicate that some students may benefit from their teachers’ use of the Student Outcome Statements more than others and that teachers’ assessment of some students may be more valid than that of others.
So, in spite of the authors' assertion, it seems that the Student Outcome Statements may not recognise ESL learners' first languages and cultural backgrounds and, as with the First Steps materials, do not take into account the extent to which they may, or may not be literate in their first language.

ESL Scales
Another framework currently available in Western Australia is the ESL Scales which, unlike First Steps and the Student Outcome Statements, was specifically designed for use with ESL learners. In 1992, the ESL Development: Language and Literacy in Schools Project and the Victorian ESL Profiles Project were in progress. In order to create the ESL Scales, material from both projects was synthesised "within the format of the National Statement and Profile" (Australian Education Council, 1994, p. 2).

The ESL Scales are intended as a supplementary document to the National Statement and Profile to "enhance students' access to the eight key learning areas" (Australian Education Council, 1994, p. 1): The relationship between the ESL Scales and the National Statement and Profile is elaborated as follows: "the ESL Scales are designed to heighten awareness of English, how it is used, how it develops and how ESL students may be assisted to develop cognitively, linguistically and affectively in it" (Australian Education Council, 1994, p. 9).

The ESL Scales is a document specifically designed for use with ESL children, and the definition of writing presented in the document reflects this:

The Writing strand focuses on writing in English. It includes the
development of the skills of encoding English into written form, and the skills of composing and presenting written texts. At the early levels, the term 'write' includes other forms of graphic communication such as drawing and sketching. (p. 5)

This definition is supported in the strand organisers of the writing strand. These strand organisers are 'Communication', 'Language and cultural understanding', 'Language structures and features' and 'Strategies'. For example, the title of strand organiser 'Language and cultural understanding' implies that cultural differences between English and other languages has been recognised in this document.

The ESL Scales share a similar format to that of the Student Outcome Statements and the National Statement and Profile. Outcomes and pointers are listed underneath each strand organiser, the outcomes describe student progress and the pointers are "indicators or signals of the achievement of an outcome" (Australian Education Council, 1994, p. 13). However, unlike the other two documents, the ESL Scales are explicit about how the document should be used by teachers for assessment and evaluation purposes:

Deciding on a student's level of ... writing in English requires teachers to make an 'on balance' judgement by relating their observations and records about the student over a period to a number of pointers in each of the organisers. (p. 11)

While it is recognised that the ESL Scales have been designed to "provide a bank of reporting language expressing a shared understanding of the likely paths of ESL achievement [in English]" (Australian Education Council, p. 10), the pointers in this framework do not appear to recognise the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of ESL learners. For example, the pointers do not appear to recognise students' use of their first language when constructing written texts. An important strategy for some ESL
learners is code-mixing and switching (as noted earlier in the review of the Highgate Project), but this is not mentioned as a pointer.

The ESL Bandscales (ESL Development: Language and Literacy in Schools Project)
The ESL Bandscales are at present being used by some teachers in Intensive Language Centres in Western Australia and some inservicing of mainstream and Intensive Language Centre teachers in the use of the ESL Bandscales is being conducted. The ESL Bandscales were developed as an outcome of the NLLIA ESL Development: Language and Literacy in Schools Project (McKay, 1994), that operated from September 1991 to December 1992. Other outcomes of the project include the reporting of the principles that informed the project, exemplar assessment activities and reporting guidelines and formats for teachers.

The structure of the ESL Bandscales is different from that of First Steps, the National Statement and Profile, the Student Outcome Statements and the ESL Scales. These documents present indicators and pointers as measures of student achievements in literacy development. On the other hand, the ESL Bandscales “provide descriptions of proficiency development in English as a Second Language in Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing within the school context” (McKay, 1994, p. A 16). These descriptors are written in such a way that they ‘paint a picture’ of student proficiency, rather than list key indicators teachers must tick off as students achieve them (as with First Steps) or provide a list of examples of pointers that teachers may or may not observe.

Observation Guides are provided in this document “to assist in the assessment of ESL learners’ language use in activities” (McKay, 1994, p.
A 15). Teachers are advised to "look for levels where the characteristics cluster around a level, and to rate according to that level" (McKay, 1994, p. A 16). The 'descriptions of proficiency development' can then be used to aid reporting.

Whilst the ESL Bandscapes are strongly based on the Bachman and Palmer model (reviewed later), which draws on second language acquisition and development theory (McKay, 1994, p. A 18), the document does not explicitly define writing. This may be because, as with the other documents, the ESL Bandscapes wish to "indicate to teachers the strong interrelationship of the four skills [Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing] in ESL learning" (McKay, 1994, P. A 28).

Whereas the Student Outcome Statements were developed as an assessment framework for all students (native and non-native English speakers alike), at all levels of schooling, the ESL Bandscapes were developed to enable teachers to "monitor and report on ESL learners' ability in using English in the range of contexts in which they learn at their phase of schooling" (McKay, 1994, p. v).

Another marked difference between the Student Outcome Statements and the ESL Bandscapes is the theoretical basis on which each framework was based. The Student Outcome Statements were based on "developmental approaches to teaching and learning" (Education Department of WA, p. 8), with influences from political issues such as devolution and school accountability. However, the ESL Bandscapes were based on "a broad philosophical and research base" (McKay, 1994, p. A7), specifically, the Bachman and Palmer model (see figure 1). This model draws on second language acquisition and development theory, as well as input from
academics and teachers of ESL children.

Figure 1. A model of language use (The Bachman and Palmer model, McKay, 1994, p. H8)

The Bachman and Palmer model is said to be 'evolutionary', which is probably due to the many changes in understanding of ESL acquisition and development. Furthermore, "the model as a whole examines and describes characteristics of the language use context, knowledge and affective schemata, and the components of the language user’s ability" (McKay, 1994, p. A 19). This appears to be a relatively complete model in that it considers the contexts in which language use occurs and the understandings learners bring to those contexts. This is reflected in the
ESL Bandscales themselves with the provision of an "orientation to ESL learner groups" description at the beginning of each age level section (junior primary, middle and upper primary, and secondary). ESL learners are described as different groups according to their level of literacy in their first language, the length of time they have been learning English, length of time they have been living in Australia and whether or not they come from a script different background.

Thus, it will be seen that a further key difference between the ESL Bandscales and Student Outcome Statements is that the ESL Bandscales consider the literacy backgrounds of the learners, acknowledge that learners will have lived in Australia for varying lengths of time, and as such, will have had varying degrees of exposure to English. Such factors are not considered in the Student Outcome Statements, merely that "students come from diverse socio-cultural and language backgrounds and the school curriculum must recognise this diversity" (Education Department of WA, 1994, p. 1).

**Summary**

This review of literature has examined topics which form the basis of the case study. These areas include: writing and its place as a part of literacy; ESL children’s writing development; and some similarities and differences that may exist between the writing development of native and non-native English speakers. Assessment and evaluation of ESL children’s writing was also reviewed, with particular attention to the purposes which teachers might have for assessment and evaluation and the frameworks currently available in Western Australia. The theoretical basis for each of these frameworks was described, with particular attention as to how well the claims made in the introductory sections of these documents (where
the aims and purposes of the frameworks are outlined) were translated into the actual indicators, pointers or descriptors.

**Note**

This review has been based on the versions of evaluative frameworks which were, to the best of my knowledge, available in Western Australia in July 1996. It is recognised that later versions of these documents and additional documents may have been prepared and may now be available. (A revised version of the Student Outcome Statements in English was published in August 1997. This was not the version used in this study).

It is further recognised that a large amount of inservice training into the use of First Steps materials has been available to practising teachers in Western Australia. There has also been some professional development for teachers into the use of other evaluative frameworks used in Western Australia. This inserviceing was not available to the author as a teacher in training.
CHAPTER III
Methodology
Research Method
In the areas of ESL children's writing development and evaluation, both quantitative and qualitative research methods have been used. A popular qualitative research method is the observational case study: "these studies often focus on a classroom, group, teacher or pupil often using a variety of observation and interview methods as their major tools" (Burns, 1995, p. 315). Examples of this type of study include Hudelson (cited in Genesee, 1994), Rohl and Barratt-Pugh (1996), and Edelsky (1991). Hudelson (1994) documented the "Spanish language literacy development of children enrolled in a whole-language bilingual program". Rohl and Barratt-Pugh (1996) analysed the writing achievements of four bilingual children in Khmer and English, and Edelsky (1991) investigated social influences on the writing of a group of bilingual children over a school year.

The case study strategy was chosen because I wished to "find out what goes on within that complex bounded system" (Burns, 1995, p. 313), that 'bounded system' being one child from the ESL population. In brief, I required the investigation "to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events" (Burns, 1995, p. 313). The case study strategy allows this to occur.

It was originally planned to analyse the writing of four ESL children. However, as the study proceeded and the data on the four children were gathered, it was decided, in view of the large amount of data, to limit the study to one case only.
In the following pages I present the research questions, the research design and data collection procedure and how each was modified to cater for one case only.

**Research Questions**

The complex nature of the writing development of native and non-native English speakers and the current changes in assessment and evaluation practices at state and national levels, which have been documented, led to an investigation of the extent to which the evaluative frameworks for writing available in Western Australia take account of ESL learners. The following research questions were formulated:

- Which features of an ESL middle primary student’s English writing are identified by each evaluative framework available in Western Australia?

- Are there any features of the student’s English writing that are not identified by the frameworks?

- What are the differences between the frameworks as heuristic tools?

**Research Design**

It was originally intended that these research questions would be investigated by describing the use of English of four middle primary ESL children when creating written texts. It was proposed that a profile of each child’s writing would be compiled, according to four evaluative frameworks currently available in Western Australia, which are the First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum, Student Outcome Statements, the ESL Scales and the ESL Bandscales. It was also proposed that these profiles would be used to construct case studies of each child. The original research design was slightly modified to make it appropriate for one case study only. Figure 2 below outlines the research design.
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Figure 2. An overview of the research design: developing a case study for one sample member

Sample

The literature review has already documented the fact that the development of written English in ESL children can be influenced by factors such as their age, linguistic background, length of time living in Australia or length of time learning English. Therefore, the children in the sample were from this diverse population.

Thus, the four children were from one Year 5/6 class in a mainstream metropolitan primary school. These children had been living in Australia and learning English for different lengths of time, and came from different linguistic backgrounds. An inner city school was selected for use in the study because a large number of ESL children attend the school, ensuring that the sample could be selected easily.

The sampling technique used to obtain the desired sample was opportunity
sampling where "research is carried out on conveniently accessible groups" (Burns, 1995, p. 72). This method was used because there were not enough children available from each linguistic background in the classroom to allow for a random sample.

**Access to sample**

Before data could be collected from the children in the sample, it was necessary to acquire written permission from people involved in the study. Firstly, written permission was sought from the school principal and from the class teacher in whose room the study would be conducted. Then, written permission was sought from a parent of each of the children in the sample. Consent forms were sent out to the parents of six children who the teacher and I thought would be suitable to participate in the study. Six children were chosen as it was anticipated that some children might not return their forms and therefore would not be able to participate in the study.

In order that the parents understood the content of the consent form sent home, the teacher carefully explained to the class the work I was intending to undertake and that written permission was necessary before I could proceed.

The children were asked to explain the form to their parents so that an informed decision about giving permission for their children to participate in the study would be made. (Copies of the consent forms are included in Appendix F).

Having the teacher explain to the class the work I was intending to do also informed the remainder of the class, who would not be participating in
the study, what to expect from my presence in their classroom and the reason for my being there.

Pseudonyms have been used to protect the privacy of the school, the teacher and children participating in this study.

**Data Collection Procedure**

An intensive period of data collection took place over three weeks at the beginning of term four. This ensured that there was minimal disruption to the classroom routine over the shortest period of time.

In order for teachers to assess and evaluate children’s writing, the developmental nature of the evaluative frameworks used requires that information be collected over a period of time using a range of assessment techniques. However, due to the limited amount of time available for data collection, it was my intention that this study would present a ‘snapshot’ of each child’s stage of development as it was at the time of data collection.

The specific information that the frameworks require teachers to collect includes the processes children use when they construct written texts, as well as the final written product. Therefore, data were collected in these areas using “sources of evidence” for case study construction as outlined by Burns (1995, p. 319). Such sources of evidence included non-participant observation, interviews and artifacts in the form of writing samples. In order that evidence of this kind could be collected, the following procedure was observed.

Firstly, an orientation visit was made to the classroom so that I could
acquaint myself with the teacher and the sample members. This also gave
the children an opportunity to become familiar with my presence in their
classroom. During this visit, *ad hoc* observations of the classroom
environment were made in order to gather contextual information that
would add flavour to the subsequent case studies.

During data collection, writing samples were collected from six children as
they had all returned a parental consent form. The inclusion of all the
children ensured that observations were not affected by the disruptions
that are a natural part of daily classroom life such as absenteeism, children
working on different tasks and in this case, children leaving for intensive
language instruction. Also, I arrived at each data collection session
prepared to observe any one of these children.

Data were collected from each of the children using the following
procedure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interview</td>
<td>I conducted an interview with each child prior to any observation. This was so that I could gather information about their backgrounds to help with the data analysis procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Observation</td>
<td>I observed the introduction of the writing lesson so that I could place each piece of writing in context. I made formal observations of each child to obtain information about their writing processes. Interactions during these sessions were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Follow-up Interview</td>
<td>I sometimes observed behaviours, the reasons for which were not always obvious. Therefore, I conducted follow-up interviews to try to discover the reasons for some of these behaviours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collection of writing samples</td>
<td>I collected samples from each of the six children at the end of each session so that I could use them for analysis in terms of each evaluative framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.* Data collection procedure with explanatory notes
A semi-structured interview was conducted using the format in Appendix A to determine the social and linguistic background of each child. This information was especially useful for analysis when using the ESL Bandscales which required background knowledge of children.

I was present for the introduction of each writing lesson and the stimulus for the writing activity, so that each piece of writing could be placed in context. Descriptions of the introductions to the writing activities are included in Chapter IV.

I then observed the writing processes of the children while they wrote a range of genres. These genres included report, narrative, and formal and informal letter writing. I observed each child on three occasions and made notes according to the format in Appendix B. While making these observations, I found that it was difficult to determine the reasons behind certain behaviours. For example, some children took frequent breaks from their writing and looked at a nearby display board. Why were they doing this? Were they looking for a specific word? Were they learning how to spell a certain word? Were they having time to think about what they were writing or were they day dreaming? I noted observations of this kind and they provided me with the format for another semi-structured interview following the writing session in order to determine the reasons behind certain writing behaviours.

Each writing session was audiotape-recorded to provide a hard copy of interactions between each child and peers or the teacher. (Extracts from transcripts have been included in Appendix C.)

The pieces of writing completed by all six children were collected at the
end of each writing session, regardless of their stage of completion. This helped to make the developmental nature of their writing explicit for analysis.

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, at the end of the planned period of data collection, it was decided that the amount of information gathered from the sample members was too large to be analysed for an investigation of this size. Therefore, one sample member was selected on the basis of his linguistic background, length of time living in Australia, length of time learning English and the comprehensive nature of the data collected from him.

The data collected from this child, using the aforementioned procedure, were analysed in terms of the four evaluative frameworks. The results of this analysis were then used to construct one case study.

**Reliability and Validity**

The reliability and validity of the case study method has often been called into question, with problems of subjectivity and investigator bias as common criticisms. However, there are methods that the case study investigator can employ to eliminate such problems. These methods include triangulation and clear presentation of procedures in the final report.

Validity can be improved by using the technique of triangulation. Burns (1995, p. 272) defines triangulation as “the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspect of human behaviour”. In this study I used the methods of participant observation and collection of writing samples.
Reliability can be improved when "the steps and procedures [are] clearly explicit and well documented in the final report" (Burns, 1995, p. 328). The procedures of this study, documented in this chapter and in Chapter IV, have been explained in detail and should enable another investigator to replicate the study with a different sample.

**Subject**

The reasons for selecting the child for the study have already been documented, but it is now important that he is introduced. The child's name is Jeffrey Chang (pseudonym) and he is 10 years old. He is originally from Taiwan, but moved with his family to Australia approximately twelve months ago. He has attended Southfield Primary School (pseudonym) for about eight months.

According to a Chinese bilingual worker at the school Jeffrey is literate in his home language Mandarin. He had not formally learned English prior to his arrival in Australia. Further information is given about Jeffrey in Chapter V.

**Summary**

This chapter documented the research questions investigated in this study and explained the research design, outlining the reason why the research design changed after data had been collected. The sample was introduced and the sampling technique was explained. The method of obtaining access to the sample via consent forms was outlined and then the data collection procedure was described. The purpose of each step of the procedure was explained in Figure 3. Finally, the subject for this study was introduced.
CHAPTER IV

Data Analysis

Methods of Analysis

In order to answer the research questions, the data were analysed by observing the following procedures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Methods of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Which features of an ESL middle primary student's English writing are identified by each evaluative framework available in Western Australia? | 1. The descriptive analysis of each writing sample was completed so that some features of Jeffrey's writing could be determined before using the frameworks.  
2. The features of his writing were then determined using the 4 frameworks.         |
| • Are there any features of the student's English writing that are not identified by the frameworks? | Summaries were written to determine which features were identified according to my descriptive analyses and the 4 frameworks.  
Any observed features not described in any of the 4 frameworks were noted.       |
| • What are the differences between the frameworks as heuristic tools?              | My own experience in using the frameworks was described and differences between them were identified.                                                  |

Figure 4. Methods of analysis

Writing samples (see Chapter V), observations (see Appendix D) and transcripts (see Appendix C), obtained during the data collection period were used for the data analysis procedure. Firstly, I completed a descriptive analysis of each genre Jeffrey had written, using only the writing samples. This was so that I could become familiar with his writing and identify some features of the writing product before I used the frameworks. It was hoped that this would aid the identification of features that might not be identified by each of the frameworks.

I used the same categories of analysis for each genre, which were adapted from an analytical framework compiled by Gibbons (1991, p. 99). However,
this framework only catered for the analysis of linguistic features. I added other categories so that I could include information regarding the background of each piece of writing, the context in which it was written and any evidence of editing.

After completing the descriptive analyses, I used the writing samples, observational notes and the transcripts of conversations recorded during some of the writing sessions to analyse Jeffrey's writing, using each of the four frameworks. I analysed his writing using the Student Outcome Statements, followed by the ESL Scales, followed by the First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum and finally the ESL Bandscales. The ESL Scales were used after the Student Outcome Statements because they were designed to be a support document to the National Statement and Profile (the national version of the Student Outcome Statements).

Each framework is divided into levels or phases, but I did not analyse Jeffrey's writing using every level or phase included in the frameworks. This was because, having completed the descriptive analyses, I had some knowledge of the level of his writing and, in all frameworks, it was evident that he was beyond the lower levels or phases. However, I continued to analyse his writing on higher levels or phases until the data showed that he did not display any of the features outlined in these advanced levels or phases.

Data Analysis Procedure
In order to analyse Jeffrey's writing using each of the four frameworks, it was necessary to follow the same procedure when using each framework. Each pointer, indicator or descriptor from the levels or phases being examined from each framework was tabulated (see Appendix E). The left
hand column of each table shows the pointers, indicators or descriptors (depending on the framework being used), for that particular level or phase. The middle column indicates whether evidence was found to suggest Jeffrey had displayed that particular feature or not. In some instances, features were not applicable because that particular indicator or pointer was not able to be observed during the particular session. For example, an indicator in Phase 3 (Early Writing) of the First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum reads “often writes a simple recount of personal events or observation and comment”. The middle column documents this indicator as “not applicable” because recounts were not observed or collected. The teacher had discouraged the use of this genre as she wanted to teach the class a range of other genres which she felt were more difficult. Finally, the third column shows the source from which the evidence was found.

The writing samples, observational notes and transcripts of conversations were then examined for evidence of features stated in each pointer, indicator or descriptor. If evidence was found in the data to suggest that Jeffrey displayed that particular feature, then the corresponding space in the middle column was filled in black. However, if no evidence was found, the space was left blank to indicate that Jeffrey had yet to display that behaviour. Those features which were not applicable were indicated by adding NA to the corresponding space in the middle column.

Some pointers, indicators or descriptors could not initially be filled in, left blank or found not applicable, because they referred to features that I had not observed as a result of the methods of data collection I had used. These pointers, indicators or descriptors required students to ‘discuss’, ‘monitor’, ‘explain’ and so on, aspects of their writing in a conference
situation. As I had not collected data of this nature, I conducted a final interview with Jeffrey to investigate whether he could display the features stated in these pointers, indicators or descriptors. This information was then added to the tables of analysis.

Summary
This chapter documented the methods of analysis used in the study in order to answer each of the research questions. The methods of analysis were explained in the order in which they were carried out and then the procedure for analysing Jeffrey's writing on each of the four frameworks was documented in detail.

Note
It is recognised that the ESL Bandscales descriptors were not designed to be used as pointers or indicators, but rather they were designed to describe children's writing level in a holistic way. Nevertheless, in order to compare the use of this framework with the other three, it was necessary to list the descriptors.
CHAPTER V

Analysis and Results

Introduction

In this chapter, a case study of Jeffrey Chang is presented, together with all his writing samples collected during the data collection period. A brief background description to each writing activity is presented and a descriptive analysis, according to my own criteria, is included for each genre. Jeffrey’s writing was also analysed according to each evaluative framework and the resultant tables of analysis are included in Appendix E. Summaries of the results of these analyses are included in this chapter.

Case Study

I now present background information about Jeffrey Chang, the child who was the subject of this study. This information was compiled from a pre-analysis interview (see Appendix A) conducted with him, informal discussions with his teacher, observations made of him while he wrote and writing samples collected after each writing session.

Jeffrey and his family arrived in Australia from Taiwan, approximately twelve months ago and he has attended Southfield Primary School for about eight months. Prior to his arrival in Australia, he had not formally learned English. Jeffrey’s teacher informed me that it is normal procedure for new ESL arrivals at Southfield Primary to begin their Australian school experience in the attached Intensive Language Centre. However, Jeffrey was immediately placed in a mainstream Year 5/6 classroom because his family did not have residency status when they arrived in Australia. Jeffrey was not therefore entitled to be placed in the Intensive Language Centre.
Jeffrey attended school in Taiwan from the age of 7 and continued his education there until his family moved to Australia. It appears that he likes going to school in Australia more than in Taiwan. In one of his writing samples, a letter to the editor arguing that children should go on school excursions in order to make learning fun, he has written, “Not like my country TAIWAN one year just once went out to play. If you didn’t write your homework Teacher will hit you that very bad”.

Jeffrey uses two languages according to the context. He uses Mandarin at home when communicating with friends and family and he mostly uses English at school. Despite his need to use English in a variety of contexts, such as for academic and social purposes, he occasionally uses Mandarin at school. For example, he asks another class member (who has been learning Mandarin outside school for approximately twelve months), to clarify teacher directions when he does not understand; he occasionally uses Chinese characters in his writing for words he does not know in English or to translate English print; and when asked if he has attended school in his native country and for how long, he mutters to himself in Mandarin and ‘writes’ with his finger Chinese characters on the carpet when working out the answer, before answering in English.

To aid his communication in the two languages, Jeffrey uses an electronic translator. This is a portable device that looks like an electronic organiser, but the keys display both the English alphabet and Chinese characters. Jeffrey always has his translator with him and he uses it for a variety of purposes. For example, he uses it to translate subject specific words from English texts, so that he can use them in his own writing. He also uses it when in conversation with the teacher or other class members, especially when he is trying to explain or ask something when he does not know the
English word or words for what he is trying to say. He also uses the translator to translate from his own Chinese text to English to help him explain to the teacher what he has written in Chinese.

Descriptive Analysis
This section of the chapter includes numbered copies of Jeffrey's writing samples, with a descriptive analysis after each genre. As explained in the data analysis section of Chapter IV, the framework used for the initial descriptive analyses was based on a framework of analysis compiled by Gibbons (1991, p. 99).
Report

This is about school holidays.

My story:
My who cinema I didn't do thing in the holidays but who at home play game just no thing.

Jowan story:
Jowan who went to Ottawa and went watch movie and play game at home no thing.

Jeffrey story:
Jeffrey who went to PINNACLE on the Sunday and at Thursday my family went to Royal show and everyday in the home no thing some time has some friends came my home play.
Report

The holidays were coming. Everyone was very happy.

MY'S STORY
My, who was at home, did nothing but he had to read, look, play, game, watch TV, and play card. And he played pong and the said at home was very boring.

JOWEN'S STORY
Jowen, who was at home, did nothing but he has slept to watch cinema and play game at home do no thing.

JEFFREY'S STORY
Jeffrey, who was at school, Friday was moon's day. And he have lot people came my home and we lot things and then got lots of fun.

On Sunday we
Genre: Report

Sample numbers: 1 & 2

Background

Jeffrey began this writing activity on the first day of Term Four. The teacher wanted the children to write about their recent school holiday, but did not want them to write recounts as she felt that they had enough experience of this genre and wanted them to write more informational texts. After discussing the various writing forms that would be appropriate for this task, the class agreed that they should write a report.

Having established an appropriate genre to use, the teacher and children adapted the conventional report framework given in the First Steps documents. The following framework was agreed upon:

- What is it about? (Introduction)
- What did you do?
- How you liked it.
- Conclusion.

As the report was to be about what individual class members and/or their peers did during the holiday, children were given plenty of time for discussion. They discussed their holiday experiences in one group and then swapped to share with another group. The children were then given half an hour to write. Writing sample 1 is the result of this initial writing session.

On the following day, the children continued with their reports. The teacher reminded them about spelling, sentence structure and editing. Further into the lesson, the children were reminded about the importance of writing a good conclusion. Writing sample 2 is the result of this second writing session.
Jeffrey was not formally observed during this writing activity.

Comments

Overall Organisation
Although sample 2 is the final draft and is unfinished, it is evident that Jeffrey has understood the purpose of the writing and has demonstrated a command of the genre. For example, Jeffrey effectively introduces the topic, demonstrating an awareness of audience. Rather than write about his own holiday, Jeffrey has included information about his peers' holidays. This significantly increased the difficulty of the task as he had to include information elicited during discussion. His use of sub-headings has organised the text in a way that makes it easier to read which is interesting as the teacher did not discuss the possibility of using sub-headings for this piece of writing.

Jeffrey has attempted to elaborate on some of the information in his report. For example, he informs the reader how the children liked their holiday, and he said at home was very boring and Jeffrey get lot of fun.

Jeffrey has written in the third person, which is appropriate to this genre for most of the text. He begins by writing about his own holiday in the third person, for example he has referred to himself as Jeffrey, but then uses the pronouns my and we.

Cohesion

Conjunctions.
Jeffrey has used the additive conjunction, and, and the adversative conjunction but, repeatedly. The lack of variety of conjunction use, in particular his overuse of the conjunction and, demonstrates a
developmental feature of his writing.

**Pronoun reference.**

Jeffrey correctly uses the pronoun *he*, for example *My* (a peer's name) . . . . . . . he and *Jowen* . . . . . . he.

**Tense**

Jeffrey has used several verbs to indicate past tense, for example *was, said, went* and *came*, which gives the reader the impression that he is writing about something that has already happened. However, in his use of the past tense, his signalling of number is inconsistent, for example *holidays was comeing, children was happy* and past tense markers are absent from some verbs, for example, *play, watch*.

**Sentence structure**

Jeffrey shows his understanding of compound-complex sentences, and repeats this pattern in each section of sample 2. For example, *Jowen who was at home do no thing but he has went to watch cinemna and play game at home do no thing*.

**Punctuation**

Jeffrey has used a range of punctuation marks. For example, he began every sentence with a capital letter and ended it with a full stop, indicating that he has a basic understanding of punctuation. He has also used commas when listing actions, for example *read book, play game, watch T.V*. He has also correctly used apostrophes for possession, for example *MY'S STORY*. 
Spelling
The only words spelled incorrectly are *comeing* and *cinema*. However, he has spelled *cinema* correctly in the first draft, so this could just be an oversight. In sample 2, Jeffrey has left blank spaces where words should be (under the sub-heading *JEFFREY'S STORY*). This could indicate that he either didn’t know the correct word to use in English or he didn’t know how to spell the word. Jeffrey has given the beginning letter in the first blank space, indicating that he is unsure of the spelling in this instance.

Editing
The inclusion of two drafts of the same piece of writing allows some insights into Jeffrey’s level of editing skills. It appears that the first draft could have been for planning purposes, so that he could plan what he wanted to write. The significant changes in the second draft indicate that he has proofread the first draft in order to make syntactic alterations to the text and add further information for the reader.

Although it appears as if Jeffrey has deleted information from *JEFFREY'S STORY* in Sample 2, I believe that, had he completed this draft, it would show that he intended to elaborate on the information he wrote in Sample 1. In Sample 2 Jeffrey writes about ‘Moon’s Day’, a topic not addressed in Sample 1, before apparently beginning to write about what he had done on the Sunday.

**Report Summary**
- Sample 2 indicates that Jeffrey organised his writing according to the framework agreed upon by the class. He went beyond the requirements of the task by adding sub-headings: he was not told to do this by the teacher.
• In Sample 2, Jeffrey wrote in the third person, which is appropriate for this genre.

• Jeffrey has shown that he has some knowledge of conjunctions.

• Jeffrey has used correct pronoun reference when referring to people.

• Jeffrey has indicated past tense, but in his use of the past tense his signalling of number is inconsistent.

• Jeffrey has repeated a known complex sentence structure.

• Jeffrey has used a range of punctuation, notably commas when writing lists, and apostrophes to indicate possession.

• Jeffrey has either left blank spaces where words should be, or has left a space but has added the the first letter of the word.

• Jeffrey has shown evidence of planning, proofreading and editing.
My name is Jeffrey Chong. I'm writing this letter to you because Robert was left school to other school. So I'm writing letter for you. I have read your letter you told me a book called "The Magic Faraway Tree". I think that book was good. Is your holiday good? Do you have went to Royal show? I have went to Royal show there was very fun. Where do you went to at the holidays.

Sorry, my English was very bad because I just new come AUSTRALIA.

From: Jeffrey Chong
Sample 5: Letter to the Editor

Dear Editor,

I think went to campus was good because we can learning somethings and get fun. If we didn't went out to play some children will think went to school was very boring then don't want to came to school or will change the school like we went to Hyde Park we learning also birds, ducks and trees and we get fun at there. If children learning in the fun place they will learning my things because at fun place they want learn it didn't think was boring so they want to learning. Not like my country TAIWAN one year... just once went out to play. If you didn't write your homework teacher will hit you that very bad. So at no fun's place children we don't want to came to school so I think went out to play was good.

your sincerely

Jeffrey Chang
Genre: Formal and informal letter writing

Sample numbers: 3, 4 & 5

Background

The writing samples shown in this section were written approximately one week apart. Writing samples 3 and 4 show two versions of the same piece of writing, an informal letter to a pen-pal from a different school. Writing sample 5 is the only draft of a formal letter to the editor of a newspaper.

Writing Samples 3 and 4

This writing activity began with the teacher and children sharing the letters they had received from their pen-pals. They discussed ways in which they could structure their letters and considered appropriate content for an informal letter of this kind. The teacher then used some of the letters as models for the children’s replies and the children made a critique of these letters, selecting appropriate content for their own work.

Jeffrey received additional support following the introduction of this activity. He had been absent when initial contact was made with the pen-pals and had not received a letter personally addressed to him. Therefore, the teacher explained the background to the activity and helped Jeffrey read the pen-pal letter and gave him some suggestions for content.

Sample 4 was completed during a second writing session two days later and Jeffrey was formally observed during this activity.

Comments

Overall organisation

During my observation of Jeffrey writing this letter, I noted that he began writing about a third of the way down the page, indicating that he was aware that an address was necessary for this genre. Noting the space he
had left, the teacher asked him if he needed the address and wrote it on the chalkboard for him. Jeffrey didn’t initially address the letter to anyone, indicating that he could be unaware of some conventions of letter writing. Nevertheless, *Dear William* was added in the second stage of the letter.

Jeffrey wrote content appropriate for an informal letter, for example, commenting on something written by the pen pal, *I have read your letter you tell me a book called the Magic Boomerang I think that book was good.* Also, he has asked questions about recent events.

In the final paragraph, Jeffrey demonstrated that he is aware that his English writing may be unconventional and explains this to his pen pal by writing *sorry my English was very bad because I just new came AUSTRALIA.*

**Cohesion**

**Conjunctions.**

Jeffrey demonstrated that he is able to use some cohesive devices when he used the causal conjunctions *so and because.* However, he writes mostly in simple sentences.

**Pronoun reference.**

It seems that Jeffrey understands the need to use pronouns as cohesive devices and is achieving success. For example, he used personal pronouns when writing about three different people. He used *I and me* when referring to himself, *you and your* when referring to the pen pal to whom he was writing and *him* when referring to a third party.
Tense
It appears that in most cases Jeffrey knows when the past tense should be used and attempts to use it, but the irregular verb inflections seem to cause him the most difficulty. For example, he has written *Rorbert was left school* instead of *Rorbert has left school* and *Do you have went to Royal Show?* instead of *Did you go to the Royal Show?* In other instances, he has apparently confused the past and present tenses. This is evident in the sentence *I has read your letter you tell me a book called the Magic Boomerang I think that book was good.* Nevertheless, it is possible that he is indicating that he read the letter (past) and that the letter tells him (present) about a book which he thinks (present) was good.

Sentence Structure
Jeffrey has used a range of statements, questions, simple and compound sentences, indicating that he is willing to experiment with syntax.

Punctuation
Jeffrey has shown inconsistent use of punctuation in this text. For example, he is aware that sentences begin with capital letters and end with full stops (*My name is Jeffrey Chang.*), but does not always use these conventions (*sorry my English was very bad because I just new came AUSTRALIA*). He has shown that he knows when to use question marks (*Is your holidays good?*), but is inconsistent in their use (*Where do you went to in the holidays.*). No other punctuation marks have been used in this text.

Spelling
Jeffrey is using a range of support materials and strategies for his spelling. His main strategy for this text was copying from a variety of sources. For
example, he copied the title Magic Boomerang from the pen pal’s letter, he used one of his own exercise books as a source for correctly spelled words and, on this occasion, he accepted teacher assistance. The teacher informed me after this writing session that where Jeffrey had wanted to write the word ‘letter’, he had written the initial letter ‘I’ and then written the Chinese character for the word. The teacher discovered what he wanted to write in English and told him how to spell it.

On two occasions in the same text, Jeffrey has written beacuse as the spelling for ‘because’. This indicates that he may be relying on the visual form of a word when he spells as he has the correct letters, but in an incorrect order.

**Editing**

My observations of Jeffrey writing the first stage of this text indicated that he proofread his work and erased parts of it. Also, when the two stages of this text are compared, evidence of proofreading and editing are apparent. For example, in the second sample of the text, he has added Dear William and the sentence If Rorbert came back I will tell him this book.

**Writing Sample 5**

This writing activity began with the teacher and children reading and discussing a newspaper article that explored the notion of cutting back the time primary school children spend on excursions, camps and other activities that may detract from formal classroom education, as outlined by the Western Australian Minister for Education. Considerations for and against this issue were then discussed.

The teacher and children then read and discussed a sample ‘letter to the
editor' from the newspaper, focussing on the structure of the text. As a result, the children were given the following framework to use for their own letters to the editor:

- Introduction
- An idea (argument)
- Support the argument
- Conclusion

Although the children were required to write a letter, this framework includes elements of an exposition. That is, they were required to present an argument.

Jeffrey was not formally observed during this activity.

Comments

Overall organisation

Jeffrey has structured his letter according to the given framework. For example, he states his argument in the introduction, *I think went to camps was good because we can leaning somethings and get fun.* He obviously agrees that children should go on camps. He then elaborates his position in the argument by writing, *If we didn't went out to play some children will think went to school was very boring then don't want to came to school or will change the school.* He then supports his argument by giving an example of how his own class went on an excursion and states how this is different from the education system he is familiar with, *Not like my country TAIWAN one year just once went out to play. If you didn't write your homework Teacher will hit you that very bad.*

In his conclusion, he provides a brief summary and restates his argument.
Jeffrey demonstrates some knowledge of formal letter writing conventions. He addresses the letter Dear Editor and ends the letter with your sincerely. However, he has not included the address of the school on this letter, and has not left any space for it, as he did for the informal letter.

Due to the fact that this text was written in one session and that he has written a relatively lengthy letter, it is probable that Jeffrey was highly engrossed in this topic.

Cohesion

Conjunctions.
In this formal letter, Jeffrey has used two types of conjunction to suit different purposes. For example, he has used the causal conjunctions because (because) and so and the additive conjunctions and and or. The causal conjunctions are particularly appropriate to the exposition genre.

Pronoun reference.
Jeffrey began writing this text in the first person, then changed to writing in the third person, before changing back to the first person. This is evident when his use of pronouns is examined. He begins by using the personal pronouns I and we, and then uses they and you.

Tense
The most noticeable grammatical pattern that Jeffrey has adopted in this text is his overgeneralisation of the present progressive ‘ing’, especially as a suffix to the verb ‘to learn’ which he has written as leaning.

Jeffrey’s unconventional use of irregular verb inflections, for example he has written went instead of go and came instead of come, seems to be a
developmental feature of his writing.

**Sentence Structure**
Throughout this text Jeffrey has made excellent attempts at forming complex language structures that were not a feature of the model letter he had access to. In fact, many of the sentences he used were based on a cause-effect pattern, for example, *If we didn't went out to play some children will think went to school was very boring then don't want to came to school or will change the school.* The first part of this sentence, *If we didn't went out to play,* is the cause and the remainder of the sentence describes a series of possible effects conditional upon this. There are very complex ideas in this sentence.

**Punctuation**
Jeffrey has used capital letters and full stops in appropriate places, although he has occasionally omitted capital letters at the beginning of some sentences. This may be an inconsistency that occurs when he is so focused on expressing meaning. He has shown understanding of the use of commas when writing lists, for example, *birds, ducks and trees.* Jeffrey is able to use apostrophes for contractions correctly, for example *didn't* and *don't.*

**Spelling**
Based on the evidence in this text Jeffrey's spelling appears to be competent, but his spelling strategies are unclear. He has consistently again misspelled *because* (*beacuse*) and *learning* (*leaning*), which may mean that he has learned the words by copying from incorrect or unclear sources.

**Editing**
There is no evidence of editing in this text, but, based on observations made when Jeffrey was writing other texts, it is likely that he proofread this piece of writing at least once and used a variety of support materials.

**Letter Summary**

- Even though no framework was given for samples 3 and 4, Jeffrey demonstrated that he was aware of some informal letter writing conventions, for example he left space for writing the address.

- Sample 5 indicates that Jeffrey organised his writing according to the framework given. He also shows understanding that, although he was writing a letter, he was expected to argue his point of view.

- Jeffrey has shown that he has some knowledge of use of conjunctions for different purposes is developing.

- Jeffrey used irregular verb inflections unconventionally.

- Jeffrey experimented with syntax, using a variety of sentence structures. In sample 5, he experimented with extremely complex language structures that were not a feature of the model text he had access to.

- Jeffrey experimented with simple punctuation, but is inconsistent in his use of these features.

- Jeffrey has apparently used a variety of spelling strategies, for example, copying from environmental print.

- Jeffrey used some editing strategies, for example, adding information to
existing text.
Sample 6: Procedure for Science Lesson

Science Experiment: Structures

Procedure

GOAL - AIM

On Wednesday afternoon we learned about some structures. We held the paper, box, circle, triangle, and looked which is easy and not.

Requirements

We had a A4 paper, and some sticky tape and a ruler and some scissors, and the weight to test the rocket, which is 5.

Steps

First, which group had 4 people which had a paper. Then we start to make. I was make (A) that was like a box, H was make (B) that was like a circle, and Luke was make (C) that was very easy. She was make very easy.
This activity required the children to write a procedure for a science investigation they had carried out several days earlier. The investigation required children to make four different paper structures and to test which was the strongest, by finding out how much weight each structure could hold before it collapsed. The teacher and children discussed the results of this investigation and then discussed an appropriate genre to use for writing about it.

The teacher gave the children the framework for writing a procedure and they discussed the content and information required under each heading. The framework was as follows:

• Goal - aim
• Requirements
• Steps
• Evaluation - testing

The children were directed to use these headings and to be explicit in their writing. It had to be clear enough to enable someone else to conduct the investigation by using their procedures as instructions.

Comments

Overall Organisation
Jeffrey's use of the required main and sub-headings has shaped the structure of this text. He demonstrated that he is aware of audience when he explained under the 'Goal - aim' sub-heading, when the activity took place and briefly what was done. He demonstrated his awareness of the purpose of this text when he explained what the aim was; to look which is strong and weak.
Although this text is incomplete, it is evident that Jeffrey had begun to sequence the procedure according to time by writing *On Wednesday, first* and *Then*.

Jeffrey experienced some difficulty in understanding what some of the headings required him to do. For example, the transcript of Jeffrey discussing the ‘requirements’ heading with a peer is provided in Appendix C and shows that once the meaning of the heading had been explained, he was able to continue with his work.

This point is further supported by observational notes taken during this activity. Jeffrey was observed looking at the framework on the whiteboard because, “I wanted to know how to write.” Then he went over to the whiteboard to see the word ‘requirements’ more easily and tried to find out for himself the meaning of this word by typing ‘requirements’ into his electronic translator. It was at this point that he asked his peer (also an ESL child) to explain the meaning to him, possibly because the meaning on the translator was not clear.

**Cohesion**

**Conjunctions.**

Apart from the time order structures mentioned earlier, Jeffrey also sequenced his text by frequently using the additive conjunction *and*. This is appropriate to this writing form which often features lists of requirements and explanation of steps in the procedure.

**Pronoun reference.**

Jeffrey used the personal pronouns *we* and *she*. Throughout most of the text, he refers to *we* without explaining who *we* are, although it becomes
evident further into the text when he explains that he was working in a group.

The First Steps materials suggest that when writing a procedure, the reader or person following the instructions is referred to in a general way. However, Jeffrey was not writing instructions, he was describing the procedure for the science activity he had completed. Therefore, it may have been more appropriate for this form of text if he had written in the third person. Nevertheless, this was not specified by the teacher and Jeffrey’s use of his first language and leaving gaps when he did not know the English word or spelling, suggests that this activity placed a significant cognitive load upon him. Writing in the first person may have reduced the level of difficulty of the task for him.

**Tense**
The reader is informed that Jeffrey is writing in the past tense when he uses the past tense forms of verbs, for example, *had* and *was*. However, his use of the past tense appears inconsistent. For example, he has written *we leaning* rather than ‘we were learning’ or ‘we learned’; *we fold* rather than ‘we folded’ and *we start to make* rather than ‘we started to make’ or ‘we made’.

**Sentence Structure**
An important feature of Jeffrey’s sentence structure in this text is his use of time order sequencing, as mentioned earlier. His use of varied sentence beginnings, for example, *On wednesday, first, and, Then we*, add more information to his statements.

His use of the sentence beginnings *On Wednesday, we had, and first,*
indicates knowledge of topic sentences that are an important feature of paragraphs. If only the sentences with these beginnings are read in this text, the reader discovers what the whole text is about.

**Punctuation**
Jeffrey has used capital letters and full stops to indicate most sentences, commas when writing lists and he has used brackets to indicate each paper structure that was made. His inconsistent use of capital letters and full stops may be a result of task difficulty, leading him to concentrate on the structure and meaning of the text, rather than on the surface features.

**Spelling**
Jeffrey’s spelling, particularly of content specific words, is excellent. This is probably because he makes use of a variety of support materials when attempting to spell a word or when finding the meaning of a new English word, for example, peers, worksheets relating to the activity, his electronic translator, environmental print and the teacher.

During the post observation interview, Jeffrey read what he had written under the ‘Goal’ heading, including the Chinese character for ‘circle’. He knew the English word, but rather than attempt to spell it in English, he wrote it in his first language and later asked a peer how to spell the word.

**Editing**
A second draft of this text would be necessary to discover further information about the level of Jeffrey’s editing skills. However, during the activity, he was observed as he proofread his work. During the post observation interview I asked him what he looked for as he read his writing and he answered, “Check if it’s wrong or not - the grammar”. This
indicates that, as he writes, he may be concentrating on the structure of his writing rather than the surface features.

**Procedure Summary**

- Jeffrey organised his writing in terms of the main and sub-headings as given in the framework, but had difficulty understanding what he was required to write under each heading.

- Although his use of conjunctions was limited, they were used appropriately for this genre.

- Jeffrey wrote this text in the first person and, as this was not specified by the teacher, may have been his choice in order to reduce the cognitive load this task placed upon him.

- Jeffrey's use of the past tense was inconsistent. Sometimes he used the conventional form, but at other times, he used the present or present progressive tense in order to communicate his meaning.

- Jeffrey experimented with a small variety of sentence beginnings to indicate time order.

- Jeffrey inconsistently used a range of simple punctuation markers.

- Jeffrey used a range of spelling strategies, for example an electronic translator and peers as support.

- Jeffrey checked his writing for grammatical errors.
Water Cycle

Water cycle is water vapour into the clouds and rain and into the groundwater and return into the sea. This is "water cycle" and the water natural resource.

The sun is source of energy in the water cycle. Because if no sun the water wouldn't vapour into the cloud. So, the source of energy is sun. If the cloud not, it wouldn't rain and sun vapour more steam and more then clouds was h and stay to rain some falls to the ocean some falls to the land. Some falls to the river it all return back to the ocean, but the rain falls at land it will return into the groundwater. Some groundwater was very deep. If the groundwater was very deep it can drink because
Water Cycle

The water cycle is water vaporizing into the clouds and then returning to the ground as rain or into the sea. This is the "water cycle" and the water resource.

The sun is the source of energy in the water cycle. If no sun, the water wouldn't turn into vapor. The clouds are the source of energy. In the cloud, it would be rain and sun vaporize more steam and more water vapor. The water vapor falls to the ocean. Some falls to the land, some falls to the river. It all returns back to the ocean. The rain falls on the land. It will return into the groundwater. Some groundwater was very deep. If dry, groundwater was very clean. It can drink because water goes down the rock and clean the water if water goes very deep, it will become clean. Many years ago, the groundwater will flow to the ocean. Some people make the well to get water from the ground.

Lest people use water. They waste water. They don't close the tap very hard, so water falls down. So we must don't waste the water.
Background

This activity required that children write an explanation about the Water Cycle to complement what they were learning as part of the Social Studies unit. The pre-writing activity gave them a lot of support. The day before they wrote their explanations, the children completed research in groups so that they would become experts on the different parts of the water cycle. They were required to research the following terms: evaporation, precipitation, condensation, hail, vapour, surface water and ground water. This was done by using a 'Jigsaw' technique: in groups, children researched the above water-cycle terms, each group researching one term. Following the research activity, the groups were mixed so that they each contained seven children who had researched different terms. Each child was then given the opportunity to explain their particular term to the rest of the group and the audience questioned the 'expert' about that term.

Immediately before they began their writing, children were given support. The teacher told them that the purpose of this activity was to test their knowledge of the water cycle and their ability to write an explanation. The teacher revised all the work they had done on the water cycle by giving them an overview of the processes involved in the water cycle and how they relate to each other.

The teacher has been involved in school-based action research regarding the implementation of the Student Outcome Statements and has made her work explicit to the children. She displayed the pointers from levels two, three and four from the 'Texts' sub-strand of the English Student Outcome Statements and used these levels, with examples of what the children might write about the Water Cycle, to explain how they could improve
their writing. For example, they were told that if they wanted to achieve level four, they would have to develop ideas and discuss issues related to the water cycle such as pollution, use of bores, water wastage and so on.

The introduction to this activity was completed by discussing the framework for writing an explanation (from First Steps), and they looked at a completed explanation as a model.

The framework the children were given was as follows:

• Definition - what it is.
• Components/parts - description of the parts.
• Operations - how it works - cause and effect.
• Applications - when and where it works or is applied.
• Interesting comment.

Comments

Overall Organisation

Once again, the headings of the framework were something that Jeffrey needed to understand before he could write. He did this by using his electronic translator to find out the meaning of the Components/parts heading.

Jeffrey has not followed the explanation framework exactly, but this is probably because most of the class (one child suggested the following to the teacher and other children agreed) decided that it would be more appropriate for them to go straight into explaining the Water Cycle after writing an introduction, rather than separately describing each part and explaining when and where the water cycle occurs. This indicates that Jeffrey has modified the framework to suit his own purposes.
Cohesion

Conjunctions.
Jeffrey has used a range of conjunctions. He has used the additive conjunction *and*, the causal conjunctions *because* and *so*, and the adversative conjunction *but*. His use of causal and adversative conjunctions indicate that he is developing beyond the repetitive use of 'and' as a cohesive device.

Pronoun reference.
Jeffrey has used the pronouns *it* and *they*. For example, *if water go very deep it will more clean*, and *lost (lots) people used water They waste water*.

Tense
Jeffrey has mostly used the present tense in this piece of writing, for example, *Water cycle is water vapour into the clouds*. But, he has also used the timeless present tense on some occasions, for example, *some falls to the ocean some falls to the land some falls to the river it all return into the groundwater*. Although he has occasionally used the past tense inappropriately, his use of present tense is appropriate for this genre.

Sentence Structure
Jeffrey has often used compound sentences to express very complex ideas. For example, *The sun is source of energy in the water cycle beacuse if no sun the water wouldn't vapour into the clouds so source of energy is sun*. The main part of the text has been written as one sentence, which confuses the meaning he is attempting to create. However, when read carefully, it appears that Jeffrey is attempting to explain extremely complex ideas, but his limited knowledge of English sentence structure has resulted in some
unconventional phrases.

Punctuation
Jeffrey has used capital letters and full stops to define his sentences. He has also used quotation marks to signal that he is defining a specific term (the term ‘water cycle’ in the first paragraph). It is unclear why he may have done this, but it does indicate that he is willing to experiment when punctuating his writing. He has also accurately used apostrophes for contractions, for example, wouldn’t and don’t.

Spelling
Jeffrey has continued to misspell ‘because’: he has written beacuse, the correct letters but in the wrong sequence. All other words, particularly the content specific words have been spelled correctly. This is probably because Jeffrey used a range of support materials when writing this text. For example, I observed him using his social studies book while writing. During the post observation interview, he explained that he was using his book to find out how to spell the words ‘vapour’, ‘groundwater’, ‘clouds’ and ‘natural resource’. He also used his electronic translator for the words ‘natural resource’. This indicates that Jeffrey uses materials available to him to find correct spellings, then uses his electronic translator to find the meaning of some of those words.

Editing
While I was observing Jeffrey during this activity, I noticed that he would look at his work and mutter to himself as if he were reading it. When I asked him afterwards if he was proofreading his work and what he was checking for, he told me “all of it”. I asked if he were checking his spelling and he replied, “Yes. And grammar”. Other evidence of editing is in his
writing. On occasions, he has inserted words to add more information, for example he has inserted the word 'water' in the first paragraph of sample 8.

**Explanation Summary**

• Once Jeffrey understood the meaning of the headings of the framework given for this activity, he was able to modify it for his own purposes.

• Jeffrey used a range of conjunctions, indicating that his knowledge in this area is developing.

• Jeffrey moved beyond using pronouns for people; he used 'it' when referring to 'water'.

• Jeffrey used the present tense when writing this text, which is appropriate for this genre, although, he occasionally used the past tense inappropriately.

• Jeffrey used compound sentences to express very complex ideas, but his limited knowledge of English sentence structure has resulted in some unconventional phrases.

• Jeffrey used simple punctuation markers, for example, capital letters and full stops, but he also experimented with quotation marks when defining a specific term and accurately used apostrophes for contractions.

• Jeffrey used a range of support materials when spelling new words, which resulted in the accurate spelling of content specific words.
Jeffrey checked his writing for grammatical and spelling errors, and inserted words to add more information to his text.
Main Characters
A little super man
Three dragon ball
lots of bad people

complication
has many bad people
don't he get dragon and
he and bad people fight

supporting Characters
his father
lots of his friends

Setting
in the earth

sequence of events
his father dead
he want get three
dragon ball and
wish his father life
again because if you
get three dragon ball
you can wish every
wish you want to

Resolution
then he kill the
all bad people
and he get three
dragon ball and
his father was
life again then
they family
reunion again
then they very
happy
Sample 10: First Draft of Narrative

Three DRAGON

Long long ago a alien came to our earth his name is the dragon told all people we don't have to go.

"If you don't take out you all will dead," said Dragon people. Then Lited people strangle his son. Then he was very angry then with Lited people. Fighting quickly him away," said. When they came back they saw the dead was very angry then he. "I will make life again father so I will kill all people." But dragon fell still in the house because if you get three dragon tall you can wish every wish you want to.

"Where are you going," said his mum. "I'm going to be there," said, you can be them because your father has trouble they still can kill your father. So the city is very good. You must find some people can tell you."

"And his mum:" I will see you mum," said.
Sample 11: Narrative

THREE DRAGON BALL

Long long ago and long, came to our earth his name is steve. Then he marry a girl and they had a son his son's name is brain. Steve had the super ability because he is alien. They family lived in a forest.

One day had 2 bad people came to steve's home.

"Where is the dragon ball?" asked bad people. "Why you want dragon ball?" asked steve. "Because if I got dragon ball I can wish I want to dominate whole world," said bad people. "We don't have," said steve. "If you don't take out you all will dead," said bad people. Then had people strange Brain and. steve was very angry then steve with had people fighting yet. "Quickly run away," said steve. Then Brain and his mum come back home say steve was dead. Brain was very angry and he would I will make you life again father, and I will kill the all had people. But dragon ball still in they house. Because if you got three dragon ball you can wish everything you want to but just once.

"When are you going. Brain," said Brain's mum. "I'm going to kill all had people," said Brain. You can't be then because your father had super ability they still can kill your father so they's hung it was very good so you must find a people can teach you hung, hung," said Brain's mum. "I would see you mum," said Brain. Then Brain took the dragon ball. Then Brain went out his home. Then he met a people tell him "at a little island there had a old man his name is James and his hung he was very good." said that people and that
people was gone. Then Brain want to find th
island it's forest there had a river and Brain
want swim to another land but the water
was very fast but Brain still swim across
Then water was push Brain away and Brain
was sleepy

When Brain wake up he was in a room. He
can walk out the room he saw a old man.

"There is here" said Brain. Happy island said
old man. "Why I'm here", said Brain. "I sell you in
the river so I just help you and this is my
home" said old man. "What is your name" ask Brain.

"My is James" said old man. "Your name is James

Can you please teach me Hung Fu" said
Brain. "Why?" said James because some bad people
tried to kill my father so I want to learning Hung Fu
and kill the all bad people" said Brain. If
you want me teach you Hung Fu that was very
hard, festival you must can push this rock
so. I will teach you Hung Fu this rock was

"Very heavy" said James. Then Brain try to
push rock but he can't and everyday he push
to push rock. Soon he can push rock and is
start to to teach Brain Hung Fu. James gave

Brain a Tortoise shell to carry on his back
every day. But Brain didn't even try. Then James
tell Brain everyday to practice jump and run.
Brain still don't know why. Soon Brain talk off
the tortoise shell. He discover he can jump
very high and he can run very fast. Because if
when he to big and he carry of tortoise shell may
he into 30 kg. Then he will jump 30 ft and run very
slow but he had practice his running and jump.
Then if he talk off the tortoise shell he will run


Very high and run very fast. Then Brain knew why James had to carry a tortoise shell. Then James started to teach Brain Kung Fu. Soon Brain's Kung Fu was very good and he leave James and went to China. Before his friends hit the city Brain and his friend saw the three of robot hit destroy the city. Then Brain and his friends with robot fight up. At home will harm the people so we change it to Arctic. There was no body said Brain. Then they fly to the Arctic and they fighting at the city. First Brain saw his many friends was wound and he was very angry and he use the fire ball. Then the robot was crumble. Then Brain pick up all his friends to the return home. When James saw Brain's friends I can help them said James. Oh yes said James I have got some magic learn if you eat magic bean you will restore your every wound and your power said James. Then Brain and his friends eat the magic bean and they's strength was no more said they has full power. How come your Kung Fu so good Brain asked his friends. Because I learning for James said Brain. Can you teach me Kung Fu James asked his friend. Okay because I don't want local people dominate the whole world said James. Then they practice Kung Fu together. Soon we must go back look my mom said Brain's friend. When Brain's friends went back they became suddenly there had one robot come James's home. Give me the Dragon fall said robot. No way said James. James knew this robot was very good and jam held robot run away. In my closet has the burn in look you take wound you can learning
kung fu from there, remember don't come back," said James. Then Brain took the dragon ball and three kung fu books away. Then he ran into the forest. No one knew he was in there. Then he start to read the kung fu book but he didn't understand what was that mean. Is try to understand and think what was that mean every day he think and think. Soon he think out what was that mean and he read the kung fu book. Then he according to the kung fu book and practice his kung fu. He learn a kung fu of the kung fu. It was very strong, he will turned into a superman is his hair all was gold, and his power will increase 100 times. This is what that three kung fu books inside said about. Then he walk the forest he went to James' house. He saw James was dead. "I will made you live again," said Brain. Then Brain went in the James' house, he find some magic bean. Then Brain went back his home he saw his mum dead too. "I must kill them now," cried Brain. Then he went to find his friends. There are you we find you so long time. My Brain's friends. Don't worry about that, that kill the bad people and get the three dragons then wish life everyone dead in the world. "Handy" said Brain. "We can't kill the bad men because they's leader is alien said Brain stem. "Don't worried I have got some magic bean," said Brain. "Okay," said Brain's friends. Then they went to harness alien sky. Then they find the alien sky, it was in a mountain. G000001 YOU IDIOT ALIEN, yellow brain. Then alien was come out. Who are you said alien. You killer
my parent, said Brain. "Oh, is that idiot kid yourself coming to deafen that good" said alien. Suddenly jumped out two robot men they fight us. Soon that two robot men Brain and his friends nearly dead they all eat the magic way they restore the sound and power. Will dont you all with dead," said alien. Suddenly Brain's friend run toward to the alien and he use the knife cut down alien's arm. Suddenly alien's arm you out again. Everybody was very amazed. Then alien jump and fly to the Brain friend and hit his friend and everybody was jump toward and fight with the flies. Then alien hit Brain's left arm and Brain's left only bone was fracture. Then alien jump out and send out a fire ball and everybody was very sorry. Then alien hit each other and everyone was faint. Then Brain was very angry and he dare the superman. His power was increase 100 times and he fight alien on air. Alien was very cool. Then Brain was nearly lose because his left arm was fracture and very hurt. "I am send you to the heaven," said alien. Then alien was very very life fire ball and Brain use the fire ball fire ball because his left arm was fracture and very hurt. Then Steve's soul was come. "My son, I will help you," said Steve. Then Steve use two hand send out a fire ball and fly to fire ball mix together it was big than alien fire ball. Then Brain's fire ball cover the alien fire ball and all toward the alien. "Boooy" said alien. "Booooooo," alien was crumble. Then Brain and his friend went to inside.
the alien ship. They found the two of the dragon ball. Then Brain put three dragon ball together. Suddenly sky turn to the black. This a big dragon come out. What wish do you want? said big dragon. I want wish. if dead in alien's land's people all live again, said Brain. Okay said dragon. Suddenly dragon was gone and three dragon ball was gone too. Then sky turn to white again. Then Brain's father and mother was live again and James was live again. This Brain's family was very happy.
Genre: Fantasy narrative
Sample number/s: 9, 10 & 11

Background
This writing activity took place over approximately two weeks. The children were required to plan their fantasy narratives by completing a story grammar (a First Steps strategy). They had previously been introduced to the story grammar technique: the teacher modelled the technique after reading some of “The Lord of the Rings”, and then the children had to construct their own in groups.

I was the teacher for this stage of the activity and the children were required to use the story grammar technique as a plan for writing their own narratives. The headings were written on the whiteboard as follows:

- Main characters
- Supporting characters
- Setting
- Sequence of events
- Complication
- Resolution

The whole class discussed characters, settings, events and so on that would be appropriate for a fantasy narrative. The differences between fantasy and reality were also discussed in order to help the children.

Following this discussion, the children used this format to plan their own fantasy narratives in the form of a story grammar and then to draft their stories.

Comments

Overall Organisation
Jeffrey needed the headings of the story grammar explained to him, and a peer (see transcript for sample 9, Appendix C) did this using stories he was
familiar with, for example ‘The Three Little Pigs’ and a book he was reading at the time. Once Jeffrey understood the meaning of the headings, he was able to complete a story grammar as a plan for his own fantasy narrative (see sample 9).

It appears that he kept to the story outline he had planned, but produced a narrative that was very complex on a number of levels. He set the scene by introducing the reader to the main characters, the setting and the time.

His sequence of events was extensive with many complications along the way. For example, Brain’s father is killed by the bad people, James the Kung Fu expert is killed by robots and his mother is also killed. These complications are resolved quite successfully.

Jeffrey has shown that he understands the need to sequence a story, particularly by using temporal descriptions. For example, he has used the descriptors long long ago, one day, when Brain and his mum come back home... when Brain wake up..., when James saw..., but he has also frequently used then and occasionally soon and suddenly, particularly during action sequences.

Cohesion

Conjunctions.

Jeffrey has successfully used a range of additive, adversative, causal and temporal conjunctions as cohesive devices, for example, and, but, because (because), and when respectively.

Pronoun Reference.

Jeffrey appears to have a good command of pronoun reference when
writing a narrative. This is illustrated in the first paragraph, *Long long ago an alien came to our earth his name is Steve. Then he marry a girl and they had a son his son’s name is Brain.* Here, Jeffrey successfully moves between using personal and possessive pronouns. However, he has used an inappropriate pronoun at the end of this paragraph: *They family lived in a forest.* This indicates that he could still be experimenting with this aspect of written English.

**Tense**

Jeffrey has written in a conventional way for a narrative. He has written his narration in the past tense, for example *long long ago an alien came to our earth . . .*, but understands that direct speech should be written in the present tense, for example “*Why you want dragon ball*” said Steve. His movement between the tenses has helped him to maintain the story telling rhythm and voice that is characteristic of narratives.

**Sentence Structure**

Jeffrey appears to be experimenting with a range of sentence structures which add interest to his writing. These structures seem to be influenced by his use of temporal descriptions discussed earlier, particularly when used at the beginning of sentences. For example, *One day* and *When Brain wake up.*

**Punctuation**

Jeffrey has continued to define his sentences by using capital letters and full stops. He has used apostrophes to signal possession (*his son’s name is Brain*) and contractions (*I’m* and *don’t*). It is interesting to note that he has overgeneralised his knowledge of possessive apostrophes on one occasion. He wrote *so they’s kung fu was very good . . .*, indicating that he
may not know the correct form (their), but has used his structure to show possession.

Jeffrey also extensively used quotation marks to indicate direct speech, but did not use a new line for a new speaker.

Spelling

Jeffrey’s standard of spelling is generally good, and there is little evidence that he experiments with different spelling strategies. This could be for various reasons: rather than take risks with his spelling he ascertains the correct spelling before writing the word; or that he is a very proficient speller; or that he is very efficient at using support materials to aid his spelling. However, it is possible that he does not use invented spelling because of the differences between English, an alphabetic language and Chinese, a logographic language. For example, there is a range of words that Jeffrey has consistently misspelled using the correct letters but in the wrong sequence: Brain instead of Brian, beacuse instead of because and kwon instead of know. It could be that he is using visual rather than phonological spelling strategies for learning new words.

Editing

Comparing the beginning of the first draft with the finished piece of writing, gives an indication of how the narrative may have developed and how Jeffrey’s use of editing may have contributed to that development.

In the first draft, Jeffrey has used a number of Chinese characters, especially for the names of the characters in the story. When I asked what the written characters meant, Jeffrey said that they were “just names”. He then used dashes to indicate the different names, rather than having to
write the Chinese characters.

Jeffrey has also used Chinese characters in the last three lines of the first draft. Two of the characters appear to be the same. When these sentences are compared with those that appear in the second draft, it seems likely that the characters could be Chinese for 'Kung Fu'. The characters he had used earlier could be Chinese for 'super ability'. All of this information indicates that Jeffrey concentrates on meaning when he writes, and then edits his writing after the initial draft stage to include English where he has initially written in Chinese.

Other editing strategies appear to be, erasing some words and phrases and, more commonly, inserting words. This could indicate that Jeffrey proofreads his work.

**Narrative Summary**

• Jeffrey used the story grammar strategy to plan for his narrative, but he needed a peer to explain the headings to him.

• Jeffrey kept to the basic story he had planned and as a result, organised his writing according to the framework given to him.

• Jeffrey used temporal descriptions to sequence his story.

• Jeffrey used a range of conjunctions.

• Jeffrey successfully moved between using personal and possessive pronouns, but there is evidence that he may still be experimenting with this aspect of written English.
• Jeffrey switched between writing in the past tense for the narration of his story and present tense for direct speech.

• Jeffrey used a range of sentence structures, but favoured the use of temporal descriptions at the beginning of sentences.

• Jeffrey used a variety of punctuation markers to suit the purpose, but particularly of note is his use of apostrophes to signal possession and contractions.

• Jeffrey used quotation marks to signal direct dialogue, but did not use a new line for each speaker.

• There was little evidence to suggest that Jeffrey experimented with spelling strategies. This may be because invented spelling is not a feature of written Chinese.

• Jeffrey used Chinese characters in his text when he did not know the English equivalent.

• Jeffrey edited his work by erasing some words and phrases, and inserting words.
Sample 12: Letter Written in Chinese

嗨！老師:

How are you? 這個意思是近來好嗎？我現在的英文比以前在台灣進步一點，需要再繼續努力。老師您現在在教以前四三班嗎？他們現在幾年級了？有沒已經換班了？我去澳洲已經一年多了，都沒有跟您聯絡過不起，大家都好嗎？說那麼多還沒告訴您我是誰？我是明源，Jeffrey Chang這是我的英文名子，我是明源，Ke是柯。老師謝謝您多的照顧，老師這裡空氣很好，您有機會可以這裡玩，我現在住在一間大農場，有150坪的屋子，一個游泳池，一個網球場，一個籃球場和非常大的一塊草地。全部共有兩公頃。我現在在讀6年級最後一個學期，剩下三個禮拜我就6年級畢業了，這裡和台灣不一樣，一年只有一個學期我畫一個圖好了。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1月</th>
<th>2月</th>
<th>3月</th>
<th>4月</th>
<th>5月</th>
<th>6月</th>
<th>7月</th>
<th>8月</th>
<th>9月</th>
<th>10月</th>
<th>11月</th>
<th>12月</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>春天</td>
<td>春天</td>
<td>春天</td>
<td>春天</td>
<td>春天</td>
<td>春天</td>
<td>春天</td>
<td>春天</td>
<td>春天</td>
<td>春天</td>
<td>春天</td>
<td>春天</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

說明：

暑假 6月

在臺灣這裡的氣候和台灣完全相反，台灣假的是春天，這裡就是秋天。這裡的聲音非常的簡單，現在他們6年級在教乘法，實在太簡單了，台灣現在教到哪裡啦？現在真想回台灣，對了他們這裡晚間店都沒開，非常的沈寂，都不像台灣天天可以遊夜市。總共一句真想回台灣，不過這裡也蠻好的。

最後祝：身體健康

萬事如意

您的學生

柯明源
Hi Teacher!

How are you? This means how are you in Chinese. My English is now much better than when I was in Taiwan, but I still need to practise more, I need to work hard. Teacher, you used to teach me in Grade 3 and Grade 4 classes. Have the Year 3 and 4 classes gone up a year, or do you teach another grade now? I come to Australia already more than one year, but I didn’t contact you and I am very sorry. Is everybody O.K? I have talked so much but I haven’t told you who I am. My name is (gives name in Chinese); Jeffrey Chang, this is my English name. Chang is the surname. Thank you very much for being my teacher and looking after me for so many years. Teacher, the weather here is very good. If you got time, you can come here and visit. I now live in a big farm and it is 150 (Jeffrey gives a measurement, but the translator was unsure of the meaning in English). I’ve got one swimming pool, tennis court, basketball court and a very, very big grass land. I’m now starting last term of Year 6. I have three weeks to go and I will graduate Year 6. Here is very different from Taiwan. Here we have 4 terms.
I draw the drawing teacher, so that you will understand. The study term is very different in Australia from Taiwan and also we have four holidays and the weather here is the complete opposite with Taiwan. If Taiwan is spring, then here is autumn - that is opposite. The math we learn here is very, very simple and easy. For the Grade 6, they are learning multiplying. That is too easy. I wonder where in Taiwan you are teaching up to now. Now I feel that I would like to go back to Taiwan. The shops here night time not open - very quiet. It wasn't like Taiwan, everyday you can go night shopping. Anyway, I really want to go back to Taiwan, but I like here too.

Goodbye Teacher,

Wish you healthy and everything O.K.

Your student Jeffrey Chang.
Background

One of the evaluative frameworks which is the focus of this study, the ESL Bandscales, acknowledges the first language of ESL children. It seems that in order to provide a wholistic picture of an ESL child's English writing development, some indication of proficiency in writing in the first language is essential. Therefore, it was important to collect a sample of Jeffrey's writing in Chinese in order that tentative conclusions regarding what he can or cannot do in his first language could be made.

Sample number 12 is a letter Jeffrey wrote to his teacher in Taiwan. This letter was translated by a multilingual teacher's assistant who works at Southfield Primary School. Her native language is Chinese and her translation has been included on pages 93 and 94. She is a trained teacher who has worked as a teacher in both Taiwan and Vietnam where she taught children of Jeffrey's age. The translation was made orally and transcribed, and as such is a hybrid text which contains elements of both oral and written genres.

Comments

The organisation of the letter, the cohesion, tense, sentence structure, punctuation, spelling and editing cannot be analysed in the same way as Jeffrey's English writing samples. Also, it is not known if the unconventional grammar in the translation is that of the translator or if she was trying to translate as far as possible word for word and it is an outcome of the difficulty of translating between two languages. There are significant differences between the two languages which make word for word translation impossible.

Sample number 12 shows that Jeffrey is aware of letter writing
conventions and has used them appropriately. For example, the translation shows that Jeffrey began the letter with "Hi teacher". The translator informed me that it is considered rude in Taiwan to address the teacher by name.

The use of the diagram to explain the different structure of the Australian school year is significant. Jeffrey designed his own diagram and included a key to convey a lot of information rather than having to write it all. This diagram enabled Jeffrey to compare life in the two countries and resulted in discussion of cause and effect, for example, 'If Taiwan is spring then here is autumn'.

Jeffrey has used English letters and numerals in this letter. This indicates that he is able to code mix and the fact that he is able to write in both English and Chinese indicates that he is able to code switch as appropriate.

In summary, the writing sample shows that Jeffrey is able to consider cultural differences when writing and he employs appropriate writing conventions from both languages that reflect this.

The translator was able to identify this piece of writing as that of a child who had been learning to write in Chinese for 5 years, suggesting that he is working at a level commensurate with his linguistic and cultural age group, even though he has been in an English speaking classroom for most of the year.
Descriptive Analysis Summary

Summaries of the features of Jeffrey’s writing have been written according to the descriptive analyses at the end of each genre. It is important that these features be summarised further to gain an overview of the features of Jeffrey’s writing across all of these genres.

• When a framework was provided, Jeffrey used it to organise his writing, although, on some occasions he experienced difficulty understanding the meaning of the headings in some frameworks.

• Jeffrey occasionally adapted frameworks to suit his own purposes, for example in one instance, he added sub-headings and in another modified the headings to suit the topic.

• In one instance, when no framework was suggested to Jeffrey, he was able to organise his writing according to appropriate conventions for that genre.

• On one occasion, Jeffrey was able to use a framework for planning his writing, but needed a peer to explain the headings to him.

• Jeffrey wrote in the first or third person, as was appropriate for the purpose of the text, although, his use of the first or third person was not always consistent.

• Jeffrey was able to use a range of conjunctions and chose those suitable for the particular genre in which he was writing, although, his use of conjunctions was rather limited.
• Jeffrey usually used correct pronoun reference when referring to people. In one instance, he used a pronoun when referring to an object.

• Jeffrey’s knowledge of tense is still developing; sometimes his signalling of number was inconsistent and occasionally, he strayed from the conventional form of the tense in which he had chosen to write. However, when writing his narrative, Jeffrey was able to switch between writing in the past tense for the narration and the present tense to signal direct speech.

• Jeffrey sometimes used irregular verb inflections unconventionally.

• Jeffrey used a range of sentence structures and made attempts at using extremely complex structures to convey complex ideas. However, his limited knowledge of English sentence structure resulted in some unconventional phrasing.

• Jeffrey experimented with a range of temporal descriptions at the beginning of sentences to signal time order.

• Jeffrey used a range of punctuation markers. However, his use of simple punctuation markers was inconsistent and he is still experimenting with more difficult features, for example the use of apostrophes to signal contractions and possession.

• Jeffrey used quotation marks to signal direct speech.

• Jeffrey’s spelling is generally conventional. He used a variety of strategies to help him spell new words, for example copying from books and
environmental print, and asking his peers and the teacher for assistance.

- On occasions when these strategies were not used, Jeffrey would either leave a space to add the word later, leave a space but give the first letter of the word, or write the word in Chinese and substitute it for its English equivalent later.

- Jeffrey used an electronic translator in a number of ways. He would find the meaning of English words to help him understand a range of spoken and written texts such as worksheets. He also used it to translate from Chinese to English when composing texts, or to translate Chinese words which he had written in the absence of his knowledge of the appropriate English terminology.

- Jeffrey showed evidence of planning, proofreading and editing his work. He checked his writing for spelling and grammatical errors, he erased some words from sentences and inserted words to add more information.

**General Summary of Jeffrey’s Writing Features**

It seems that Jeffrey’s ability to communicate is high for a student at his level of learning English. He is able to write using a range of text types to suit different purposes and audiences, although this is usually teacher directed.

Jeffrey is able to convey complex ideas and concepts through his writing in English and often attempts to use complex language structures to do this. However, he does appear to have some difficulty with the subtleties of English, for example his use of some syntactic structures is not consistent. He appears to be experimenting in this area.
Jeffrey occasionally uses his first language, Chinese, for support when he writes and often uses his electronic translator to translate between the two languages. He does this to help him understand written English text and to translate what he wants to express from Chinese to English. He appears to be working at a level appropriate to his educational level in his first language, which has very different writing and grammatical systems from those of English.

Frameworks Analysis

This section of the chapter will include a summary of the analysis of the features of Jeffrey's writing according to the four frameworks which are the focus of this study. They are the Student Outcome Statements, the ESL Scales, First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum and the ESL Bandscales. The tables of analysis are included in Appendices E1 - E4. The structure of, and the principles underlying the evaluative frameworks have already been examined in the literature review in Chapter II. However, it is important to explain how these documents were intended to be used by teachers and to explain how they have been used in my analysis and why they have been used in that way. Therefore, a brief explanation will preface the description of the use of each framework.

The following summary will outline what Jeffrey is able to do, and not do, in terms of his writing features, according to the four frameworks used in this study. This will inform the discussion on what features of Jeffrey's writing are or are not identified by the frameworks, which will be included in Chapter VI. The following summary will describe the features of Jeffrey's writing according to the pointers, indicators and descriptors included in the frameworks and how far Jeffrey has achieved each level, phase or outcome.
Student Outcome Statements

Precisely how the Student Outcome Statements were intended to be used by teachers is not explicitly explained in the document, but it is explained that the pointers are “signals of achievement of an outcome” (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994, p. 10). Therefore, the framework analysis (Appendix E1), has been organised as follows: the Writing Strand was divided into the three sub-strands, ‘Texts’, ‘Contextual Understanding’ and ‘Linguistic Structures and Features’, in the order in which they appear in the document.

It is important to note that some pointers have been very slightly modified in order to fit the page layout and these have been indicated by an asterisk (*).

The analysis of Jeffrey’s writing according to the Student Outcome Statements is included in Appendix E1.

Student Outcome Statements Summary

Features of Jeffrey’s writing were identified in each of the sub-strands across levels 3, 4 and 5 of the Student Outcome Statements.

According to the Student Outcome Statements, Jeffrey was able to:

Sub-strand: Texts:

• 3.4 “Experiment with interrelating ideas and information when writing about familiar topics within a small range of text types”. However, a number of the pointers at this level were not applicable (NA) to Jeffrey.

• 4.4 In some instances, Jeffrey went beyond level 3.4 and “used writing to develop familiar ideas, events and information”. When the pointers
required that Jeffrey include detail, or needed to be explicit in his writing, he either did not achieve that pointer, or was still developing in that area. Some pointers were not applicable (NA) to Jeffrey at this level.

5.4 In most cases, Jeffrey was unable to “use a variety of text types for writing about familiar or accessible subjects and explore challenging ideas and issues”. However, at this level, he was able to write a sustained narrative.

Sub-strand: Contextual Understanding:
3.5 None of the pointers were applicable to Jeffrey at this level.

4.5 In most instances, Jeffrey was able to “adjust writing to take account of aspects of context, purpose and audience”.

5.5 In most instances, Jeffrey was able to “identify the specific effect of context, audience and purpose on written texts”, but was still developing in one pointer at this level.

Sub-strand: Linguistic Structures and Features:
3.6 Jeffrey achieved all pointers at this level and demonstrated that he was able to “control most basic features of written language and experiments with some organisational and linguistic features of different text types”.

4.6 In some instances, Jeffrey was able to “control most distinguishing linguistic structures and features of basic text types such as stories, procedures, reports and arguments”. However, when Jeffrey was required to be ‘consistent’ or ‘precise’, he was still developing those pointers.
5.6. In most instances, Jeffrey was able to “control the linguistic structures and features necessary to communicate ideas and information clearly in written texts of some length and complexity”. However, his use of paragraphs was still developing.

**ESL Scales**

The ESL Scales are more explicit about how the document should be used for assessment and evaluation purposes. The document states that teachers need to “make an ‘on balance’ judgement by relating their observations and records about the student over a period to a number of pointers in each organiser” (1994, p. 11). This study did not require an ‘on balance’ judgement about Jeffrey’s level of writing, rather, it set out to discover what features of his writing were or were not identified by each framework. Therefore, the ESL Scales were used in a similar way to the Student Outcome Statements.

The framework analysis of Jeffrey’s writing according to the ESL Scales (Appendix E2), was organised as follows: the Writing Strand was divided into the four strand organisers, ‘Communication’, ‘Language and Cultural Understanding’, ‘Language Structures and Features’ and ‘Strategies’, in the order in which they appear in the document. As with the Student Outcome Statements, the features of Jeffrey’s writing were analysed with reference to each pointer as they appear under each organiser rather than level, so that it was possible to comment on which particular features of Jeffrey’s writing were or were not identified by each organiser, across different levels of the document.

The analysis of Jeffrey’s writing according to the ESL Scales is included in Appendix E2.
ESL Scales Summary

The features of Jeffrey's writing were identified in each of the strand organisers across levels 3, 4 and 5 of the ESL Scales.

According to the ESL Scales, Jeffrey was able to:

Strand Organiser: Communication:

- **3.9** In most instances, “communicate on a number of familiar topics through writing simple creative and informational texts in response to classroom demands”. Two pointers at this level were not applicable to Jeffrey.

- **4.9** In most instances, “Communicate for a range of purposes on a variety of familiar topics, using a basic repertoire of text types”. Once again, three pointers at this level were not applicable to Jeffrey.

- **5.9** Jeffrey achieved all but one pointer at this level, indicating that he was able to “communicate on a range of familiar topics and incorporate language and ideas drawn from different sources in response to the varying demands of the classroom”. He did not ‘write from the viewpoint of a designated character in a story’, but from the viewpoint of a narrator, inserting direct speech where appropriate.

Strand Organiser: Language and Cultural Understanding:

- **3.10** Jeffrey achieved all pointers of this outcome at this level. This indicates that he was able to “demonstrate awareness of common formats required of class texts”.

- **4.10** Jeffrey achieved all but one of the pointers of this outcome, at this level. This indicates that he was able to “demonstrate an awareness of
how effective writing is tailored to the requirements of the topic and the needs of the reader”. Jeffrey did not show evidence of using ‘colloquial and idiomatic language’ in his texts.

5.10 Jeffrey achieved all pointers of this outcome, at this level, apart from the pointers which were not applicable to him. This indicates that he was able to “adjust the form of writing to intended contexts, purposes and audiences”. One pointer that was not applicable to Jeffrey as the feature was not directed by the teacher was, ‘use a variety of formats suited to the purpose to support or illustrate written texts (diagrams, graphs, tables). Although he did not do this in any of his English written texts, sample 12 shows that he is able to do this in his first language. As the ESL Scales are designed to report on development in English, the document does not recognise Jeffrey’s achievement of this pointer.

Strand Organiser: Language Structures and Features:
3.11 Jeffrey achieved many of the pointers of this outcome, at this level. This indicates that he was able to “write a variety of simple cohesive texts, demonstrating a developing use of simple language and structures”. The pointers that Jeffrey did not demonstrate, seem to be the ones that required him to go beyond the use of simple language structures and features, for example ‘select suitable descriptive words to enhance effectiveness of writing’.

4.11 Jeffrey achieved many of the pointers of this outcome at this level. This indicates that he was developing his ability to “write a variety of texts, demonstrating some overall cohesion and coherence”. Significant pointers he did not achieve were the ability to write cohesive paragraphs and topic sentences to announce the ideas of the paragraph.
It appears that Jeffrey was still developing in terms of language structures and features at this level. Although he had achieved many pointers of this outcome at this level, it seems that there are several key features that he has apparently not yet mastered, for example, 'use a range of conjunctions to relate ideas across sentences or paragraphs in a text'.

Strand Organiser: Strategies:

Jeffrey has achieved all pointers at this level, indicating that he was able to "draw on knowledge of the writing process to plan, write and redraft texts".

Jeffrey achieved some of the pointers at this level, although two were not applicable to him. This indicates that he was developing in his ability to "make use of discussion and reflection to enhance the writing process". Jeffrey's reflection process may improve when he is able to 'revise text beyond word or phrase level' and 'consider alternative wordings (substitute a more effective word by crossing out the original word).

Some of the pointers at this level are not applicable to Jeffrey. However, he has achieved two of the pointers which indicates that he was beginning to "focus on planning and editing writing to improve range and expression".

First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum

The authors of the First Steps materials believe that children's language and literacy development can be mapped as 'developmental pathways'. Specifically, the Writing Developmental Continuum is used to record children's writing behaviours by identifying which minor indicators and
key indicators children have achieved in different phases. As it is the key indicators that "describe behaviours that are typical of a phase" (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994, p. 2), a child must display *all* key indicators in a phase to be described as having achieved that particular phase. The teacher can use this information to inform her future teaching of individual children.

The aim of this study was not to place Jeffrey in a phase on the Writing Developmental Continuum. Rather, it set out to use this First Steps document to discover which features of Jeffrey's writing were or were not identified. Therefore, Jeffrey's writing was analysed using *each* indicator (key and minor indicators) to gather information about his writing.

The analysis of Jeffrey's writing according to the First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum is included in Appendix E3.

**First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum Summary**

The features of Jeffrey's writing were identified from phases 3, 4 and 5 of the Writing Developmental Continuum.

According to the First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum:

**Phase 3: Early Writing:**

• Jeffrey used a small range of familiar text forms.

• Jeffrey chose topics that are personally significant.

• Jeffrey used basic sentence structures and vary sentence beginnings.

• Jeffrey experimented with words drawn from language experience
activities, literature, media and oral language of peers and others.

- Jeffrey began to develop editing skills.

- Jeffrey attempted to use some punctuation.

- However, Jeffrey did not demonstrate the ability to explain in context, some of the purposes of using writing, e.g. shopping list or telephone messages as a memory aid. This may have been because his oral language in English is still developing, but it is likely that Jeffrey was not asked to do this.

- Although Jeffrey talked with others in order to ask for assistance, he was not observed to talk with others to plan and revise his own writing.

Phase 4: Conventional Writing:
- Jeffrey used text forms to suit purpose and audience.

- Jeffrey did not explain why some text forms may be more appropriate than others to achieve a specific purpose. This may be because his oral language in English is still developing or that he was not required to do this.

- Jeffrey wrote a range of text forms including stories, reports, procedures and expositions.

- Jeffrey used a variety of simple, compound and extended sentences. However, he did not group sentences containing related information into paragraphs.
• Jeffrey began to select vocabulary according to the demands of audience and purpose, e.g. "uses subject-specific vocabulary".

• Although Jeffrey was able to punctuate simple sentences correctly, he punctuated inconsistently.

• Jeffrey used a range of strategies for planning, revising and publishing own written texts.

**Phase 5: Proficient Writing:**

• Jeffrey explained the goals in writing a text and indicated the extent to which they were achieved.

• Jeffrey wrote to define, clarify and develop ideas and express creativity, e.g. stories, poems, reports, arguments.

• Jeffrey used a variety of simple, compound and complex sentences appropriate to text form.

• Jeffrey edited his own writing during and after composing.

• Although Jeffrey attempted to use a range of punctuation, it was not always accurate.

• Jeffrey did not use a wide range of words that clearly and precisely convey meaning in a particular form. He used subject specific vocabulary, but his vocabulary on the whole is not, as yet, extensive.

• Jeffrey did not write a topic sentence and include relevant information to
develop a cohesive paragraph.

•As Jeffrey did not write in conventional paragraphs, he did not organise paragraphs logically. However, he was able to organise his writing logically to form cohesive texts.

•Jeffrey did not select text forms to suit purpose and audience, as they were all selected by the teacher. However, he did demonstrate control over most essential elements of the text form he used.

•Jeffrey was not observed taking notes, selecting and synthesising relevant information. However, he did plan text sequence.

**NLLIA Middle & Upper Primary ESL Bandscales**

The ESL Bandscales outlines, quite specifically, how the document should be used by teachers for assessment and evaluation purposes. It is not essential that observation guides are used "to assist in the assessment of ESL learners’ language use in activities" (McKay, 1994, p. A 15). The information collected using the observation guides is used to place learners on a level according to ‘descriptions of proficiency development’ (the levels that have been used in the following analysis), provided in the Bandscales. It is possible that the features of an individual learner will be evident across more than one level, so teachers are recommended to find one level around which the learner’s features cluster, and to rate the learner’s achievements according to that level (McKay, 1994, p. A 16).

The observation guides were not used for analysis in this study as it appeared to be more appropriate to use the descriptors provided in the ESL Bandscales. It is, after all, the ESL Bandscales that are a focus of this
study. Rather than analyse the features of Jeffrey's writing on yet another framework and then rate him on a particular level of the ESL Bandscales, his writing features were analysed on different levels of the ESL Bandscales. In this way, a broad sense of the features of Jeffrey's writing according to the ESL Bandscales could be ascertained.

For the purposes of this analysis, the descriptors in each level have been separated so that Jeffrey's writing features could be analysed according to each one. This was necessary in order to use the ESL Bandscales in a format similar to that of the other frameworks. It is not, however, a procedure recommended by the authors of the document. The analysis of Jeffrey's writing according to the ESL Bandscales is included in Appendix E4.

ESL Bandscales Summary

The features of Jeffrey's writing were identified on levels 4 and 5 of the Middle Primary ESL Bandscales.

According to the ESL Bandscales, Jeffrey was able to:

Level 4: (The following summary has been adapted from level 4 of the ESL Bandscales).

Jeffrey was able to write simple texts (e.g., narratives, reports and procedures) modelled on those read with and/or by the teacher (but with ESL features). He was continuing to experiment with language (this experimenting is a sign of language growth). The length of his writing was growing, but "depth" of meaning of his writing in English was held back by his limited language resource.

Jeffrey also expressed himself in his first language, either in whole texts or
as part of his English writing.

Phase 5: (The following summary has been adapted from level 5 of the ESL Bandscales)

Jeffrey was showing signs of becoming more independent in his writing and was gaining greater control over the language and texts. He was able to write independently (though with support normally given in mainstream classes) narratives, recounts and other texts, as expected at his phase of schooling, but with ESL features.

In writing on informational topics, he was able to write short reports, projects etc. (though with ESL features) with clear guidance, and if reading source material is at his level of reading ability. If reading source material is too advanced, writing may break down. However, he will not write with "depth" because of limited control over English (e.g. narrow range of vocabulary, structures, subtleties of the language).

Although Jeffrey drew on themes and ideas from reading in English and in his first language, he was not yet drawing more from English than from Chinese.

Framework Analysis Summary

This section of the chapter has dealt with those features of Jeffrey’s writing identified by each of the four frameworks. Jeffrey’s writing was analysed using the Student Outcome Statements, ESL Scales, First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum and the ESL Bandscales. The features of Jeffrey’s writing according to each of these frameworks were summarised at the end of each framework analysis.
Discussion

This section of the chapter presents the three Research Questions. Firstly, the features of Jeffrey’s English writing as identified by each evaluative framework available in Western Australia are reported. The features of Jeffrey’s English writing that are not identified by these frameworks are also reported. Finally, differences between the frameworks as heuristic tools are identified.

Research Question 1

Which features of an ESL middle primary student’s English writing are identified by each evaluative framework available in Western Australia?

In order to answer this question, a descriptive analysis of each of Jeffrey’s writing samples was completed so that some of the features of Jeffrey’s writing could be determined. The features of his writing were then identified using the Student Outcome Statements, the ESL Scales, First Steps Developmental Continuum and the ESL Bandscales.

The results that answer this question have already been documented in the analysis sections of this chapter. The tables of analysis (in Appendices E1 - E4) explicitly document the features of Jeffrey’s writing identified by each framework and these features are summarised at the end of each framework analysis section.

Research Question 2

Are there any features of the student’s English writing that are not identified by the frameworks?

Although the results that answer this question have already been
documented in the analysis section of this chapter, it is important to explicitly report the features that are not identified by the frameworks. Those features not identified by each framework are reported in the following section and are summarised and discussed in Chapter VI.

**Student Outcome Statements**

- Although this framework recognises a student's ability to 'adopt organisational conventions when given a structured format for writing a particular type of text', the fact that Jeffrey experienced difficulty in understanding the meaning of the headings in some of the genre frameworks presented by Jeffrey's teacher (due to his developing skills in reading English), this pointer is not identified as a feature of his writing.

- It seems that Jeffrey's use of some linguistic structures and features were not identified as features of his writing, for example, his selection and use of first or third person as appropriate for the purpose of the text, his use of pronoun reference, and his use of a range of sentence structures.

- Although spelling is recognised in this framework, the variety of strategies Jeffrey used to aid his spelling does not seem to be identified as a feature of his writing. However, spelling strategies are considered in the processes and strategies section of each level, not used for analysis in this study.

- Jeffrey's use of his first language in his written English text is not recognised as a feature of his writing.

- The use of an electronic translator was an often used feature of Jeffrey's writing and this is not recognised in the framework.
• Planning, proofreading and editing are implicit in the pointers, for example, ‘experiment with rearranging sentences’, but are not included as individual pointers. Planning, proofreading and editing are considered in the processes and strategies section at the end of each level, not used for analysis in this study.

**ESL Scales**

• Although the use of ‘organisational framework[s] in writing familiar text types’ and the seeking of ‘assistance about approach or language needed for a writing task’ are considered in this document, it seems that Jeffrey’s difficulty in understanding the meaning of some of the headings in the genre frameworks presented to him by his teacher (due to his developing reading ability in English), is not identified as a feature of his writing.

• It seems that Jeffrey’s use of the first or third person as appropriate for the purpose of the text is not identified as a feature of his writing.

• It appears that Jeffrey’s occasional use of unconventional irregular verb endings is not identified as a writing feature.

• Checking for accuracy of punctuation is included as an editing strategy, but it seems that Jeffrey’s ability to use a range of punctuation markers is not identified as a feature of his writing.

• Although revising a draft to check for spelling (among other features), is included as a pointer, accuracy of spelling and spelling strategies are not identified as features of Jeffrey’s writing.

• Jeffrey’s use of an electronic translator is not identified as a feature of his
Jeffrey used Chinese characters in some English texts and this is not identified as a writing feature.

First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum

Although the use of an organisational framework is included as an indicator, Jeffrey's difficulty in understanding the meaning of the headings in some genre frameworks presented to him by his teacher (due to his developing ability in reading English), is not recognised as a feature of his writing.

Jeffrey's occasional use of unconventional irregular verb endings is not identified as a feature of his writing.

Re-reading to check for spelling errors is included as an indicator, but the spelling strategies Jeffrey used, for example, copying from environmental print is not identified as a writing feature. However, there is a separate Spelling Developmental Continuum.

Jeffrey's use of Chinese in his English texts and his use of an electronic translator are not identified as features of his writing.

ESL Bandscales

As the levels in the ESL Bandscales document rather general 'descriptions of proficiency development', most of the features of Jeffrey's writing are identified by this framework. However, his use of the electronic translator could not be identified by any of the descriptors and therefore, appears to be the only feature of Jeffrey's writing not to be identified by the ESL.
Summary

This chapter covered several areas of the study. Firstly, a case study of Jeffrey Chang was presented, together with all his writing samples collected during the data collection period. A brief background description to each writing activity was presented and a descriptive analysis, according to my own criteria, was included for each genre. As Jeffrey’s writing was also analysed according to each evaluative framework, the resultant tables of analysis are included in Appendix E. Summaries of the results of these analyses were included in this chapter. Chapter V concluded with a discussion of Research Questions 1 and 2. A summary and discussion of Research Question 3 is presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER VI

Discussion

This chapter will re-visit the purposes and aims of conducting this study and will answer Research Question 3. The findings of the study will be summarised and interpreted, and will also be examined in relation to current literature.

Rationale of the Study

This study set out with two purposes: firstly, to provide an insight into the processes of using the various frameworks available in Western Australia to assess and evaluate the writing of one ESL child and secondly, to provide an insight into which particular features of that child's writing are recognised in each framework.

In order to provide these insights, the writing practices of Jeffrey Chang, an ESL child whose first language is Chinese, were observed over a period of three weeks. This involved observing him while he wrote a range of English texts and collecting the resultant writing samples. Each writing session was audiotape-recorded to analyse interactions between Jeffrey and his teacher and/or peers. Jeffrey was also interviewed.

Each writing sample was described in detail using another framework, so that some features of Jeffrey's writing could be identified before all observations were used to analyse his writing products and processes according to four frameworks that are currently available in Western Australia to assess and evaluate ESL children's writing. They are the Student Outcome Statements, the ESL Scales, the First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum and the ESL Bandscales.
Summary of the Findings

Many features of Jeffrey's writing were identified by the four frameworks. In all instances, these features were identified across more than one level or phase, depending on the framework. The features of Jeffrey’s writing that highlighted what he could do, did not necessarily ‘cluster’ around one particular level or phase, but were often evenly distributed across levels and phases. This was particularly the case with the ESL Scales and the ESL Bandscales. In the case of the Student Outcome Statements, the pointers that highlighted what Jeffrey could do appeared to be more prevalent in level 3, except for level 3 of sub-strand ‘Contextual understanding’, where none of the pointers were applicable to Jeffrey. On the First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum, the features of Jeffrey’s writing that highlighted what he could do seemed to be more prevalent in phase 3, but were also distributed across phases 4 and 5.

The specific features of Jeffrey’s writing identified by the frameworks are documented in detail in the tables of analysis in Appendices E1 - E4.

Jeffrey appeared to achieve at different levels or phases among the sub-strands, strand organisers and key indicators. For example, on the ESL Scales framework, Jeffrey appeared to be more successful across levels 3, 4 and 5 equally, in the ‘Communication’ and ‘Language and Cultural Understanding’ sub-strands. However, in the ‘Language Structures and Features’ sub-strand, Jeffrey appeared more successful in level 3 than levels 4 and 5.

Although many features of Jeffrey’s writing were identified by the frameworks, there were some features that were not identified by any framework. In particular, Jeffrey used his electronic translator extensively
as he wrote, for example, to translate written English to Chinese, often so that he could understand written instructions or parts of the organisational frameworks for writing specific text types. However, none of the frameworks used to analyse Jeffrey’s writing identified this or the use of a bilingual dictionary which could have served a similar purpose, as a feature of his writing.

The **Student Outcome Statements**, the **ESL Scales** and the **First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum**, did not recognise Jeffrey’s use of his first language in his English written texts, nor the fact that he had difficulty understanding the headings in some of the organisational frameworks of specific text types, because of his, as yet, relatively undeveloped reading ability in English.

The **Student Outcome Statements** did not identify some linguistic structures and features in Jeffrey’s writing, for example, his use of a range of sentence structures. This document was different from the others in that it dealt with processes and strategies as a separate section; they were not considered as a sub-strand with their own individual statement of outcome. Therefore, there were several features of Jeffrey’s writing that were not identified because of this, for example, spelling strategies and planning, editing and proofreading.

The **ESL Scales** did not seem to recognise some of the linguistic structures and features that Jeffrey used in his writing, for example, his ability to use a range of punctuation markers. This is despite the fact that this particular framework provides an extensive ‘Language structures and features’ strand organiser.

Apart from the features not identified commonly between frameworks, it
seems that the First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum did not identify Jeffrey's use of unconventional irregular verb endings or the spelling strategies he used. (The use of unconventional verb endings may, in some cases, reflect grammatical development rather than spelling development *per se*). However, there is a separate Spelling Developmental Continuum.

It appears that, apart from not identifying Jeffrey's use of an electronic translator, the ESL Bandscales identified the most features of Jeffrey's writing. Although the descriptors were not as specific and detailed as the pointers and indicators of the other frameworks, the general 'descriptions of proficiency development' provided in the ESL Bandscales, appeared to identify all of the features contained in the other frameworks (although in a general way), and, in addition, they recognised Jeffrey's use of his first language. Further, the ESL Bandscales are organised into sections that consider the ages of the students to be evaluated. None of the other frameworks present age of students as a factor to consider when assessing and evaluating ESL students.

**Interpretation of the Findings**

In answer to Research Question 3, the findings from this study seem to indicate that the four frameworks used in this study differ as heuristic tools and as such, raise issues about their structure and use. The following discussion is qualified by the fact that I was a student in training who was using some of the frameworks for the first time and then with only one ESL student's writing.

When analysing Jeffrey's writing using the frameworks, it was often difficult to interpret some of the pointers, indicators or descriptors,
especially when they were related to more than one feature. For example, in the sub-strand ‘Linguistic structures and features’ at level 3 of the Student Outcome Statements, a pointer stated ‘control basic sentence structure and attempt to vary sentence beginnings and clause structure’. Jeffrey was able to control basic sentence structure, but attempts to vary sentence beginnings and clause structure were sometimes inaccurate. Therefore, it was difficult to know if Jeffrey had displayed this feature or not.

Interpretation of pointers, indicators or descriptors often required the use of ‘professional opinion’, indicating that teachers will interpret these frameworks in different ways. It was useful that the Student Outcome Statements and the ESL Scales provided example pointers that were not exhaustive. These frameworks encouraged teachers to modify and/or add their own pointers, thus making these frameworks more flexible and enabling teachers to interpret them according to their own needs.

Although I found that the Student Outcome Statements was a flexible document and the pointers provided examples of “signals of achievement of an outcome”, it was confusing that the ‘Processes and strategies’ section did not have its own outcome statement. Therefore, the processes and strategies a student uses were not taken into consideration when determining which outcomes that student had achieved. This indicates that processes and strategies are not seen to be as important as the sub-strands ‘Texts’, ‘Contextual understanding’ and ‘Linguistic structures and features’. However, the other frameworks have included processes and strategies in their pointers, indicators or descriptors and have highlighted the importance of these features when assessing and evaluating ESL children’s writing.
The inclusion of examples aided interpretation of the pointers, indicators or descriptors, particularly when language structures and features were analysed. The ESL Scales provided particularly good examples in this area, especially as these examples were written with ESL features. The Student Outcome Statements did not give examples that were as clear as in the ESL Scales, but the framework did provide work samples which showed how some texts had been interpreted using this document. The First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum provided few examples for the indicators, but did provide one piece of text for each phase in the overview of the Writing Developmental Continuum. This introduces teachers to what to expect from children’s writing in the different phases. However, the latest version does provide several examples in the text, but it would be useful if some were included with the indicators for ease of interpretation. The ESL Bandscales provided short writing samples in the Junior Primary Bandscales, but none appear in the Middle and Upper Primary Bandscales.

It appears that the inclusion of examples with the pointers, indicators or descriptors, particularly with ESL features, would enable teachers to make more uniform interpretations of the documents.

It seems then, that although the frameworks differ as heuristic tools and therefore differ in structure and use, a key difference between the frameworks seems to be those features they were designed to assess and evaluate. For example, the First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum appears to concentrate on assessing and evaluating language (which is assumed to be English), the Student Outcome Statements appear to assess and evaluate English, whereas the ESL Scales and the ESL Bandscales
appear to concentrate on assessing and evaluating students’ achievements in *English (as a second language)*. However, the ESL Scales also focus on students’ achievements in English as a second language in terms of *access to curriculum areas*.

**Relationship of Findings with Current Literature**

The main findings of this study were that:

• Many of the features of Jeffrey’s writing were identified by the frameworks, but to varying degrees.

• Some of the features of Jeffrey’s writing were not identified by the frameworks.

• The frameworks differ somewhat as heuristic tools according to the features they were designed to assess and evaluate.

These findings will now be related to current literature in the area of assessment and evaluation of ESL children’s writing. These findings will also be linked with the writing models outlined in the literature review.

A feature of Jeffrey’s writing that did not appear to be identified by the frameworks was his use of an electronic translator. This feature of his writing supports the notion that literacy is more than just being able to read and write and that it is always evolving in response to constant changes in society and technology, as his use of the translator could certainly be considered a literacy practice.

In terms of the writing process specifically, the features of Jeffrey’s writing
appear to reflect the ideas presented in the 'Context Pyramid Model of Writing' (Mosenthal, 1983, pp. 30-33), but from an ESL perspective. The model recommends that a definition of writing should comprise the five main contexts involved in writing, namely, 'writer', 'materials', 'task', 'situation organiser' and 'setting'. In his case as the 'writer', it was important to consider Jeffrey's linguistic and cultural background when assessing and evaluating his writing. For example, Jeffrey's use of his first language in his English texts appeared to be an important feature of his writing as it allowed him to focus on meaning and organisation before linguistic structures and features were considered.

The 'materials' or 'physical stimulus' required for writing needed to be at a level of English that Jeffrey could understand. For example, when Jeffrey was given the organisational frameworks to help him organise a particular text type, he did not understand some of the headings and this interfered with his writing. He needed additional time to understand the meaning of the headings and what was required of him, before he could actually complete his writing. To expand on this, Jeffrey also needed additional support from peers and/or the teacher in understanding the 'task'.

In terms of the 'situation organizer' and the 'setting', it was the teacher who was responsible for having Jeffrey write in a setting that was specifically arranged to help all children in the class to write. For example, relevant environmental print was readily available and Jeffrey often referred to this as he wrote.

Some features of Jeffrey's writing reflect current literature regarding the development of ESL children's writing. For example, Edelsky (1982, p. 214) states "what the child tacitly knows about writing...is applied to
rather than interferes with writing in another language" and Jeffrey appeared to demonstrate his knowledge of purpose and audience in many of his texts, including the letter he wrote, in Chinese, to his teacher in Taiwan. Also, Hudelson (cited in Genesee, 1994, p. 137) states that children "are in control of the processes as they use information from the environment...in their construction of meaning". This appeared to be the case when, on several occasions, Jeffrey used environmental print, information from the teacher and peers and his electronic translator, in order to complete written tasks in English.

The Highgate Project (Education Department of Western Australia, 1994) provided a comprehensive view of ESL children’s writing development and some of the features of the writing development of the ESL learners in this project were observed in Jeffrey’s writing. For example, Jeffrey was able to ‘convey complex meanings in English using simple forms’, although, occasionally Jeffrey also used complex forms. He also seemed to ‘rely on visual strategies rather than phonemic strategies due to differences in phonological systems of different languages’. This was evident when Jeffrey spelled words such as ‘beacuse’ consistently unconventionally. His use of visual strategies in spelling may also be as a result of differences in the two writing systems in that Chinese is logographic and English is alphabetic. Also, ‘code mixing and switching’ appeared to be important for him as he sometimes used Chinese characters in his English texts.

The Highgate Project (1994) set out to discover “the extent to which the First Steps [spelling and writing] materials are appropriate and useful as a means of evaluating and supporting the development of ESL learners” (p. 2). The findings of this project were that the First Steps materials could generally be used to monitor the spelling and writing development of ESL
children, but that teachers need to support linguistic and cultural diversity in their classrooms. The use of the First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum to assess and evaluate Jeffrey's writing appears to support this view. For example, many of the features of Jeffrey's writing were identified by this framework, but the use of his first language and electronic translator were not identified. This indicates that this framework does not cater for all children, as is implied in the document.

The Student Outcome Statements also imply that the framework caters for the needs of all students in the WA Government School system. However, as with the First Steps document, the Student Outcome Statements did not identify Jeffrey's use of his first language or his electronic translator.

Although the Writing strand in the ESL Scales “focuses on writing in English” (Curriculum Corporation, 1994, p. 5), this framework also did not recognise Jeffrey’s use of his first language or his translator. It appears that these features in particular were important in his development of written English and should be considered in a framework that has an English as a second language focus.

The ESL Bandscales were developed specifically for use with ESL children and, as Jeffrey's use of his electronic translator appears to be the only feature not identified by this framework, the ESL Bandscales seems to be a relatively comprehensive document to use when Jeffrey's writing was assessed and evaluated. In particular, it recognised the use of his first language and level of development, in both Chinese and English.

Summary
This chapter has presented a summary and interpretation of the findings of this study. The relationship between these findings and some current literature in the area of assessing and evaluating ESL children’s writing was reported.
CHAPTER VII

Conclusion

In this chapter possible limitations of the study are examined and implications for future research and classroom practice are reported.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of this study do exist and it is important that they are discussed. Firstly, only one child was the focus of this study. It could be argued that, to improve the reliability and validity of the study, a range of ESL children should have been included in the sample, for example, from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and living in Australia and learning English for varying periods of time. However, it was still important to conduct the study as it allowed for a fine grained analysis using one child, and raised important questions regarding the assessment and evaluation of ESL children.

Secondly, is the fact that this study presents the interpretations of the frameworks of one person, a student in training. It is quite likely that if other teachers had used these frameworks with the same writing samples, they may have interpreted them in a different manner, thus producing different findings. However, again, the interpretations of one person have still raised some important issues.

It is recognised that a further limitation of the study could be in the research method itself, but as was shown in Chapter III various procedures were put in place to minimise these weaknesses as far as possible. For example, triangulation and clear presentation of procedures have been used in this study to minimise the problems of subjectivity and investigator bias.
Possibly the greatest limitation of the study relates to Research Question 2 which asked about those features of an ESL child’s writing not identified by the frameworks. It is likely that there were features of the child’s English writing that were not observed either by the frameworks, nor by the single researcher. For example, had the child’s writing in Chinese been subjected to the same detailed analysis as the English writing sample, it could have been possible to trace the influence upon the child’s English writing to his knowledge of Chinese writing conventions.

Implications for Future Research

The three main findings of this study have been documented in the previous chapter, namely, that there was a range of features identified by the frameworks, but that there were also some features of Jeffrey’s writing not identified in the frameworks. Also, it appears that there were differences between the frameworks as heuristic tools. These findings raise issues regarding the possible need for future research into this area.

Firstly, this study focused on one ESL child, from one particular cultural and linguistic background. It seems that further research is needed to identify if these findings would differ if a number of ESL children were studied, who have come from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, who have lived in Australia for different lengths of time and who have been learning English for different periods of time.

Further, as mentioned in the previous section, this study represents an interpretation of the frameworks by one person, a student in training. It would be interesting to discover how different teachers interpret these frameworks when assessing and evaluating ESL children’s writing, and to find out how these different interpretations (if in fact, they are different),
relate to the findings of this study.

As this study suggests there are features of one ESL child’s writing not identified by the frameworks. Further research needs to identify how this finding may have an effect upon future versions of the documents, if at all. For example, should these features be included in the documents, or should the documents be made more flexible so that teachers can identify exceptional features and include them in the documents themselves?

It also seems that further research needs to be carried out to discover if the frameworks that claim to cater for the needs of all children, actually do as they claim. For this research the writing of a range of children who have different individual needs would need to be examined.

Implications for Classroom Practice
As outlined in the Literature Review (Chapter II), there has been a recent shift towards outcomes-based assessment and evaluation. This approach enables teachers to ‘assess individual progress’ of students, aids reporting to interested parties and aids ‘implementation of curriculum objectives’. This outcomes-based approach has given rise to the evaluative frameworks included in this study, namely, the First Steps Writing Developmental Continuum, the Student Outcome Statements, the ESL Scales and the ESL Bandscales.

However, as this outcomes based approach is a relatively recent initiative, there is not a wealth of information available to teachers to assist in their assessment and evaluation of ESL students. Nevertheless, this study has produced findings to indicate that a range of writing process and product features of one ESL student were identified by these frameworks, and
there were some features that were not identified. Also, there seemed to be differences between the frameworks as heuristic tools. Although these findings cannot be generalised to the ESL population, they do present implications for classroom practice that teachers could consider when assessing and evaluating ESL students. Some of these implications are outlined below.

• As approximately one quarter of Australian school children are from non-English speaking backgrounds, there is a great need for teachers to have access to relevant documents and knowledge that will aid the assessment and evaluation of the literacy achievements of such students.

• It appears that very few teachers are using specialist ESL documents in Western Australia. As such, many ESL children may not have any account taken of their first language and as such may be assessed as achieving at a much lower level than that of which they are capable. Therefore, there is a need for the inserviceing of mainstream teachers in the use of those documents, so they have access to knowledge even if they don’t choose to use them.

• When assessing and evaluating the child used in this study, I did not attempt to allocate him to a particular phase of writing. As a result, I was able to observe and analyse his writing in English and, on the basis of this, I could have planned for the child’s individual needs in language development. This proved to be a very comprehensive approach to assessment and evaluation, as I was not constrained to placing him in a particular phase for reporting purposes.

• This leads to a further point regarding the mainstream documents,
particularly First Steps. This is a document widely used in Western Australia for assessment and evaluation purposes, where teachers are required to allocate children to phases. My analysis of Jeffrey's writing according to First Steps shows that he displayed indicators from various phases. If I were using this document to allocate Jeffrey to a particular phase of writing development as his teacher is required to do, he would have been placed at the lowest level in which he showed all key indicators. However, if teachers, including mainstream teachers, used the ESL Bandscaler for this purpose, use of the child's first language would be considered and placement in a phase of writing development could be more appropriate.

• This study has shown that it is not enough for teachers to assess and evaluate ESL children's English writing products without considering the processes these children use while writing in English, the length of time they have lived in Australia, length of time they have been learning English, the level of schooling in their native country, their age and their linguistic background.

• Most schools in Western Australia use school-based assessment procedures. At Southfield Primary School, a mainstream school where this study was conducted, all mainstream children are assessed in terms of First Steps phases and the results recorded on computers for school accountability. This leads to many problems for schools such as Southfield with many ESL children. For example, the school profile may be unjustifiably low, resulting in negative responses from parents. Further, not all aspects of ESL children’s literacy achievements, as outlined above, would be considered. It is likely that a true picture of the capabilities of these children is not presented in the First Steps assessments. (In the
Intensive Language Centre at Southfield Primary School, the teachers are trialling the use of alternative methods of assessing ESL children.

• Each document used in this study emphasised different aspects of writing. This means that each could be used for different assessment and evaluation purposes. For example, *First Steps* emphasised writing processes and products in English; the *Student Outcome Statements* had a writing product focus (in English) and did not consider processes as specific outcomes; the *ESL Scales* also emphasised writing processes and products in English, but were designed to be used specifically with ESL students, therefore, cultural differences between English and other languages were recognised; finally, the *ESL Bandscales* focused on the range of contexts in which ESL children use English at different levels of schooling. These different emphases meant that when Jeffrey’s writing was assessed and evaluated using all four of the documents, the *ESL Bandscales* and the *ESL Scales* appeared to be the most suitable to use because they were designed to be used with ESL children only. This does not mean that *First Steps* and the *Student Outcome Statements* were unsuitable for assessing and evaluating Jeffrey’s writing, but that I would have needed to consider factors that affect ESL learners (such as age, length of time learning English and so on), in addition to the data collected by using these documents.

• All of the documents were time consuming to use when a detailed profile was made and this could be problematic for teachers in schools such as Southfield, who have many ESL children in each class. In order to assess and evaluate the individual attainments of such diverse groups of children in a meaningful way would require a great deal of time.
It is important to note that none of the documents used in this study attempted to assess and evaluate ESL children in their first language. Although it is recognised that this would be an extremely difficult task, the translation of Jeffrey's letter written in Chinese (in Chapter V), and the data collected from it, indicates that it could be extremely important for teachers to know what an ESL child is capable of in his/her native language when assessing and evaluating literacy achievements in English.

Recommendations
While it is recognised that the findings from this study cannot be generalised to the ESL population, the above implications for classroom practice suggest that there are issues that mainstream teachers could consider when assessing and evaluating ESL children using First Steps, Student Outcome Statements, ESL Scales and the ESL Bandscales.

It seems that teachers need to carefully consider what, why and who they are assessing and evaluating, and select a document or combination of documents to suit the needs of the school, teacher and student. To this end, in a school such as Southfield that predominantly uses First Steps, it seems important that key indicators from a range of phases are considered rather than that an ESL child is placed into a phase of writing development. It may also be important that the ESL Bandscales are trialled as this document considers the writing development of ESL children specifically, and recognises the use of their first language.

It is also suggested that, where possible, teachers attempt to find out the level at which an ESL child is operating in terms of writing development in the first language. This could aid planning for future teaching and learning.
• As all of the documents are time consuming to use, it is suggested that whichever document is used, it should be used in greater detail with ESL children who are experiencing difficulty.

• Overall, it seems that the ESL Bandscales was the most appropriate of the four documents used to assess and evaluate Jeffrey’s writing. As a result, this may be the most appropriate document for teachers to use, particularly in classes with many ESL children, as it could be modified to be used in differing degrees of detail.
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APPENDIX A: PRE-ANALYSIS INTERVIEW

NAME: _________________________ DATE: _____

• How long have you lived in Australia?

• From which country did you move?

• What is your first/native language?

• What language do your parents use when they talk to each other?

• What language do they use when they talk with the rest of the family/friends?

• What language do your grandparents use?

• What language do you mostly use at home?

• What language do you use when you talk with your friends?

• Do you use your first language at school? Why? Why not?

• How long have you been learning English?

• Did you learn English in your native country?

• Did you attend school in your native country?
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Observation Sheet

Name: __________________________________________

Date: _________________________

Description of activity/stimulus:

Purpose:

Stage of writing (1st draft etc):

Grouping of children:

• Involvement with task:

• Interaction with peers:
• Evidence of proof reading/editing:

• Use of support materials (dictionaries, environmental print, peers etc):

• Child's understanding of the task:

• Miscellaneous observations:
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Procedure (Writing Sample 6)

This conversation was recorded as the children were writing procedures for a science activity. Here, Jeffrey is asking peers about the ‘Requirements’ heading of the procedure framework.

J: This to be done too?
T: No (inaudible) That one?
J: No, this one.
(Both inaudible)
T: What you need. Weights . . .
J: What you need?
(Inaudible)
T: You know that thing we used? (inaudible) O.K? Just write it.
J: Ohhhhh. (Inaudible)
J: Yep.

Explanation (Writing Samples 7 & 8)

This conversation was recorded while the children were writing an explanation of the Water Cycle. The Year 5 children were leaving the room for a physical education lesson, leaving the Year 6 children in the classroom.

C: Do we keep going?
T: Yes. Year 6’s you can keep going.
J: What to do? (Whispers to peer)
M: Write, write, write.

Story Grammar (Writing sample 9)

This conversation was tape recorded during the story grammar writing activity. The story grammar was completed as a plan for a narrative. During
this transcript, class members are explaining to Jeffrey the meaning of the
'Main Characters' heading.

J: (asks an inaudible question)

L: Characters? Main characters? Then you write . . .

J: Who's character (inaudible) . . . you write who's character.

T: Make-up, say lion or (inaudible) you know?

J: O.K.
APPENDIX D: OBSERVATIONS

This Appendix includes summaries of observations made of Jeffrey during four different writing activities. Although Jeffrey was observed during five activities, one observation session has not been included because Jeffrey changed activities after I had been observing him for a short time. The new activity was not suitable for observing his writing behaviours.

The following observations were made by completing observation sheets the same as the one enclosed in Appendix B. Further information was obtained from Jeffrey by conducting semi-structured interviews after some of the observation sessions.

Pen Pal Letter

The following observations were made as Jeffrey completed writing sample 3.

1. Jeffrey read the pen pal’s letter orally while the teacher listened and corrected him when necessary.
2. Jeffrey looked through photographs of the pen pals’ visit to Highgate Primary school.
3. Overall, Jeffrey was involved with the task, but occasionally stopped to listen to other classroom members, to look at their writing, or just to look around the room.
4. Jeffrey looked across the desk at other children’s writing before he began his own work.
5. Jeffrey began writing his letter a third of the way down the page, leaving room for the address.
6. Jeffrey copied the address of the school from the blackboard after the teacher had asked him if he needed it.
7. After writing a few lines, Jeffrey read what he had written so far and erased something.
8. During the activity, Jeffrey often referred to the letter from the pen pal.
The teacher helped Jeffrey with his spelling, but he also copied something from his exercise book.

After the observation session, the teacher informed me that when trying to write the word 'letter', Jeffrey had written the letter 'l' and then a Chinese character after it. Once the teacher told him how to write the word in English, he rubbed out the Chinese character and replaced it with the English word.

**Story Grammar**

The following observations were made as Jeffrey completed writing sample 9.

Jeffrey needed further assistance before he could begin; the teacher explained the story grammar framework headings to him again, another class member explained the headings to him, linking them with stories Jeffrey was familiar with.

Jeffrey asked another class member to explain the meaning of the 'Main Characters' heading (see transcript from writing sample 9, Appendix C).

Jeffrey used the framework headings that were on a teacher constructed story grammar pinned to a display board to help him understand the task.

Jeffrey began his own story grammar once he had a thorough understanding of the meanings of each of the headings.

Jeffrey used his electronic translator during this activity.

**Procedure**

The following observations were made as Jeffrey completed writing sample 6.

At the beginning of the session, Jeffrey talked to his neighbour.

Jeffrey was looking at the procedure framework on the whiteboard because "I wanted to know what to write".

Jeffrey was talking to his neighbour, looking at the framework and pointing to his work because "I asked him what is to be done".

Jeffrey looked at another class member's writing (who had written a lot), because "I wanted to know how much you needed to write" [under each heading].

Jeffrey looked at another class member's writing because "I saw him
what he have done”.

21 •Jeffrey used his electronic translator to find the meaning of the word ‘requirements’ (a heading from the procedure framework), and went to the whiteboard so he could see the word more clearly.

22 •Jeffrey talked to his neighbour about the ‘Requirements’ heading (see transcript from writing sample 6, Appendix C).

23 •Jeffrey wrote the word ‘weights’ on a piece of paper and asked his neighbour to explain the meaning (inaudible on tape).

24 •Jeffrey looked at his work and muttered to himself because he was proofreading. When asked what he does when he proofreads, he replied “Check, if it’s wrong or not - the grammar”.

25 •During the post observation interview, Jeffrey read the paragraph under the ‘Goal’ heading. Where he had written Chinese characters, he read them in English, indicating that he knew the English word but not the spelling. He filled in some blank spaces as he was reading.

**Explanation**

The following observations were made as Jeffrey completed writing sample 7.

26 •Jeffrey copied the title of the writing from his neighbour.

27 •Jeffrey looked at his neighbour's writing because “I was seeing how to write”.

28 •Jeffrey talked to his neighbour, but he couldn’t remember why.

29 •Jeffrey looked at the explanation framework infront of him.

30 •He was looking at the ‘Definition’ heading of the framework when he began his writing.

31 •During the session, Jeffrey looked in his social studies book because “I want to see how to spell vapour, groundwater, clouds, natural resource”.

32 •Jeffrey used his electronic translator to find the meaning of the ‘Components/parts’ heading on the framework.

33 •He also used his translator to find the meaning of the words ‘natural’ and ‘resource’.

34 •Jeffrey looked at his writing and muttered to himself because he was proofreading. When asked what he checked for he replied, “All of it”. I asked if he checked his spelling and he replied, “Yes and grammar”.

Jeffrey was very involved with this activity. When the teacher stopped the class so that a sample of a child's writing could be read, it appeared that he wasn't listening; he was involved with his own writing and his electronic translator.
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### APPENDIX E: FRAMEWORKS ANALYSIS

Appendix El: Student Outcome Statements

#### The Writing Strand

**Sub-strand: Texts**

**Level 3**

**The student:**

3.4 Experiments with interrelating ideas and information when writing about familiar topics within a small range of text types.

*This will be evident when students, for example:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Recount in sequence several aspects of a personal experience or an event, commenting on their significance (list events and conclude with an overall comment on them).</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No recounts observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write a report which includes information on several aspects of the topic.</td>
<td>See samples 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construct riddles and jokes in which the second part depends on the first.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No riddles and jokes observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write an imaginative story with a distinguishable storyline in which some events are clearly related to the resolution of a problem.</td>
<td>See samples 9, 10 &amp; 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Devise a simple recipe or a set of instructions for a game with some attention to detail and logical sequence (refer to equipment or materials and include essential steps).</td>
<td>See sample 6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Give a few related reasons that support a position (why the school canteen should sell a particular kind of food).</td>
<td>See sample 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write a broad description of a familiar item or person with attention to several distinguishing characteristics (a wanted poster or character portrait).</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No descriptions observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write an advertisement which includes most relevant details for a class or school event.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No advertisements observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level 4**

**The student:**

4.4 Uses writing to develop familiar ideas, events and information.

*This will be evident when students, for example:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Construct stories in which ideas, details and events are developed and relevant to the storyline.</td>
<td>See samples 9, 10 &amp; 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Argue in writing a position or point of view, raising a few related points in support of a thesis.</td>
<td>See sample 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discuss in writing some pros and cons of a topical issue, attempting to relate these to one another.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No writing of this nature observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construct an information report that elaborates on and classifies details on a number of aspects of the topic.</td>
<td>This pointer is developing in samples 1 &amp; 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write a detailed description of a person, place or object, selecting details that develop an overall image of what is being described.</td>
<td>Descriptions of characters and setting were not included in sample 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write a short play for a performance by peers in which characterisation is developed through events and dialogue.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No writing of this nature was observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Level 4 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create poetry in varying forms, attempting to use language economically</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Samples of poetry were not observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to develop ideas or images.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate some detailed description and reflection into a written account of a personal experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection is developing in sample 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devise a set of explicit instructions that involve related steps (how to ride a bicycle).</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is developing in sample 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment with humorous adaptations of standard text types to amuse or entertain.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Writing of this nature was not observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 5

**The student:**

5.4 Uses a variety of text types for writing about familiar or accessible subjects and exploring challenging ideas and issues.

*This will be evident when students, for example:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write about personal experiences (in letters, journals) with attention</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not evident in samples 3 &amp; 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to detail, consciously using narrative structures to involve readers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a detailed description of a natural scene, an object, a place,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptions of characters and setting were not included in sample 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choosing details to convey a specific impression of it to someone else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write sustained narratives an familiar, possibly self-chosen, topics</td>
<td></td>
<td>See samples 10 &amp; 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with attention to time order, characterisation, consistent narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>point of view, and development of a conclusion or point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment with writing poetry in various specified formats (using</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Samples of poetry were not observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple metrical patterns; writing shape or concrete poems; using poetic elements such as imagery and rhyme to enhance meaning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write informative texts for familiar but wide audiences, providing more</td>
<td></td>
<td>*This is developing in samples 1 &amp; 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than an exclusively personal perspective (write a newsletter article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about a school event in such a way that both a wider school audience and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the participants would be interested).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop written arguments about ideas and issues for a general</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is developing in sample 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audience, stating and justifying a personal viewpoint, providing more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than one argument and some relevant supporting details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep logs, journals or notes from teacher or peer discussions about</td>
<td></td>
<td>This was not directed by the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing, recording such things as ideas for future writing or aspects of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their own writing that need more attention and reflections on personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Outcome Statements

The Writing Strand

Sub-strand: Contextual Understanding

**Level 3.**
The student:

3.5 Recognises that certain text types and features are associated with particular purposes and audiences. This will be evident when students, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• With teacher guidance, examining models of a text type (a poster, a recipe, a report or a story) discussing its purpose and some of its distinguishing features (the function of different parts of stages of a text).</td>
<td></td>
<td>During the interview (Appendix F), models of a text type were discussed, but not for purpose and distinguishing features. Jeffrey had difficulty understanding some questions, so it was decided to discuss the differences between the two text types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compare, with teacher guidance, the features of two different text types and talk about how these differences are related to purpose (compare the function of a setting in a story with the list of ingredients in a recipe).</td>
<td></td>
<td>As above, but Jeffrey did understand the purpose of the pizza advertisement. See lines 129 - 131 in Appendix F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Select, from a small known range, an appropriate text type for a particular writing purpose and explain why they have chosen it.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is not possible, as all texts observed and collected were completed under teacher direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keep a record of the purposes and audiences for which they have written and the text types used.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeffrey was not directed to do this by the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compare the features of personal writing with those of texts written for more formal and public purposes and audiences (attention to presentation, accuracy of conventions).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeffrey recognised the differences in presentation of two texts (see line 136, Appendix F), but accuracy of conventions was not discussed. Jeffrey had difficulty understanding some of the.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider, with teacher guidance, some needs of readers before writing (predict what a particular reader may need to know, or the topics for a story likely to appeal to a specified audience).</td>
<td></td>
<td>This was not done by the teacher individually with Jeffrey prior to any of the writing sessions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level 4.**
The student:

4.5 Adjusts writing to take account of aspects of context, purpose and audience. This will be evident when students, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Consider and attempt to incorporate alternative viewpoints on an issue when writing to persuade others to a point of view.</td>
<td>See writing sample 5. Jeffrey gives the viewpoint of someone from another country to persuade the reader to his point of view.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Level 4 Continued.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognise the importance of being well-informed on a topic when writing, doing extra research if necessary, especially if the purpose is to persuade others or to describe situations and events in a plausible way.</td>
<td>He did not do additional research for his explanation, and only used his social studies book to check spellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider an audience's likely knowledge of a topic and provide helpful explanations or definitions.</td>
<td>See writing sample 3 &amp; 4. Jeffrey explains who he is and why he is writing the letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore options for influencing readers in writing (appeals to authority or emotions; use of humour).</td>
<td>See writing sample 5. Jeffrey attempts to influence the reader by arguing his point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognise occasions where slang and colloquial language might be inappropriate and adjust writing style (letter to the editor, writing for formal, unknown audiences).</td>
<td>This would depend upon Jeffrey's knowledge of Australian slang and colloquial language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider whether their own writing takes into account the interests and needs of potential readers (in a report, choose illustrative examples familiar to both girls and boys; avoid sexist or racist terms).</td>
<td>*See writing sample 5. Jeffrey has written for a young newspaper audience and has considered their needs and interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss influences on their own choice of topics for writing (film and television, reading preferences).</td>
<td>See lines 153 - 228 (Appendix F). Jeffrey discusses influences on his choice of storyline for his narrative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level 5.**

*The student:*

**5.5 Identifies the specific effect of context, audience and purpose on written texts.**

This will be evident when students, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discuss written forms such as advertisements and poetry in which the conventions of standard written English may be waived, the effects on audiences of varying these conventions, and experiment with controlling these effects.</td>
<td>NA  <em>Although an advertisement was discussed (see Appendix F, lines 108-146), Jeffrey has not had the opportunity to 'experiment with controlling these effects'.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss similarities and differences between talking to a friend about an event and writing to that friend about the same event (while much of the language is the same, the written version will probably be more organised).</td>
<td>See lines 58 - 100. Jeffrey discusses the similarities and differences between talking to a friend about an excursion and writing to that friend about the same event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the readability of presented work, taking into account context and purpose (use a word processor if available; set out a newspaper article using a real one as a model; use large print on posters so that they can be read from a distance).</td>
<td>Jeffrey has used headings in his holiday report, to make the finished product easier to read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 5 Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand that writers need to bring readers into the world of the text, and make efforts to set the scene clearly at the beginning of their own expository or imaginative texts.</td>
<td>Jeffrey has clearly set the scene at the beginning of his narrative (sample 11). He has informed the reader where and when the story takes place; who the main character is and additional information about that character, e.g. Steve had the super ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Understand that readers have expectations of certain text types and try to meet these (recognise the need to unify a story and make all details relevant; make topical relevance of a letter to the editor clear in the first paragraph).</td>
<td>Jeffrey is still developing this pointer. He makes all details relevant in his narrative, but does not make the topical relevance clear in his letter to the editor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Outcome Statements

The Writing Strand

Sub-strand: Linguistic Structures and Features

Level 3.

The student:
3.6 Controls most basic features of written language and experiments with some organisational and linguistic features of different text types.

The will be evident when students, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Control basic sentence structure and attempt to vary sentence beginnings and clause structure</em></td>
<td>Jeffrey is able to control basic sentence structure (e.g. 'My name is Jeffrey Chang'), but other linguistic features are sometimes inaccurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Relate ideas in writing, using a variety of conjunctions suited to the purpose.</em></td>
<td>A range of conjunctions were used in all samples, e.g. 'They don't close the tap very hard so water fall down' (see sample 8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Select language that enhances meaning (use known technical terms or precise descriptive words).</em></td>
<td>For example, technical language in sample 8 - 'water vapour', 'energy' etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Spell many common words correctly in own writing.</em></td>
<td>Evident in all writing samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Write legibly on most occasions, using consistent shape, size and slope and cursive script (when rewriting a draft for presentation to an audience; when making a sign for display).</em></td>
<td>Writing is legible on most occasions, but sometimes shape and slope of letters is inconsistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Use some conventions of layout to assist the reader (group related ideas or information under sub-headings), and experiment with various ways of presenting written work to appeal to the reader (by using different headings, layout and illustrations).</em></td>
<td>For example, use of sub-headings in samples 2 &amp; 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Use time order to organise writing of recounts and stories.</em></td>
<td>For example, use of 'long, long ago', 'One day' etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Use correct tense for selected text type (simple present tense when reporting information).</em></td>
<td>Uses correct tense for most text types, but can be inconsistent, e.g. 'I think went to camps was good because we can...'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>With teacher guidance, use text organisation to develop ideas and information (a recipe including a list of ingredients and directions; a story with setting, problem, episodes and resolution).</em></td>
<td>Evident in all writing samples. Teacher guidance given by giving Jeffrey the most appropriate genre framework to use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level 4.

The student:
4.6 Controls most distinguishing linguistic structures and features of basic text types such as stories, procedures, reports and arguments.

This will be evident when students, for example:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Evident in all writing samples</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopt organisational conventions when given a structured format for writing a particular type of text (write a story with a setting, problem, events and a resolution).</td>
<td>The student: Controls the linguistic structures and features necessary to communicate ideas and information clearly in written texts of some length and complexity. This will be evident when students, for example:</td>
<td>- Jeffrey was given a structured format for each writing activity.</td>
<td>Teacher did not discuss aspects of grammar as characteristic of particular text types, but Jeffrey adopted some in his own writing, e.g. past tense for narration and present tense for direct speech in his narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss with the teacher and peers how particular aspects of grammar are characteristic of particular text types and attempt to adopt these consistently in own writing (use of simple present tense in reports and procedures).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognise meaningful divisions between sections of text and set these out as paragraphs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Although he recognises divisions between sections of text, they are not always set out as conventional paragraphs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a range of conjunctions to indicate relationships between ideas in writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conjunctions used in writing samples include: and, because, so, but.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently use most common punctuation marks and discuss the purpose of less familiar punctuation in text models (dashes, colons and semi-colons).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeffrey's use of common punctuation marks is not consistent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select vocabulary for precise meaning and discuss the effect of vocabulary choices in their own writing and text models.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeffrey discussed his choice of 'dominate whole word' (see lines 330-373, Appendix F), but was unable to discuss the effect of this choice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a legible handwriting style and cursive script as required by audience and purpose for writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uses legible handwriting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of print and script styles to emphasise or highlight parts of the text (bold or underlined headings, italics, all capitals).</td>
<td></td>
<td>For example, use of sub-headings in sample 2, capital letters in samples 4, 5 &amp; 11, the way he has written 'no' and 'box' in sample 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 5

*The student:*

5.6. Controls the linguistic structures and features necessary to communicate ideas and information clearly in written texts of some length and complexity.

*This will be evident when students, for example:*

- Use suitable heading and sub-headings in sustained informational texts such as projects and assignments or accepted text divisions such as extra space accompanied by a short line to convey the passage of time in sustained narratives.  
- Use paragraphs to indicate a sequence of ideas in informational and narrative texts.  
- Control cause-and-effect sequences in narratives so that the reader is clear about what is happening and why.
**Level 5 Continued.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ensure that spelling and punctuation conform to Standard Australian English, as demanded by the task.</th>
<th>Spelling and punctuation conform to SAE, but he often misses out punctuation that is necessary in the text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment with rearranging sentences by transforming, expanding, rearranging and reducing them to achieve an intended meaning.</td>
<td>This is evident when writing samples 1 &amp; 2 are compared. He has rearranged sentences for the final draft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E2: ESL Scales

The Writing Strand

Strand Organiser: Communication

Level 3.
At level 3, a student:
3.9 Communicates on a number of familiar topics through writing simple creative and informational texts in response to classroom demands.
Evident when students, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write simple creative texts (imaginative recounts, descriptions, narratives, poems).</td>
<td>See samples 10 &amp; 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write simple personal and opinionative texts that present a point of view (journals, statement of opinion, responses to a question).</td>
<td>See sample 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write poems based on simple, repetitive and modelled language</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Poems were not observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write conventional informational texts based on personal experience (science experiment, report based on classification activity).</td>
<td>See samples 2 &amp; 6. This pointer is also evident in sample 8, but is not based on personal experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write suitable captions for pictures and photographs.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Captions were not observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write simple descriptions of things, events, places, processes or people.</td>
<td>Jeffrey described what his peers had done during the school holiday in sample 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write simple reports appropriate to different topic areas (on animals, land forms, levels of government).</td>
<td>see sample 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level 4.
At level 4, a student:
4.9 Communicates for a range of purposes on a variety of familiar topics, using a basic repertoire of text types.
Evident when students, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write letters of invitation (to friends, visiting class speakers).</td>
<td>Sample 3 shows that Jeffrey is able to write letters of response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a story line and some characterisation in creative texts.</td>
<td>See sample 11. Storyline is very complex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborate and refine narrative and descriptive texts.</td>
<td>See sample 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write poems based on models using some identifiable rhythm and stress patterns.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Poems were not observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain 'voice' in personal and creative texts.</td>
<td>See sample 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and sequence information for specific text type (report, biography).</td>
<td>Evident in most samples, particularly samples 1 &amp; 2 and samples 9, 10 &amp; 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-construct a text (using notes or through discussion).</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Texts were not re-constructed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Level 4 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>•Make summaries by writing sentences expanded from writing sentences expanded from copies and paraphrasing.</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Data not observed or collected.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•Incorporate information from another source into own writing (copying, paraphrasing).</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Evident in many samples. E.g., sample 4, Jeffrey incorporated information from his pen pal's letter, in sample 6, he incorporated information from the science experiment worksheet and in sample 8, he used information from the social studies worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Support a point of view and come to a conclusion (order sentences logically to support an argument).</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>See sample 5. Jeffrey states his argument at the beginning, logically orders the argument, giving examples where necessary and concludes by restating his point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Write simple explanations.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Sample 8 indicates that Jeffrey is beyond writing simple explanations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 5.

At level 5, a student:

5.9 Communicates on a range of familiar topics and incorporates language and ideas drawn from different sources in response to the varying demands of the classroom.

Evident when students, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>•Use own writing for personal reflection (personal journal writing).</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>This pointer is developing in sample 5, where Jeffrey reflects on an issue and his education experience in Taiwan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•Write from the viewpoint of a designated character in a story.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>In his narrative, he wrote from the viewpoint of a narrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Emulate literary forms such as poetry and dialogue, drawing on studied models.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Jeffrey's use of dialogue in his narrative is consistent with conventional narrative forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Sustain an argument on a simple point of view and come to a conclusion (why students shouldn't smoke).</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>See sample 5. Jeffrey has sustained an argument, giving examples to support his point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Write logically, incorporating relevant information (in giving an account of a motor accident).</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Most samples show that Jeffrey adopts a logical approach to his writing, e.g. sample 8 follows a logical structure and does not contain irrelevant information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Write a report attempting to incorporate information from two or three different sources (by summarising, paraphrasing or copying).</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Jeffrey's report incorporated information given to him from his peers during a discussion about their holidays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Level 5 Continued.**

- Maintain an appropriate balance between general ideas and supporting detail in texts.

| See sample 8. Jeffrey has balanced his general ideas (camps make learning fun which will motivate children to learn), with supporting details (Jeffrey gives an example of an excursion and his experiences in Taiwan). |
ESL Scales

The Writing Strand

Strand Organiser: Language and Cultural Understanding

**Level 3.**

*At level 3, a student:*

**3.10 Demonstrates awareness of common formats required of class texts.**

_Evident when students, for example:_

| *Plan the format of a text according to its intended communicative purpose (a letter).* | Formats used for most samples were teacher directed. However, Jeffrey did plan the format for his pen pal letter (sample 4). See observation 5, Appendix D. |
| *Discuss the impact of different text formats on the reader (poster, exercise book).* | See lines 108-145, Appendix F. |
| *Discuss sequencing of events and ideas in own writing.* | See lines 229-289, Appendix F. |
| *Use key features of a specialised subject format (procedural headings in science report).* | See sample 6. |
| *Use some conventions for separating ideas or sections in a text (starting a new idea on a new line, starting a new section on a new page, paragraphs).* | Evident in all samples. Jeffrey has mostly used sub-headings and paragraphs. |
| *Present writing in appropriate format (use headings, illustrations, layout in final draft).* | Evident in all samples. However, formats were teacher directed. |

**Level 4.**

*At level 4, a student:*

**4.10 Demonstrates an awareness of how effective writing is tailored to the requirements of the topic and the needs of the reader.**

_Evident when students, for example:_

| *Elaborate on own knowledge of the world, using own experience and perspectives to support viewpoint.* | See sample 5. Jeffrey has used his own experiences of excursions and school life in Taiwan to support his viewpoint. |
| *Identify characteristic aspects of spoken and written language.* | See lines 72-107, Appendix F. |
| *Use text type appropriate to class writing.* | See all writing samples. |
| Present information appropriately in texts (choose when to use diagrams, illustrations, points). | All samples are presented appropriately, although this was done as a result of teacher direction. Diagrams etc. were not a requirement of any of the samples. |
### Level 4 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Show understanding of the structure and function of paragraphs (write suitable topic sentence for a given paragraph where it has been omitted).</td>
<td>Jeffrey shows an understanding of the structure and function of paragraphs, although his use of paragraphs is not always accurate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create mood and feeling by selection of appropriate words.</td>
<td>See final page of sample 11. Ben created mood at the end of his narrative when he wrote about the sky changing colour. The sky turned black when the dragon appeared and went white when it disappeared, creating a dramatic effect at the end of his story.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use some colloquial and idiomatic language appropriately in texts.</td>
<td>No evidence of this in any samples.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 5.

**At level 5, a student:**

5. 10 Adjusts the form of writing to intended contexts, purposes and audiences.

*Evident when students, for example:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Show some awareness of audience in writing (consider how much the reader may already know about the topic before writing).</td>
<td>See sample 4. Jeffrey explains who he is and why he is writing the letter, indicating an awareness that the reader will not know who he is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify important common differences between spoken and written texts (that informal spoken texts are loosely organised and that choice of vocabulary and structure may vary).</td>
<td>See lines 61-84, Appendix F).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify inappropriate use of register in own writing (use of slang in formal text).</td>
<td>Jeffrey has not used inappropriate register, so he was not asked to identify this in the interview (Appendix F).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish a relationship with the reader throughout the text (through stance taken, use of inclusive we).</td>
<td>See samples 5 &amp; 8. Jeffrey establishes a relationship with the reader in sample 5 by using personal examples to illustrate his point of view. He uses the inclusive ‘we’ in sample 8, when he urges people not to waste water.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Choose a style and vocabulary appropriate to the perceived reading level of the audience (when writing for young children).</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Most writing samples are aimed at his own reading level due to the nature of the writing task, as directed by the teacher. He writes for the same audience in sample 5, even though he is actually writing to the editor of a newspaper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use fitting detail in descriptions and stories.</td>
<td>Jeffrey has used sufficient detail for the reader to follow the story in sample 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Level 5 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Use a variety of formats suited to the purpose to support or illustrate written texts (diagrams, graphs, tables).</strong></th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>This was not directed by the teacher, although there is evidence of this in his first language (see sample 12).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustain an appropriate tone throughout a text.</strong></td>
<td>Evident in all writing samples.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use appropriate content language for different subject areas.</strong></td>
<td>See sample 6, e.g. 'We had a A4 paper and some sticky tape ...', &amp; sample 8, e.g. 'water vapour', 'groundwater', 'source of energy' etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ESL Scales**

**The Writing Strand**

**Strand Organiser: Language Structures and Features**

**Level 3.**

At Level 3, a student:

3.11 Writes a variety of simple cohesive texts, demonstrating a developing use of simple language and structures.

Evident when students, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use organisational framework in writing familiar text types (simple classification/description in reports, goal and steps in procedures).</th>
<th>Evident in all writing samples, as frameworks were teacher directed. Especially evident in samples 2 &amp; 6, where sub-headings have been used.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write identifiable paragraph topic sentences.</td>
<td>Jeffrey's use of paragraphs and topic sentences is inconsistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write coherent sentences using some dependent clauses ('I can do anything when I am happy').</td>
<td>See sample 5, e.g. 'If we didn't went out to play some children will think went to school was very boring...'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use simple time sequence markers when describing a process or event (first, next, at last).</td>
<td>See sample 6, 'On Wednesday afternoon... first...', and sample 11, 'long long ago... One day...'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a number of common conjunctions to link ideas between sentences (before, after, because, but, when).</td>
<td>Jeffrey has used a range of conjunctions in most samples, e.g. 'but', 'because', and', 'so'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make expository statements using introductory there it (there is, it has).</td>
<td>See sample 6, e.g. 'it is...'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use simple phrases to express personal opinion ('I like...because...and...'; 'I think (that)...').</td>
<td>See sample 4, e.g. 'I think that... and sample 5, e.g. 'I think... because... and...'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and sometimes signal direct speech in writing.</td>
<td>See sample 11, e.g. &quot;Where is the dragon ball? ask bad people'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use direct speech in narrative or dialogue with some appropriate punctuation ('He say no don't do that': &quot;Is this the right one?&quot; he asked').</td>
<td>See sample 11, e.g. 'Brain was very angry and he vowed 'I will made you life again father, and I will kill the all bad people&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use pronoun references with some noun/pronoun agreement appropriate for describing people and things ('Yesterday the class went... We...'; 'Kangaroos are marsupials. They...').</td>
<td>See sample 2, e.g. 'Jowen who was at home...he...', sample 4, e.g. 'My name is...I'm...', sample 5, e.g. 'If children...they...'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use simple phrases to express basic comparisons (the same as, bigger than).</td>
<td>Not evident in any sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select suitable descriptive words to enhance effectiveness of writing (huge instead of big, delicious instead of tastes good).</td>
<td>Although Jeffrey has not used effective descriptive words, his choice of vocabulary is developing, e.g. in sample 11, p. 1, he has written 'he vowed' rather than 'he said'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Level 3 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Write predominantly in present and simple past tenses ('I put the flask on the mat', 'I hit the bunsen burner').</td>
<td>See sample 4, e.g. 'I'm writing letter for you...'; sample 5, e.g. 'we went to Hyde Park...'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use subject-verb agreement with some accuracy.</td>
<td>See sample 4, e.g. 'I'm writing letter...'; sample 5, e.g. 'we went to Hyde Park...'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exemplify using some explicit signals (for example: e.g.).</td>
<td>But, Jeffrey does exemplify in sample 5 by writing 'like we went to...'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Over-generalise regular past tense rules (dranked, buyed).</td>
<td>But, Jeffrey does overgeneralise irregular past tense e.g. 'Jeffrey who was went to...' (sample 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use some specialised words in appropriate context</td>
<td>See sample 8, e.g. 'water vapour', 'groundwater', 'steam', 'source of energy'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(polluted, evaporates, government).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make varying use of articles for common and mass count nouns</td>
<td>See sample 8, e.g. 'They don't close the tap...', 'So we must don't waste the water'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the homework, a water).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 4.

At level 4, a student:

4.11 Writes a variety of texts, demonstrating some overall cohesion and coherence.

Evident when students, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Write cohesive paragraphs reflecting distinct ideas.</td>
<td>Jeffrey is not yet writing topic sentences followed by supporting sentences that relate to it. He tends to write about the main idea at the beginning of his texts. E.g. in sample 5 he did not explain to which newspaper article he was referring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write appropriate opening and closing sentences within a text or</td>
<td>In most samples, Jeffrey writes appropriate opening and closing sentences within that text (not paragraph). For example, see sample 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporate a number of identifiable stages in common text types</td>
<td>See samples 6 &amp; 11. However, in sample 11, Jeffrey has gone beyond this and has included several complications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(classification, description, details in reports; orientation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complication, resolution in narratives).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use introductory topic sentences to announce the idea of the</td>
<td>However, this is developing, e.g. in the last paragraph of sample 8 where Jeffrey introduces the idea of water wastage. He writes 'lost (lots) people used water - They waste water...'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paragraph ('Pollution is spoiling our environment for these</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasons...').</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use common aspects of formal and informal tone or register</td>
<td>See sample 5. Jeffrey uses formal tone appropriate for the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriately (in dialogue).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Level 4 Continued.

- Use simple linking expressions such as so, too, also, as well as in sentences ('Water is part of our life so we must protect it').
- Link ideas using relative clauses with varying accuracy ('The ozone defend the earth of ultraviolet light who can cause cancer to skin').
- Combine simple sentences into complex ones using common conjunctions and relative pronouns.
- Use a range of language for classification, emphasis and exemplification (it belongs to, it is called: indeed, in other words; such as, for instance).
- Use simple conditionals in writing for argument or hypothesising ('If it keeps increase there will be no more place for people to live...').
- Use appropriate time sequence references (When the mixture was heated the liquid evaporated. The gas was then collected).
- Use direct or indirect speech appropriately in context ('He said he didn't like it'; ‘He said, "I don't like it"').
- Use common words in specific ways (state of matter, and State of NSW).
- Use a range of antonyms and synonyms in descriptive writing.
- Use a set of common specialised words (technical or non-technical terms appropriate to a topic area).
- Use common abstract nouns as verbs or adjectives ('can't development' for develop; 'had to be responsibility for everything' for responsible).
- Use a number of simple modals (can't, could, should, must).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Level 5.</strong></th>
<th><strong>At level 5, a student:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.11 Writes a number of coherent texts, demonstrating some flexibility and control over key organisational and language features. Evident when students, for example:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See sample 8. They don't close the tap very hard so water fall down!.

See sample 8. E.g. 'The sun is source of energy in the water cycle because if no sun the water wouldn't vapour into the clouds so source of energy is sun'.

See sample 5. E.g. 'If children leaning in the fun place they will leaning more things because at fun place they want leaning they didn't think was boring so they want to leaning'.

This pointer is developing, e.g. in sample 6 '...we leaning about science it is we fold paper...'.

See sample 5. E.g. 'If we didn't went out to play some children will think went to school was very boring...'.

See sample 6, e.g. 'First, which g had 4 people... Then we start to make'.

See sample 11. Jeffrey uses direct speech appropriately, but punctuation isn't always accurate. In the last paragraph on p. 1, he was confused between direct and indirect speech.

Not evident in any samples.

Not evident in any samples.

See sample 8, e.g. 'water vapour', 'source of energy', 'groundwater'.

Not evident in any sample.

See sample 8, e.g. 'So we must don't waste the water'.

Evident when students, for example:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Sample 11 alternates between narrative and direct speech. Indirect speech is developing.</th>
<th>Sample 11 alternates between narrative and direct speech. Indirect speech is developing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write texts alternating between narrative, dialogue and indirect speech.</td>
<td>See sample 6. Jeffrey has used active voice.</td>
<td>See sample 6. Jeffrey has used active voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use aspects of register suited to the text type (use of passive voice as part of an objective description in a science report).</td>
<td>See sample 5, e.g. &quot;If we didn't went out to play some children will think went to school was very boring then don't want to came to school or will change the school.&quot;</td>
<td>See sample 5, e.g. &quot;If we didn't went out to play some children will think went to school was very boring then don't want to came to school or will change the school.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of connectives avoiding mechanical repetition (then, after that, later, when).</td>
<td>See sample 8. Although Jeffrey has used a range of conjunctions, they are not used to relate ideas across sentences or paragraphs because he hasn't written in sentences and the text needs more paragraphs.</td>
<td>See sample 8. Although Jeffrey has used a range of conjunctions, they are not used to relate ideas across sentences or paragraphs because he hasn't written in sentences and the text needs more paragraphs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a range of conjunctions to relate ideas across sentences or paragraphs in a text (although, yet, however).</td>
<td>Not evident in any sample.</td>
<td>Not evident in any sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use some cohesive phrases that link ideas expressed in preceding sentences and paragraphs (as a result, due to, for these reasons).</td>
<td>However, this pointer is developing. For example, in sample 5 Jeffrey has written 'If children leaning in the fun place they will leaning more things...' which reiterates his point of view and unifies his ideas within the text.</td>
<td>However, this pointer is developing. For example, in sample 5 Jeffrey has written 'If children leaning in the fun place they will leaning more things...' which reiterates his point of view and unifies his ideas within the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use topic sentences within as well as at the beginning of paragraphs to unify ideas within a paragraph.</td>
<td>See sample 8. Jeffrey gives an overview of the water cycle before giving a detailed description of the processes involved in the cycle.</td>
<td>See sample 8. Jeffrey gives an overview of the water cycle before giving a detailed description of the processes involved in the cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulate given and new information within sentences to maintain coherence in texts.</td>
<td>See sample 8, e.g. 'some falls to the ocean some falls to the land...!'</td>
<td>See sample 8, e.g. 'some falls to the ocean some falls to the land...!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make generalisations using timeless present tense or non-human participants ('rainforests provide...', 'timber is used...').</td>
<td>Jeffrey doesn't use a range of expressions. He signals personal opinion with 'I think...' (see samples 4 &amp; 5).</td>
<td>Jeffrey doesn't use a range of expressions. He signals personal opinion with 'I think...' (see samples 4 &amp; 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a range of expressions that signal personal opinion ('In my view...', 'My opinion is that').</td>
<td>See sample 8, e.g. 'The sun is source of energy in the water cycle because if no sun the water wouldn't vapour into the clouds...'.</td>
<td>See sample 8, e.g. 'The sun is source of energy in the water cycle because if no sun the water wouldn't vapour into the clouds...'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write sentences using relative clauses with some accuracy ('The water that comes from the sea returns to the sea').</td>
<td>See sample 11, e.g. 'When Brain and his mum come back home sew Steve was dead'; &quot;When are you going Brain&quot;.</td>
<td>See sample 11, e.g. 'When Brain and his mum come back home sew Steve was dead'; &quot;When are you going Brain&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use simple past and continuous tenses with some consistency in narratives and reports.</td>
<td>See sample 8, e.g. 'wouldn't'.</td>
<td>See sample 8, e.g. 'wouldn't'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express possibility, probability, obligation or doubt through use of modals such as may, might, could and should.</td>
<td>See sample 8, e.g. 'wouldn't'.</td>
<td>See sample 8, e.g. 'wouldn't'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Level 5 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance and vary noun and pronoun references in texts (in referring to multiple characters in stories).</td>
<td>Jeffrey created a number of characters in his story (sample 11). He effectively uses noun and pronoun references so that the reader can easily follow the story. E.g. following direct dialogue, Jeffrey always tells the reader which character has spoken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a range of adjectival expressions for descriptive purposes ('many attractive places', 'other dangerous people').</td>
<td>Not evident in any sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use some simple rhetorical devices in writing (rhetorical questions).</td>
<td>Not evident in any sample.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ESL Scales

### The Writing Strand

#### Strand Organiser: Strategies

#### Level 3.

**At level 3, a student:**

3.12 **Draws on knowledge of the writing process to plan, write and redraft texts.**

_Evident when students, for example:_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Example/Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Use knowledge of sentence patterns to form new sentences (base a new story on repetitive formulae from a known story, from written or spoken texts).</td>
<td>See sample 2. Jeffrey has repetitively used '...who was at...'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write first draft, focusing on meaning rather than accuracy.</td>
<td>See samples 10 &amp; 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revise draft after re-reading or conferencing (add or delete ideas, revise word order or choice of words, correct errors in spelling and punctuation).</td>
<td>See observations, numbers 7, 10, 24, 25 and 34 (Appendix D).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan before writing (by discussing ideas and possible topics in first language or English).</td>
<td>See sample 9. Jeffrey has used the story grammar framework to plan his narrative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Level 4.

**At level 4, a student:**

4.12 **Makes use of discussion and reflection to enhance the writing process.**

_Evident when students, for example:_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Example/Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Confer and cooperate in groups for planning or writing.</td>
<td>See observation numbers 16, 18, 22, 23 (Appendix D), and transcripts (Appendix C) for samples 6 &amp; 9. These observations show Jeffrey conferring with another child to help with his own writing. He was not observed writing as part of a group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participate actively in conferencing and brainstorming as a pre- and post-writing exercise.</td>
<td>NA Conferencing and brainstorming were not observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Defer the revision and editing of text until a first draft has been written.</td>
<td>NA The writing samples were either not carried through to the final draft, or were written without previous drafts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revise text beyond word or phrase level (reverse the order of paragraphs).</td>
<td>Not evident in any samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider alternative wordings when writing (substitute a more effective word by crossing out the original word).</td>
<td>Not evident in any samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keep a learning journal such as a diary or a log.</td>
<td>This pointer was not observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level 4 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Level 5.</strong></th>
<th><strong>At level 5, a student:</strong></th>
<th><strong>5.12 Focuses on planning and editing writing to improve its range and expression.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Evident when students, for example:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>•Seek assistance about approach or language needed</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pointer not observed or collected.</strong></td>
<td><strong>See observations 21, 23 &amp; 32</strong> (Appendix D) when Jeffrey seeks assistance from his electronic translator &amp; a peer. See also transcripts for samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>for a writing task (nature or sequencing or events or ideas).</strong></td>
<td><strong>See sample 9.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not evident in any sample, transcript or observation.</strong></td>
<td><strong>•Generate ideas before writing (by constructing a concept map).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•Generate ideas before writing (by constructing a concept map).</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point not observed.</strong></td>
<td><strong>•Focuses on planning and editing writing to improve its range and expression.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•Select suitable materials from a range of sources.</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>See observation 34 (Appendix D).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evident when students, for example:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•Redraft to improve suitability for intended audience (make significant changes to text in the light of responses).</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jeffrey didn't take notes, but he did use books as support materials while writing, e.g. observation 31 (Appendix D).</strong></td>
<td><strong>•Take notes from books or while listening to assist in writing a text.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•Check writing to ensure spelling and punctuation are correct.</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evidence of this not observed or collected.</strong></td>
<td><strong>•Identify some unintended meanings in own writing.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•Monitor own writing to check for habitual errors.</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jeffrey monitors his own writing (see observation 34, Appendix D), but not necessarily for habitual errors.</strong></td>
<td><strong>•Proofreading for clarity and accuracy of meaning.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•Focuses on planning and editing writing to improve its range and expression.</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>See observations 24 &amp; 34, Appendix D.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evident when students, for example:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E3: First Steps

Writing Developmental Continuum

Phase 3: Early Writing

*In phase 3:* Children write about topics which are personally significant. They are beginning to consider audience needs. They have a sense of sentence but may only be able to deal with one or two elements of writing at one time, e.g. spelling but not punctuation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content, Organisation and Contextual Understandings</th>
<th>Jeffrey uses a large range of familiar text forms</th>
<th>See sample 4.</th>
<th>Evident in most samples. See sample 4 as an example.</th>
<th>See interview, Appendix F. Jeffrey was unable to explain some of the purposes of writing.</th>
<th>All samples were written using a framework and some frameworks, e.g. for the narrative were complex.</th>
<th>Recounts were not observed or collected as the teacher had discouraged the use of this genre.</th>
<th>See sample 11, e.g. 'long long ago...'; 'One day...'.</th>
<th>See sample 11. This shows that Jeffrey is beyond using some narrative structure.</th>
<th>See samples 2, 5, 6 &amp; 8.</th>
<th>Sample 8 shows that Jeffrey writes complex factual accounts with elaboration.</th>
<th>Recounts were not observed or collected.</th>
<th>See sample 5. Jeffrey orientsthe reader to the extent that he states his argument, but he assumes that the reader knows which newspaper article he is referring to.</th>
<th>Retells not observed or collected.</th>
<th>Retells not observed or collected.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>uses a small range of familiar text forms</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>chooses topics that are personally significant</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>uses basic sentence structures and varies sentence beginnings</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>can explain in context, some of the purposes of using writing, e.g. shopping list or telephone messages as a memory aid</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>uses a partial organisational framework, e.g. simple orientation and story development</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>often writes a simple recount of personal events or observation and comment</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>uses time order to sequence and organise writing</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>is beginning to use some narrative structure</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>is beginning to use some informational text structures, e.g. recipes, factual description</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>writes simple factual accounts with little elaboration</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>includes irrelevant detail in 'dawn-to-dusk' recounts</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>attempts to orient, or create a context for the reader, but may assume a shared context</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rewrites known stories in sequence</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>includes detail in written retell</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Phase 3 Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Observation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes several items of information about a topic</td>
<td></td>
<td>See sample 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is beginning to use 'book' language, e.g. 'By the fire sat a cat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>See sample 11, e.g. 'long long ago...'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joins simple sentences (often overusing the same connectors, e.g. 'and', 'then')</td>
<td></td>
<td>Although Jeffrey tends to use 'and' &amp; 'then' often, most writing samples show that he is beyond this stage of writing because he used a range of other connectors, e.g. 'but', 'because'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses knowledge of rhyme, rhythm and repetition in writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not evident in any sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeats familiar patterns, e.g. 'In the jungle I saw...'</td>
<td></td>
<td>See sample 2. Jeffrey repeats the same pattern '...who was at home do no thing but he has...'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Word Usage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Observation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiments with words drawn from language experience activities, literature, media and oral language of peers and others</td>
<td></td>
<td>For example, Jeffrey wrote 'dominate whole world' in his narrative. (See lines 330-333, Appendix F).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses word formations and meanings; noticing similarities and differences</td>
<td></td>
<td>See observation 23 (Appendix D), where Jeffrey asks for the meaning of the word 'weights'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers words encountered in talk; or reading, to writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>See sample 8. Jeffrey has transferred words from discussions and texts about the water cycle to his explanation, e.g. 'water vapour', 'groundwater'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlights words for emphasis, e.g. BIG</td>
<td></td>
<td>See sample 11, p.5. Jeffrey has highlighted 'no' and 'boo'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Editing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Observation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begins to develop editing skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addition and deletion of information is evident in most samples. Also see observations 24 &amp; 34, Appendix D, for evidence of proofreading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletes words to clarify meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deletion of words to clarify meaning in particular is not evident in any sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adds words to clarify meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td>See sample 8. Jeffrey has added the word 'water' in the first paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begins to proofread for spelling errors</td>
<td></td>
<td>See observation 34, Appendix D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to requests for clarification</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA Not observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts the use of a proofreading guide constructed jointly by students and teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA Construction of a proofreading guide not observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 3 Continued.

### Language conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attempts to use some punctuation</td>
<td>Evident in all samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes uses full stops</td>
<td>Usually uses full stops, but no full stop at the end of sample 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes uses a capital letter to start a sentence</td>
<td>Usually uses a capital letter to start a sentence, but no capital letter at the beginning of some sentences, e.g. last paragraph of sample 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses capital letters for names</td>
<td>See samples 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attempts use of question marks</td>
<td>See sample 4. Question marks not used in sample 11, e.g. &quot;Where is the dragon ball&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attempts use of exclamation marks</td>
<td>Not evident in any sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes uses apostrophes for contractions</td>
<td>Usually uses apostrophes for contractions, e.g. 'didn't', 'don't' in sample 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overgeneralises use of print conventions, e.g. overuse of apostrophes, full stops, dashes and commas.</td>
<td>This is not evident in the samples because Jeffrey appears to be beyond this stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often writes in the first person</td>
<td>There is a balance between his use of first and third person, according to the purpose of the text as directed by the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attempts writing in both first and third person.</td>
<td>Evident in all samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usually uses appropriate subject/verb agreements</td>
<td>Sometimes uses appropriate subject/verb agreement, e.g. &quot;I'm writing letter for you because Robert was left school to other school&quot; (sample 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usually maintains consistent tense</td>
<td>Sometimes maintains consistent tense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writes a title which reflects content</td>
<td>See sample 11.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>talks with others to plan and revise own writing</td>
<td>Jeffrey was observed talking to others (see transcripts, Appendix C), but this was to ask for assistance and not to plan and revise own writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re-reads own writing to maintain word sequence</td>
<td>Jeffrey was observed re-reading his own writing, but it is not known if this was to maintain word sequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attempts to transfer knowledge of text structure to writing, e.g. imitates form of a familiar big book.</td>
<td>See sample 11, Jeffrey has imitated the structure of a narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shares ideas for writing with peers or teacher</td>
<td>This was not evident in any transcript or observation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Phase 3 Continued.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>NA/Not Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>participates in group brainstorming activities to elicit ideas and information before writing</em></td>
<td>Group brainstorming activities were not observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>in consultation with teacher, sets personal goals for writing development</em></td>
<td>The setting of personal goals were not observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>discusses proofreading strategies with peers and teacher and attempts to use them in context</em></td>
<td>Not evident in any transcript or observation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attitude**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>perseveres to complete writing tasks</em></td>
<td>This attitude is evident in all samples, transcripts and observations. Jeffrey uses a range of support strategies to help him complete a writing task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**First Steps**

**Writing Developmental Continuum**

**Phase 4: Conventional Writing**

*In phase 4:*

Writers are familiar with most aspects of the writing process and are able to select forms to suit different purposes. Their control of structure, punctuation and spelling may vary according to the complexity of the task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content, Organisation and Contextual Understandings</th>
<th>See all samples. However, these forms were directed by the teacher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>uses text forms to suit purpose and audience</strong></td>
<td>Key Indicator not observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>can explain why some text forms may be more appropriate than others to achieve a specific purpose</strong></td>
<td>Evident in all samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>writes a range of text forms including stories, reports, procedures and expositions</strong></td>
<td>All samples show that Jeffrey experiments with sentence use and some sentences are very complex, e.g. 'My who was at home do no thing but...' (see sample 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>uses a variety of simple, compound and extended sentences</strong></td>
<td>All samples show that Jeffrey groups sentences containing related information, sometimes into paragraphs. Sometimes he does not use paragraphs where he should.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>groups sentences containing related information into paragraphs</strong></td>
<td>Evident in all samples, e.g. addressing his letter and explaining who he is (sample 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>takes account of some aspects of context, purpose and audience</strong></td>
<td>See samples 2, 4, 6 and 8. For example, Jeffrey gives a brief explanation of the water cycle before explaining in detail (sample 8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>considers the needs of audience and includes background information</strong></td>
<td>NA These effects were not required in the writing activities Jeffrey took part in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>uses rhyme, rhythm and repetition for effect (where appropriate)</strong></td>
<td>See sample 8. Jeffrey has developed and elaborated on the topic of the 'water cycle'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>demonstrates the ability to develop a topic</strong></td>
<td>See samples 2, 6, 8 and 11. Jeffrey adopts correct conventions for the type of text he is writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>demonstrates knowledge of differences between narrative and informational text when writing</strong></td>
<td>See samples 2 and 6 for examples of the use of headings and subheadings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>organises the structure of writing more effectively, e.g. uses headings, subheadings</strong></td>
<td>See samples 2 and 6 for examples of the use of headings and subheadings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 4 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can write from another's point of view</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Writing from another's point of view not observed or collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows evidence of personal voice (where appropriate)</td>
<td>See samples 4 and 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is developing a personal style of writing</td>
<td>Jeffrey has used strong personal voice in sample 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes place, time and situation</td>
<td>See sample 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often includes dialogue</td>
<td>See sample 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses dialogue to enhance character development</td>
<td>See sample 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows evidence of the transfer of literary language from reading to writing</td>
<td>See sample 11, e.g. 'long long ago...', 'One day...', 'Brain was very angry and he vowed...'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organises paragraphs logically</td>
<td>When Jeffrey does use paragraphs, they are organised logically, e.g. in sample 8, the first paragraph gives an overview of the water cycle, the bulk of the text explains the different parts and the final paragraph outlines a related issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses titles and headings appropriately</td>
<td>See samples 2, 6, 8, 9 and 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orders ideas in time order or other sequence such as priority order</td>
<td>Evident in many samples, e.g. sample 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a variety of linking words such as and, so, because, if, next, after, before, first</td>
<td>Variety is evident across all samples, e.g. 'because','so' in sample 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Word Usage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is beginning to select vocabulary according to the demands of audience and purpose, e.g. uses subject-specific vocabulary</td>
<td>See sample 8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses some similes or metaphors in an attempt to enhance meaning</td>
<td>Not evident in any sample.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies vocabulary for interest</td>
<td>Jeffrey's use of vocabulary is not extensive to achieve this indicator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes specific vocabulary for explain or describe, e.g. appropriate adjectives</td>
<td>Jeffrey's use of vocabulary is not extensive enough to achieve this indicator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses adverbs and adjectives to enhance meaning</td>
<td>Jeffrey's use of vocabulary is not extensive enough to achieve this indicator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses simple colloquialisms and cliches</td>
<td>Not evident in any sample.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Editing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses proofreading guide or checklist to edit own or peers' writing</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Proofreading guide not used during observation period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 4 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*edits and proofreads own writing after composing</th>
<th>See observations 24 &amp; 34 for evidence of proofreading. Writing samples show evidence of editing, e.g. erasing words, adding words, change in sentence structure between samples 1 and 2, use of Chinese characters that are then edited to English.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*reorders text to clarify meaning, e.g. moves words, phrases and clauses</td>
<td>Not evident in any sample. Jeffrey does not reorder text, he makes additions or deletions when he edits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*reorders words to clarify meaning</td>
<td>As above. Jeffrey adds or deletes words when editing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*attempts to correct punctuation</td>
<td>This was not evident in any transcript, observation or sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*recognises most misspelled words and attempts corrections</td>
<td>NA This was not directed by the teacher during the observation period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Conventions</strong></td>
<td>Writing samples show that Jeffrey is capable of this, but he punctuates inconsistently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*punctuates simple sentences correctly</td>
<td>Inconsistent use of capital letters for proper nouns, e.g. 'Magic Boomerang', 'Royal show' in sample 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*uses capital letters for proper nouns</td>
<td>Inconsistent use of capital letters to start sentences, e.g. 'Where do you...', 'sorry my English was very bad...' in sample 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*uses capital letters to start sentences</td>
<td>See samples 2, 6, 8, 9 and 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*uses capital letters for titles</td>
<td>Usually uses full stops but can be inconsistent, e.g. 'Where do you went to in the holidays', 'sorry my English was very bad because I just now came AUSTRALIA'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*uses full stops to end sentences</td>
<td>Jeffrey is able to use question marks, but uses them inconsistently, e.g. 'Do you have went to Royal show?', 'Where do you went to in the holidays.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*uses question marks correctly</td>
<td>See samples 2, 5 &amp; 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sometimes uses commas</td>
<td>See sample 11, p. 1, e.g. 'son's name', 'steve's home'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*uses apostrophes for possession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 4 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*writes apostrophes for contractions</td>
<td>See sample 5, e.g. 'didn't', 'don't'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*writes effectively in both first and third person</td>
<td>See all writing samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*uses appropriate subject-verb agreements</td>
<td>Sometimes uses appropriate subject-verb agreements, e.g. 'I'm writing letter for you because Robert was left school to other school' (sample 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*uses appropriate noun-pronoun agreements</td>
<td>See sample 11, e.g. 'long long ago an alien came to our earth his name is steve. Then he marry a girl and they had a son his son's name is Brain'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maintains appropriate tense throughout text</td>
<td>Jeffrey appears to maintain appropriate tense, but it can be inaccurate, e.g. 'Robert was left... ' (see sample 3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategies

*uses a range of strategies for planning, revising and publishing own written texts

*selects relevant information from a variety of sources before writing

*can transfer information from reading to writing, e.g. takes notes for project

*brainstorms to elicit ideas before writing

*attempts to organise ideas before writing

*plans writing using notes, lists or diagrams or other relevant information

*sets and monitors goals for writing

*uses knowledge of other texts as models for writing

*rereads and revises while composing

For example, story grammar, proofreading and editing.

Selects information from peers (see transcripts, Appendix C & observations 4, 11, 12, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 26 & 27), support materials (see observations 2, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, 21, 29, 30, 31, 32 & 33).

See sample 8, Jeffrey transferred contents of worksheet to his explanation of the water cycle.

Brainstorming was not observed.

See samples 1 & 9.

See samples 1 and 9. Jeffrey used sub-headings and story grammar to plan writing.

Not observed.

Jeffrey uses other texts as models for writing, rather than his knowledge of other texts. For example, he often referred to other class member's writing and his pen pal's letter while he was writing his reply (see observations 4 & 8, Appendix D).
### Phase 4 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>writes for enjoyment</em></td>
<td>Although Jeffrey stated that he enjoyed writing (see lines 1-6, Appendix F), it is not known if he writes specifically for enjoyment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>writes to get things done</em></td>
<td>This indicator is a little unclear, but when asked this question (see lines 8-28, Appendix F), Jeffrey agreed that he wrote letters. This could be classed as getting things done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>experiments with calligraphy</em></td>
<td>Jeffrey used different graphics for the titles in samples 10 &amp; 11. Sample 10 also shows that he uses Chinese characters and substituted these with dashes. However, experimentation with calligraphy, graphics and different formats was not observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>manipulates language for fun, e.g. puns, symbolic character or placenames (Ms Chalk, the teacher, Pitsville)</em></td>
<td>This was not observed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 5: Proficient Writing

In phase 5:
Writers have developed a personal style of writing and are able to manipulate forms of writing to suit their purposes. They have control over spelling and punctuation. They choose from a large vocabulary and their writing is cohesive, coherent and satisfying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content, Organisation and Contextual Understandings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>selects text forms to suit purpose and audience, demonstrating control over most essential elements</em></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>can explain the goals in writing a text and indicate the extent to which they were achieved</em></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>writes to define, clarify and develop ideas and express creativity, e.g. stories, poems, reports, arguments</em></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>writes a topic sentence and includes relevant information to develop a cohesive paragraph</em></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>organises paragraphs logically to form cohesive text</em></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>uses a variety of simple, compound and complex sentences appropriate to text form</em></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>identifies likely audiences and adjusts writing to achieve impact</em></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>conveys a sense of personal involvement in imaginative writing</em></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>conducts research effectively in order to select appropriate information to fulfil task demands</em></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>demonstrates success in writing a wide range of forms, e.g. stories, reports, expository texts, poems, plays</em></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jeffrey did not select any of the text forms in the samples. They were all directed by the teacher.

See lines 290-329, Appendix F.

For example, Jeffrey developed a storyline in his narrative (sample 11).

Although the information Jeffrey includes in his paragraphs is relevant (e.g. see sample 8, paragraph 1), he does not always write a topic sentence.

See sample 8.

All samples show that Jeffrey uses simple, compound and complex sentences appropriate to text form, e.g. Jeffrey mostly uses simple sentences for the direct dialogue, but more complex sentences for the narrative in sample 11.

The writing tasks were teacher directed. Therefore, the audiences were identified for Jeffrey.

Not observed.

Research was not a requirement of any of the writing tasks.

See all writing samples. Jeffrey's use of language conventions may not always be accurate, but he has achieved success in effectively conveying meaning through the use of the different writing forms.
**Phase 5 Continued.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Detailed Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>has sufficient quality ideas to fulfil task demands</em></td>
<td>See sample 11. Jeffrey displays sufficient quality ideas to create a complex storyline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>develops topic fully</em></td>
<td>See sample 8. Jeffrey has explained the 'water cycle' and has provided additional information by writing about a related issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>uses a plan to develop ideas</em></td>
<td>See sample 9. Jeffrey has used a story grammar format to develop his narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sustains coherence and cohesion throughout text</em></td>
<td>See sample 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>demonstrates ability to view writing from a reader's perspective</em></td>
<td>NA Not observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>expresses a well reasoned point of view in writing</em></td>
<td>See sample 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>can justify a decision in writing</em></td>
<td>NA Not observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>can write about the same topic from different points of view</em></td>
<td>NA This was not a task directed by the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>writes a complete, succinct orientation and develops relevant ideas and events</em></td>
<td>See sample 11. Jeffrey writes a brief orientation, but the reader is given little contextual information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>uses complex sentences with embedded clauses or phrases</em></td>
<td>See sample 2, e.g. 'My who'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>discusses and uses a range of linking words, e.g. thus, furthermore, in addition</em></td>
<td>As an ESL speaker, Jeffrey has a limited vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>signals cause and effect using if, then, because, so, since, result in, brings about, hence, consequently, subsequently</em></td>
<td>See sample 8. Jeffrey signals cause and effect, e.g. he uses 'if,' 'because' and 'so'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>signals comparisons using like, different from, however, resembles, whereas, similar</em></td>
<td>Not evident in any sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>signals alternatives using on the other hand, otherwise, conversely, either, instead (of), whether</em></td>
<td>Not evident in any sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>signals time order using later, meanwhile, subsequently, initially, finally</em></td>
<td>Although Jeffrey signals time order, he does not use any of these signals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Word Usage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Detailed Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>uses a wide range of words that clearly and precisely convey meaning in a particular form</em></td>
<td>Jeffrey uses subject specific vocabulary, e.g. 'natural resource' (sample 8), but vocabulary is, on the whole, not extensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>discusses selection of words, clauses or phrases for their shades of meaning and impact on style</em></td>
<td>Jeffrey discussed his selection of 'dominate the whole world' in his narrative (see lines 330-373, Appendix F), but not for its shade of meaning or impact on style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>chooses appropriate words to create atmosphere and mood</em></td>
<td>Not evident in any sample.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 5 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Not observed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>elaborates ideas to convey coherent meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustains appropriate language throughout e.g. formal language in a business letter</td>
<td></td>
<td>See samples 4 &amp; 5. Jeffrey sustains appropriate language throughout both of these samples, e.g. an informal style during which he asks questions in sample 4 and a formal, expository style in sample 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses humour, sarcasm or irony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses idioms and colloquialisms to enhance writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not evident in any sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attempts to involve the reader by the use of metaphor, simile, imagery and other literary devices that require commitment from the reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not evident in any sample.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Editing**

| Objective                                                                 | NA | Not evident in any observation. |
| edits own writing during and after composing                              |    | See observations 7, 10, 15, 21, 24, 25, 34 in Appendix D. |
| attempts to re-order words, phrases, clauses and paragraphs to clarify and achieve precise meaning |    | See samples 10 & 11. Re-orders words, phrases and clauses. |
| uses a revising and editing checklist to improve own                      |    | |

**Language Conventions**

| Objective                                                                 | NA | All samples show that Jeffrey attempts to use a range of punctuation, but it is not always accurate. |
| demonstrates accurate use of punctuation                                  |    | As above. |
| demonstrates accurate use of: capital letters, full stops, commas for a variety of purposes, quotation marks, exclamation marks, apostrophes for contractions, apostrophes for ownership, paragraphing, brackets and dashes. |    | See sample 11. Jeffrey uses 'Booo0000' and 'Noooooooooo0000 to enhance meaning. |
| uses punctuation to enhance meaning                                       |    | |

**Strategies**

| Objective                                                                 | NA | Although sample 9 shows that Jeffrey plans text sequence, he was not observed taking notes and selecting and synthesising relevant information. |
| takes notes, selects and synthesises relevant information and plans text sequence |    | |
| evaluates writing of others                                               |    | Not evident in any transcript or observation. |

**Attitude**

| Objective                                                                 | NA | Although Jeffrey enjoys writing, he does not necessarily write to get things done or for personal expression. See lines 1-40, Appendix F. |
| writes for enjoyment, to get things done and for personal expression      |    | |
### Phase 5 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shows interest in the craft of writing</th>
<th>Jeffrey's responses in lines 1-5, Appendix F, and his experimentation with sub-headings and punctuation, demonstrate an interest in the craft of writing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is resourceful in gathering information</td>
<td>Jeffrey used a variety of and was resourceful in his use of support materials and strategies, e.g. observation 21, Appendix D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E4: NLLIA Middle & Upper Primary ESL Bandscales

**Writing**

**Level 4**
Applying understandings of writing to experimenting with longer and more structured discourse: drawing on knowledge of the world in L1 and English, and on L1 and English language and literacy (to varying degrees).

*At level 4, children:*
Are able to write simple texts (e.g., narratives, reports, recounts, procedures) modelled on those read with and/or by the teacher (but with ESL features as described below). Are continuing to experiment with language (this experimenting is a sign of language growth). Length of writing is growing, but “depth” of meaning of their writing in English is held back by their limited English language resource.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Have greater speed and fluency in writing because of their increased fluency in spoken English and their wider knowledge base in English</em></td>
<td>Most writing samples were completed in one or two sessions, e.g. sample 5 was completed in one session and shows Jeffrey's fluency in written English which reflects his fluency in spoken English and development of a wider knowledge base in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Are prepared to take more risks because of this i.e. will continue to keep the ideas going and complete the text, knowing that their first draft will contain errors.</em></td>
<td>Jeffrey's willingness to take risks is evident in his first drafts (e.g. sample 1), and the texts he has written in one session (e.g. sample 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>May make more errors than before as they experiment.</em></td>
<td>NA Early writing samples were not observed or collected. They are no longer available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>May wish to express themselves in writing in their L1 (if able to do so).</em></td>
<td>Jeffrey is literate in his L1 (See sample 12). Therefore, he is able to express himself in writing in Chinese, either as whole texts (sample 12), or as part of his written English (see samples 6 and 10).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Are writing with ESL features in structure (e.g., omission of articles and verb endings, and tense (time orientation) difficulties).</em></td>
<td>Jeffrey omits some verb endings, e.g. 'play game, watch T.V' (sample 2), and has tense difficulties, e.g. 'I think went to camps was good because we can...' (sample 5). But he does not omit articles, e.g. sample 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Level 4 Continued.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing is influenced by the characteristics of their spoken language (e.g., continual use of and; spelling errors reflecting pronunciation errors.)</th>
<th>Jeffrey appears to be beyond this. He uses a range of other connectives rather than 'and', and his writing displays very few spelling errors. His accurate spelling might be because he has access to an electronic translator.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESL features will sometimes cause loss comprehensibility, with reader having to re-read, predict/ask for the correct meaning.</td>
<td>See samples 2, 3, 6, 7, 8 &amp; 10. Jeffrey has either written in his L1, or has left spaces for words he does not know in English or does not know how to spell. This causes the reader to predict some of the content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level 5
Growing independence in writing but complexity and precision is limited: drawing on knowledge of the world in L1 and English, and on L1 and English language and literacy (to varying degrees).

At level 5, children:
Are showing signs of becoming more independent in their writing and are gaining greater control over the language and texts. Are able to write independently (though with support normally given in mainstream classes) recounts, narratives, story retellings, and other texts, as expected at their phase of schooling, but with ESL features as below.

In writing on informational topics, are able to write short reports, projects etc. (though with ESL features) with clear guidance, and if reading source material is at their level of reading ability. If reading source material is too advanced, writing may break down. However, will not write with "depth" because of limited control over English (e.g., narrow range of vocabulary, structures, subtleties of the language).

| • Have growing control over the writing processes (e.g., reading and re-reading, editing), which reflects a growing control over the language within the writing, however, will still need task to be clarified. | See observations 7, 24, 25 & 34 for evidence of reading, re-reading & editing. See transcripts and observations 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, 23 & 27 for evidence of Jeffrey needing tasks to be clarified. |
| • May not yet have enough language awareness about written English to adequately self-assess their written texts and may confuse length of content with comprehensibility and coherence of written texts. | Appendix F shows that Jeffrey can self-assess his written texts. It is possible that he does not confuse length of content with comprehensibility and coherence of written texts (lines 390-430). |
| • Growing proficiency in English will allow learners to be able to talk about their own writing and that of others more effectively (e.g. in conferencing). | See Appendix F (interview). |
| • Written language is beginning to reflect less the features of spoken language and to reflect more the features of written language (at the level expected for the phase of schooling). | See samples 2, 4, 6, 8 & 11. Jeffrey has used language features that are appropriate to the genre he was writing. |
| • Because proficiency in English and in reading skills is developing and range of reading in English is growing, are beginning to spontaneously draw on themes and ideas from reading in English and in L1 (to varying degrees) | Jeffrey drew upon reading in his L1 for ideas for his narrative (sample 11), see lines 154-221, Appendix F. |
| • Will capitalise on what they know, and will avoid language and topics with which they have difficulty. (See "plateau" learners below). | Not evident in any sample, observation or transcript. |
**Level 5 Continued**

| May be beginning to draw more from English and literacy in English than from L1 and from L1 literacy. | Jeffrey only draws from L1 and from L1 literacy (see lines 149-221, Appendix F). |
| Are writing using more complex clauses with more subordination (e.g., Through the winter their larvae will stay in a safe place waiting for warm weather to come). | See sample 8. The sun is source of energy in the water cycle because if no sun the water wouldn't vapour into the clouds... |
| Are writing using more complex clauses with more internal references (e.g., After the rain gauge filled with water it was measured and then emptied.) | See sample 5. If we didn't went out to play some children will think went to school was very boring... |
| Are using a growing range of cohesive devices (e.g., because, so, however, the planet, ... they, etc). | The collection of writing samples shows that Jeffrey is able to use the following cohesive devices: but, because, so, or. |
| Are continuing to experiment with a variety of structures; this experimenting is a sign of language be less likely to impede meaning. | Evident in all writing samples, e.g. 'but he has do read book, play game, watch T.V....' |

**Note:** Level 5 Writing, particularly in academic contexts, presents difficulties for many ESL learners. It becomes a "plateau" level for a number of ESL learners especially those without a solid grounding of content knowledge or with interruptions in their L1 language and literacy development. Many learners find it hard to move beyond Level 5; yet further progress in essential for more sophisticated language use and for success in school.
APPENDIX F

POST OBSERVATION INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT
I: O.K. First of all Jeffrey, do you enjoy writing?
J: Yep.
I: You do? Is that in Chinese or English?
J: Mmm, both.
I: Equally? You enjoy writing in both. Now I would like to talk about why you write O.K?
J: O.K.
I: First of all, do you think you write to get things done?
J: Yep.
I: You do? In what ways?
J: What is er ...what things done?
I: So, do you write things like letters? I know you write letters, I've seen you letters. How about shopping lists and things like that?
J: Like shopping?
I: Mmm.
J: What shopping?
I: You know when you might go to the shops with mum and dad and buy food or clothes? Sometimes you write things down to help you remember what you need to buy.
J: Yeah.
I: Do you write things like that?
J: My mum do.
I: Your mum does O.K. Do you sometimes write notes to help you remember things?
J: Mmm no.
I: No? Not at all O.K. But you write letters...
J: Yeah.
I: O.K. Also, do you think you write for personal expression? So,
do you write poems or rhymes or things like that?
J: What's the rhymes?
I: O.K. I remember seeing some limericks that you wrote in the class about everybody.
J: Ah yeah.
I: O.K. Do you remember doing those? They were really funny.
J: Yeah.
I: Um... have you written anything like that at any other time?
J: Any... not in the class.
I: Yeah, so at home do you write things like that?
J: No.
I: No? O.K. What sort of writing do you do at home?
J: What sort of writing? Mmm... writing. Write about... mmm...
J: O.K. You know how we do a lot of writing at school?
J: Yeah.
I: What writing do you do at home?
J: What's writing? Write what?
I: You know writing...
J: Yeah, write about what?
I: Well, anything. Do you write at home at all?
J: Mmm, sometime I write. Lots is in the school. I didn't write anything... like homework yeah like homework yeah...
I: Homework, O.K. Do you do any other writing apart from what you do at, apart from something to do with school?
J: No.
I: No?
J: No.
I: O.K. I'd like you to imagine that you've just been on an excursion...
J: Excursion...
I: O.K? You know when you go on a trip away from school? Remember how you wrote to the editor saying that you like trips and excursions? Remember that?
J: Yeah.
I: O.K? and you’re telling a friend about that trip O.K?
J: Which one?
I: So think...when...did you go and see ‘Dick Whittington’?
J: Dick Whittington...yep.
I: You went to see that O.K. I would like you to imagine that you are telling a friend about that...
J: Yeah.
I: O.K? What...what would be the differences between if you were telling your friend, if you were speaking to your friend...
J: Yep.
I: and if you wrote it down? If you wrote to your friend and told him or her about that trip...
J: Oh yeah.
I: in writing. What do you think the differences would be between talking and writing?
J: Talking is...er...is more good, because talking if he don’t know he can tell you and you can explain to him. If you write...er...and you send to him and he write back to you it will take a long time and you can’t...er...right now you can’t get a message if you use your writing...er...if you use talking, you can ask him like that it’s better. Yep.
I: O.K. Good boy, Jeffrey. So you think that talking is better than writing O.K? And you talked about how they were different didn’t you? How do you think talking and writing to your friend might be the same?
J: To my friend? To which friend?

I: Anyone. Say you were telling Ton about 'Dick Whittington'

O.K? And you said how talking would be better...

J: Yeah.

I: How do you think talking and writing would be the same?

J: Mmm...it can't be the same.

I: Why not?

J: Because if writing...is...you need to send to him it take a long time or send to him is a letter and send to his house (inaudible)...send to his house that would take a long time. If you send to his house and he send back that would be no same.

I: O.K. Thank you Jeffrey. (Pause as interviewer organises the next question). Alright, I'd like you to have a look at some different texts. You know texts are writing? O.K? So that's text, that's written text, that's written text O.K? And all of these lovely writing samples here are written texts (interviewer shows Jeffrey samples of writing).

J: Yeah.

I: I would like you to think about differences...between different pieces of writing O.K? Now, for example, there's two different types of writing (interviewer shows Jeffrey an advertisement for pizzas and his own letter to the editor). How does this advertisement about pizzas O.K? 'Cause this is telling you how much two large pizzas are and you've got a nice, bright colourful picture about...showing you the pizzas...

J: Yeah.

I: O.K? And it gives you the phone number and a slogan from the company O.K? Something easy to remember...

J: Yeah.

I: How does that...how does that make you feel?
J: Feel good.
I: It makes you feel good. Why?
J: Because...er...because you see this and because it is food on there...
I: There's food on there...
J: Yeah, it's mm...I don't know...mm...the food on there is, you can feel good more better than this.
I: O.K. Why? What are the differences between those pieces of writing; the pizza picture and your letter to the editor?
J: This um... this is about er...the writing and this is about the er...the shop tell you what is er...the what is the shop got... the shop got...
I: O.K. What the shop has, yes.
J: Yeah, mmm.
I: So what...you look at these without reading what's on each piece of paper. What would the differences be between the two?
J: This is of colour, this has no colour.
I: O.K. So the pizza picture is in colour and your writing is not in colour...
J: Yeah.
I: So how does that make you feel when you look at them?
J: Mmm this one feel good because it's a picture and then you look er...it's good and this is no picture you feel...you feel bad (laughs).
I: You feel bad.
J: Yeah.
I: You shouldn't, that's your piece of writing and it's really good.
O.K. I better move that pizza picture, I'm getting hungry (both laugh). O.K. Now I loved reading your story, I thought it was fantastic. Where did you get the idea for writing your story?
J: Mmm get from the ... the story?

I: Mmm.

J: Yeah.

I: So did you get your idea from a film or from television or from other books?

J: No from book.

I: Oh, so was it one book or lots of books you’ve read?


I: So you’ve read...

J: No, it’s same because he has lots... very long. 42 books.

I: Oh, so is it a series of books, all about the same characters?

J: Yeah.

I: So the story you wrote, did you use the same characters in your story as in those books you’ve read?

J: Mmm think er... yep, but his name’s no same.

I: So the name’s not the same O.K. So what...what are those books called that you’ve read?

J: Dragon Ball.

I: So they’re called the Dragon Ball. And I thought you were clever and made that up all on your own (both laugh). Um, are they Chinese or English books?

J: Chinese.

I: They’re Chinese books O.K. Are they books especially for children?

J: Mmm, sometime because that book is er... about the fights like, like that, mmm like fights help people (inaudible)...some people do like some people do not.

I: Alright, so there was lots of Kung Fu fighting in those books...

J: Yeah.

I: O.K. So was there a book or a story called ‘The Three Dragon
Ball’?

J: There’s not, there’s just Dragon Ball. That story have seven

Dragon Ball, because I just do, I just do three (laughs).

I: You just did three, O.K. (laughs).

J: Yeah.

I: So was the actual... your story you wrote was it the same as any

of the other stories you’ve read?

J: Which one?

I: You know your Dragon Ball story you wrote...

J: Yep.

I: Was it exactly the same as a story you read in one of those

books?

J: No, no I’ve changed because they were too long, yeah and I

changed a little part...er yeah I changed it a lot...

I: You changed it a lot. So which bits were the same?

J: Mmm...when they have the (inaudible).

I: When they?...

J: They have the super...I don’t know how to say... the power,

super power.

I: The super power! That was the same.

J: Yeah.

I: And the characters were the same.

J: Yeah. And er...and the bad people were the same.

I: The bad people...

J: Same, yeah , that’s about the same...

I: But the rest of the story you made up...

J: Made up, yeah.

I: I’m glad to here it Jeffrey! O.K. um, you’ve answered the next

question as well, um so, your ideas that you have for your stories, do

they come mainly from things you’ve read in Chinese or things
you've read in English?

J: Can you say again?

I: O.K. You know you read Chinese books, Dragon Ball books, and at school you read English books...

J: Yeah.

I: The ideas that you have for writing your stories, do they come mostly from your Chinese books or your English books?


I: From your Chinese books. Do you get any ideas at all from your English books?

J: Mmm...no.

I: None at all.

J: Yeah.

I: O.K.

J: (Inaudible).

I: Pardon?

J: I just make up.

I: You just make them up (laughs).

J: Yeah, I did.

I: Um, I have your story here, and I’ve got the first draft that you wrote and I’ve got the second draft that you wrote O.K? So that’s the first one, alright? Where you had the Chinese names O.K? And then this thick story is the second one you wrote. Now, they’re actually quite different aren’t they?

J: Yeah, I changed them a little bit.

I: You changed...I think you changed it a lot didn’t you?

J: Um, when I finished a draft is 4 pages and er...

I: So you finished this first draft...

J: Yeah, it’s 4 page.

I: Ohh, and that 4 pages long, O.K.
J: And I finish (inaudible) one it's 6 page.

I: I know! It took me ages to read that.

J: (laughs).

I: O.K. Now, the things that happen in this...in both of the stories...

J: Yep.

I: O.K? They happen in different orders. So, here...at the beginning, in the first draft, bad people come to Steve's home don't they?

J: Yeah.

I: And also in the second draft bad people came to Steve's home and they ask where the Dragon Ball is don't they?

J: Yeah, the same.

I: O.K? But then after that, the next things that happen in both stories are quite different.

J: What different?

I: Why is that?

J: I don't know. Because when...when I finish a draft I think I need to copy again because the draft is have Chinese on it, so I...I want to copy again and I...I want to make more...more interesting, so I just think about it and I edit in, edit in.

I: You edit in.

J: Yeah.

I: What things do you edit in?

J: Like this...first...the first...the first paragraph is...this is three lines and here's mmm...and here's five lines...

I: Ohh, it's five lines.

J: Yeah, so I've edit some in.

I: So which, what did you put in?

J: (Refering to his 'Dragon Ball' story) He met a girl and they have
270 (inaudible). Steve has, yeah...

271 I: Ahh, so...

272 J: Yeah because...

273 I: (Reading from the ‘Dragon Ball’ story) Steve had the super

274 ability because he is an alien...

275 J: Yeah.

276 I: So you put that in, you didn’t have that in your first draft did

277 you?

278 J: Yeah, yeah.

279 I: O.K? Why did you put that in the second draft?

280 J: Because is more the people read him, he can more understand

281 about er...because here, here...mm...because he said it (inaudible).

282 I: So you said earlier...

283 J: Because...I don’t know...because er...I was copy the...the

284 Chinese book, yeah. In the Chinese book, his father have the super

285 (inaudible).

286 I: O.K. So in this first story, did he have the super powers?

287 J: Yep, here super power...

288 I: Ohh, so you had written it in Chinese.

289 J: Yeah.

290 I: Oh, O.K. Wonderful. Now, when you started writing this story,

291 what goals did you have for this story? What were your aims?

292 J: What aims?

293 I: What did you want to achieve? Why, why were you writing the

294 story...apart from the fact that Mrs. Butcher told you you had to

295 write a story, why else would you have been writing that story?

296 J: Why else?

297 I: Mmm.

298 J: Mm...mm...maybe...

299 I: What did you want to learn by writing this story?
J: What did I want to learn?
I: Mm.
J: The... the English.
I: Learn English O.K. What parts of English?
J: The spelling...
I: Spelling...
J: Yeah and er... write a long story. First I never write the English that long.
I: So this is the ... this is the most English writing you've ever done.
J: Yeah.
I: So is that something you wanted to do at the beginning? You wanted to write a really long story?
J: Mmm because I heard the My, he say... he say his story is probably more than twenty page.
I: Ahh...
J: Yeah.
I: Was that My in the class?
J: Yeah and I thought wow, that is long! When I just think I done, maybe I can just done two page and I heard him twenty page, wow! (Inaudible) some... some interesting in it, so I make it six pages.
I: O.K. Good. So, when you started this story, you wanted to practice your English...
J: Yeah.
I: Your spelling...
J: Yeah.
I: And you wanted to write a long story.
J: Yeah.
I: O.K. Um, do you think you've done those things?
J: Do you think? Of course...
I: Of course you have. Now in your story, you wrote 'dominate the whole world', an excellent sentence, I really liked that...

J: Dominate (inaudible) same as the Chinese book.

I: In the book, so you copied that straight from the Chinese book.

J: Yeah.

I: Now, are there any other English words you could have used instead of the word 'dominate'?

J: Dominate... mmm, I don't know I just... I just type in the computer you know? And I just and I just choose and I there's so many word that is about dominate and I just choose... I choose, choose and I say dominate is better, so I just put dominate.

I: Ah, so in your Chinese book...

J: Yeah.

I: You had the sentence in Chinese dominate the whole world...

J: Yeah.

I: And you put that into your translator? Is that what you're saying? Your little...

J: No, I just put er... dominate.

I: Dominate.

J: Yeah.

I: So you put dominate into your translator and it gave you all of these English words.

J: Yeah, so many.

I: Lots and lots and lots.

J: Yeah (inaudible) dominate.

I: Can you remember any of the English words?

J: No.

I: No?

J: No, I can't remember.

I: You can't, but you... and you just chose dominate.
J: Yeah.
I: Why did you choose dominate?
J: Because he have explain er...what is dominate mean (inaudible) explain all the...the English mean and I see that... I see that this dominate is better to use on this.
I: O.K. Why? Why was it better?
J: Because dominate...I don’t know... I just... he... mmm...why is better? I just choose I didn’t say...I didn’t know dominate is very good. When, when I...I...the...the...book tell me wow, he can use dominate in this (inaudible) and I know wow dominate is very interesting word...
I: So it’s an interesting word.
J: Yeah, first time I didn’t know that dominate is a very interesting word.
I: And now you’ve learnt a new word haven’t you?
J: Yeah.
I: Good boy. O.K. this is the very last question.
J: Yep.
I: What do you think about your writing in English? What do you think of your English writing?
J: Very bad.
I: Very bad. Why?
J: Because this is no (inaudible).
I: Because?
J: The grammar is... this is no grammar.
I: The grammar.
J: Yeah...it is no good.
I: Alright, just compare your letter and your story.
J: Yeah.
I: Now, your story is very, very long.
J: Yeah.
I: Your letter is not as long.
J: Yeah.
I: Which do you think is the better piece of writing?
J: Mmm...this.
I: The letter to the editor, the shorter piece. Why do you think that?
J: Because...can you say again, the question?
I: So you think this piece of writing is better than that one.
J: No. Can you say again, the question?
I: The story is a very long piece of writing, the letter is not very long...which of the two pieces of writing do you think is the best one?
J: Best one?
I: Mmm.
J: This one.
I: The story.
J: Yeah.
I: Why?
J: It's very long.
I: It's very long. So you think the longest piece of writing is the best one.
J: Not really, it's inside. What you (inaudible), what you er...writing.
I: So even though...it's good that it's long...
J: Yeah.
I: But you like the story because of what you've written inside it...
J: Yeah.
I: Not just because it's really long.
J: Yeah.

I: Is that what you're saying?

J: Yeah. You (inaudible) look the...the...the inside you can see the (inaudible). Long...long writing is better, maybe long writing is (inaudible) about something, and short writing have some questions, so you must look inside at what they written...written.

I: Oh, good boy. So you have to...so even if it's...just because it's a long piece of writing, doesn't mean that it's really good.

J: Yeah.

I: Wonderful. Thank you very, very much Jeffrey.
APPENDIX G

CONSENT FORMS
YOUR CONSENT

I understand that, at the beginning of term four, Liza Phillips will be observing and collecting samples of the written and spoken language of four pupils in my class over a period of approximately three weeks.

Any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this study knowing that I may withdraw my permission at any time.

I agree that samples of the pupils’ written and spoken text gathered for the study can be published provided that my pupils’ and I are not identified.

Teacher’s signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________________

Researcher’s signature: __________________________ Date: ____________________
YOUR CONSENT

I understand that, at the beginning of term four, Liza Phillips will be observing and collecting samples of the written and spoken language of four pupils from this school, over a period of approximately three weeks.

Any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to allow Liza Phillips to collect data at this school knowing that I may withdraw my permission at any time.

I agree that samples of the pupils' written and spoken text gathered for the study can be published provided that the school, teacher or pupils' are not identified.

Principal’s signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Researcher’s signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
YOUR CONSENT

I understand that, at the beginning of term four, Liza Phillips will be observing and collecting samples of the written and spoken language of my child.

Any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree that my child can participate in the study, knowing that I may withdraw my permission at any time.

I agree that samples of my child’s written and spoken text gathered for the study can be published provided that my child is not identified.

Parent’s signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________

Researcher’s signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________