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This thesis is concerned with the quality of argument in lengthy academic texts. The aim of the research reported in this thesis is to better understand the ways arguments in undergraduate dissertations are constructed through the employment of a range of linguistic resources. It investigates two dissertations written by student writers who, while from very different linguistic background and educational contexts, are both neophyte participants in an increasingly global higher education market. In this research, argument refers to “a mode of thinking and composition or ‘metagenre’” (Andrews, 2005), by which undergraduate student writers create and organise meanings in the dissertations. The research is particularly interested in the textual and the interpersonal zones in academic texts where novice writers must learn in constructing effective arguments that embody the organisation of the texts as unified whole, the staging of meanings to achieve texts’ communicative purposes, and the enactment of the writers’ engagement with others in the literature as they take up their positions in the discourse community.

The research is underpinned primarily by comprehensive theoretical frameworks of the model of “language as social semiotic” (SFL) (Halliday, 1994, 2004). Particularly, the research draws on the Periodicity framework (Halliday, 1985b; Martin & Rose, 2007), the genre theories (Swales, 1990; Martin, 1992; Martin & Rose, 2008), and the Appraisal framework (Martin, 2000a; Martin & White, 2005) to conduct in-depth linguistic analyses on the linguistic resources utilised to construct the arguments, focusing on three-key text features: Periodicity, genre and Engagement. A complementary theory of the model of “the layout of argument” by Toulmin (1958, 2003) is utilised to assess the organisation of the elements of arguments laid out across stretches of the dissertations.

This research is descriptive in nature; in which, the in-depth linguistic analysis is conducted to investigate the phenomena emerging in both texts with a view to noticing the similarities and differences in the ways the two student writers manage these tasks. It analyses an Honours dissertation from an Australian university and a dissertation written by an Indonesian student writer studying English as a foreign language (EFL) in an English department at an Indonesian university. Three-stage analyses are conducted in the top-down manner suggested by the three-key text features. Firstly, Periodicity analysis
explores each dissertation to see how each student writer organises meanings as unified whole hierarchically and construct the macro-argument effectively. Secondly, genre analysis examines three selected chapters from each dissertation to see how writers stage meanings to achieve their communicative purposes in the meso-level of argument. Thirdly, analysis on Engagement in the sentence level (i.e. micro-level of argument) is conducted to samples from each text those that potentially show how the writers engage with readers and other writers in the field.

The research uncovers that the two writers employ linguistic resources to organise meanings to construct arguments in both similar and different ways. The Periodicity analysis reveals that both writers structure their texts at the macro-level of arguments according to conventional ways of organising dissertations. This suggests commonality in modelling practices across the students’ institutions. However, genre analysis and Appraisal analysis show important differences that emerged in how students structure their texts at the meso-level (at chapter, section and paragraph levels), and in how the writers accomplish negotiation by their employment of evaluative language at the micro-level of sentence and below. The arguments within these levels are differently organised that might influence their soundness (quality). These practices indicate the dissimilarities the way each discourse community employs linguistic resources in academic setting, and the academic discourse practices within communities where each student writer participated in.

The thesis contributes to the understanding of how arguments are constructed across lengthy texts through (i) choices in the ways meanings are hierarchically organised at various levels of texts, and (ii) in the ways meanings are staged to achieve the texts’ communicative purposes, together with (iii) how writers engage with others in respect to other voices in the discourse within the academic context. The research extends existing explanations of text development and its relations to genre staging. This staging is verified by the evaluative linguistic analysis in which the staging is signposted. Pedagogically, the findings of the research contribute to the advancement of the teaching of argument in academic genre in EFL educational context. More specifically, a more nuanced approach to pedagogy is necessary in the Indonesian tertiary context.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1. Preview of the research

This research is concerned with the quality of argument in lengthy academic texts. It explores the way arguments in undergraduate dissertations are constructed by student writers\(^1\) coming from two different linguistic backgrounds and educational contexts. The term ‘argument’ refers to “a mode of thinking and composition” (Andrews, 2005) by which student writers create and organise meanings in the dissertations. The ‘quality of argument’ in question is pursued through the textual and the interpersonal zones in the analysed texts. These zones relate to points in the text that demonstrate effective argument construction by taking a position in relation to the research topic and organising the text in stages to achieve the communicative purpose of persuading a reader. In order to explore the quality of arguments, three integrated tools of analysis are used: Periodicity, genre, and Appraisal frameworks.

The research reported in this thesis is a linguistic investigation with a view to noticing\(^2\) the similarities and differences between the ways the student writers manage these academic tasks. It investigates two dissertations that are most suitable to the characteristics of the present research. One Honours level dissertation entitled “Home/Community and School Literacies: Transitions for young learners” written by an Australian student writer from an Australian university is examined together with one

\(^1\) The term ‘student writer(s)’ will be used throughout the thesis to refer to the students who write dissertations as they pursue undergraduate degrees. The term is used to differentiate these students from the ‘researcher-writers’ in masters and doctoral degrees and ‘established’ writers.

\(^2\) What I mean by ‘noticing’ is similar to comparing with a purpose to identify linguistic phenomena that may occur in any text; but please note that it is not a comparative study.
‘Skripsi’ entitled “The Points of Assessment used in an English Competition “English News Report Contest ESA Week 2010” at English Department Semarang State University” written by an Indonesian student writer from an English department at an Indonesian university. The ‘Skripsi’ (the Indonesian undergraduate level dissertation) was taken from a group of high-graded compilation in English Department at the Indonesian university. The Honours dissertation is considered a similar academic text developed at a comparable level of education to the ‘Skripsi’ within the “Western (English) academic” (as used in Altbach (1989)) community. This academic community is the one targeted by many Indonesian students to participate in their future academic careers. In this case, Sue’s dissertation is an Honours thesis submitted to an Australian university to gain a specific degree. Similarly, the Indonesian dissertation, Sri’s ‘skripsi’, represents a document that undergraduate students submit to qualify for the equivalent of an Honours thesis in Indonesia. Importantly, the research is not intended to be a comparative analysis; any comparison of the two texts is meant to notice unique phenomena that might emerge. The reasons not to approach this study as a comparative one are compelling, such as the differences of the demands and expectations each student writer faced in developing her dissertation based on the cultural and educational context in which she participated.

1.2. Concern of the research

Analysing the ways in which meanings are organised and negotiated and stances are taken up in the dissertations examined here has the potential to uncover how writers

---

3 The term ‘Indonesian student writer(s)’ is used throughout the thesis to refer to student writer(s) of Indonesian origin who learn and use English as a foreign language (EFL) in an Indonesian educational context. I do not make any further claims when I use the term EFL, than that of students who use and learn English as their second or subsequent language in any educational context other than English. The term ‘Australian student’ is used throughout the thesis to refer to those who use English as their first language in the Australian educational context.
stage arguments to achieve their social purpose – that is, how academics within a
discourse community employ language to achieve its communal purposes—the genre
(Derewianka, 2012; Martin, 2009). A particular concern of this thesis is the
appropriateness of the dissertations with regards to the conventions and expectations of
the English-speaking (‘Western’) academic discourse community, which are commonly
targeted by those who study English for academic purposes (EAP). For Australian
Honours student writers, such conventions and expectations—that typically relate to the
textual organisations and the language of academic texts, by which student writers need
to observe in developing their dissertations, are embedded in their academic life, as they
immediately live and participate in the community. Thus, although they may not be
explicitly taught any subject on such matters, they have observed these textual
organisations and language in their academic writing practices throughout their study.
For Indonesian student writers, on the other hand, they do not have any immediate
access to these conventions and expectations. In this case, in the department where Sri’s
dissertation was taken, student writers are taught a two-credit subject of “Academic
Writing” that discusses these textual organisations and language of academic texts.
However, as they have limited access and exposure to these academic writing practices,
what they have learnt are not adequately used and practiced in their real academic life.
Yet, in their future academic career, they still need to be aware of them before
participating in the English-speaking academic discourse community—as those who
participate in the international seminars or continue their study in Western universities.
Thus, investigating the arguments in the analysed dissertations is crucial as:

“Although these characteristics [the main aspects that constitute students’
academic writing] are similar in both Australian and Indonesian universities, the
ways the topics and paragraphs are developed and the way references from other
sources are exploited differ them” (Jubhari, 2009).
This thesis considers both analysed dissertations as similar academic texts where undergraduate students investigate certain topics in-depth and communicate the findings of this investigation in a written form. The way meanings are organised in these written texts is critical to the effectiveness of their communication in realising the relationship that the writers establish, both to the literature and with readers. Here, the “organisation of meanings” refers to the way the texts are developed for constructing their arguments. This organisation denotes the way each of these lengthy texts is systematically organised to map the hierarchy of Themes, or thematic development, of the argument which is sensitive to the staging of the genre (Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 198). Thus, the analysis of the argument organisation focuses on the textual meanings (through the Periodicity framework) and the genre of dissertation. In addition, this study explores the interpersonal meanings (through the Appraisal framework) to investigate the writers’ engagement with others in the literature. Further, through the Appraisal framework, the relationship between the writers and readers and writers and others in the literature is focused on to uncover the writers’ “stance”. Linguistically, stance is concerned with what Biber and Finegan (1989, p. 92) describe as the lexical and grammatical expression of attitudes, feelings, judgments, or commitment with respect to the topic and the literature under exploration. In other words, stance concerns the writer’s use of interpersonal meanings to show her position toward the material she presents and those with whom she communicates (Martin & White, 2005).

The theoretical perspective underpinning the research primarily follows the Periodicity framework (Halliday, 1985b; Martin & Rose, 2007), genre theory (Swales, 1990; Martin, 1992; Martin & Rose, 2008) and Appraisal system (Martin, 2000a; Martin & White, 2005). In the first instance, the Periodicity framework makes it
possible to unpacking the complete layers of meanings in both texts to uncover their ‘texture’ (Halliday, 1973b, 1978a, 1985b; Martin, 1992). This study will unpack the hierarchical layers of meanings in two dissertations to easily assess their meanings in any level of realisation.

In the second instance, genre theory offered by Swales (1990) and Martin (e.g. Martin, 1992; 1993; 2009, p. 13). Swales’ influential work assists the analysis of the three analysed chapters by providing a genre analytical method that accounts for textual organisation according to the conventions of discourse communities and their communicative purpose. Martin’s genre theory represents a further advancement of the perspective of language as a ‘social semiotic’ system (Halliday, 1978a). Martin (1992) theorises that as a meaning making resource, language operates depending on the social purposes behind its use. These purposes are defined in terms of systems of social processes – or “context of culture” (Eggins, 2004, p. 9; Halliday, 1991, p. 273) – at the level of genre. Martin further explains the concept of genre as ‘a staged goal-oriented social process’ (e.g. Martin, 1993; 2009, p. 13). The last instance, the Appraisal system, drawing on Volosinov’s (1973) concepts of “dialogism” and “heteroglossia”, is used to uncover the engagement between the writers and readers, and writers and others in the literature, based on a premise that all verbal communication is dialogic (in Martin & White, 2005, p. 92). In this case, it is considered as a given that to write is to always engage with others by anticipating their potential responses. These engagements are accomplished through the interpersonal or evaluative language⁴ that the writers employ in the text.

---

⁴ Interpersonal or evaluative language refers to an aspect of language or meaning that represents the subjective presence of the writers in the text as they adopt stances towards both the material they present, and those to whom they communicate (Martin & White, 2005). This kind of meaning is different from, yet complements, the other two kinds of meaning; ‘ideational’ and ‘textual’ (Halliday,
1.3. Background and context of the study

1.3.1. Academic writing in higher education

Academic writing has a central role in higher education. It is embedded in everything universities accomplish: education, research, and community services. Writing academic texts begins when students are about to enter the universities. It continues in their classes and laboratories in the teaching, learning, and researching processes. Universities provide students with access to writing support, for instance, through seminars or workshops, individual and pair support, as well as online support. Research, as the heart of the university life, cannot be separated from academic writing. Academic writing is related to a process which overlaps considerably with researching itself (e.g. Badley, 2009; Horowitz, 1989; Kamler & Thomson, 2006). Embedded in research activities, academic writing stands against the well-known metaphor of “writing-up” which separates the research itself and the writing processes of its report. The interrelation between research and writing denotes that both are recursive processes (Horowitz, 1989). Indeed, Hyland (2013b) sums up such arguments by saying that “universities are about writing”.

Academic writing accomplishes the primary communication among academics. Researchers, educationists, and linguists regularly disseminate their ideas or research through modes of academic writing (Hyland and Hamp-Lyons, 2002), either through seminars, conferences or publications. However, the genres of academic writing are discipline dependent (Elton, 2010), in which members of an academic community—with similar academic interests, depend on each other particularly in the dissemination...
of their ideas, and in the promotion of academic apprenticeship. These reliance and apprenticeship realised in their writings provide student writers with essential assistance in shaping the novice writers in their writing practices in the discipline (Belcher, 1994; Elton, 2010; Woodward-Kron, 2004).

Academic writing has long been a main concern of the field of English for academic purposes (hereafter EAP). The field has become the primary domain for promoting academic English, particularly to university students coming from the context of English as a foreign language (EFL) who study at English-medium universities, both in English speaking and non-English speaking countries (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001; Hyland and Hamp-Lyons, 2002). It has the specific aim of helping learners to study, conduct research or teach in that language (English) (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001, p.8). Hyland and Hamp-Lyons (2002) confirm that EAP has developed rapidly and become a major force in English language teaching and research.

In the Indonesian educational context, academic writing and writing skills in general are neglected in the teaching of English. Writing skills are overlooked at all levels of education (Alwasilah, 2001), leaving student writers unsupported in developing their academic texts. As a consequence, many Indonesian academics and student writers lack the ability and skills to write proper academic texts (e.g. Adnan, 2009; Mirahayuni, 2002; Safnil, 2013). However, the paradigm shift in the teaching and learning of English in Indonesia in the early 2000s has brought a new era in academic writing practices. Since 2004 the Australian genre-based pedagogy has been adopted in the National Curriculum for the teaching and learning of English (Agustien, 2004; Emilia, 2005; Emilia & Hamied, 2015) at almost all levels of education. By applying Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) (e.g. Halliday, 1978a, 1994; Halliday &
Matthiessen, 2004) as its philosophical foundation, the curriculum offers both theoretical and practical bases for understanding how language operates in the negotiation of meaning in texts (Agustien, 2004).

As with “communicative competence” as the main goal, this new curriculum is crucial in developing students’ writing skills. By observing the ways English is taught through a teaching and learning sequence, known as the “Teaching and Learning Cycle” (Rothery, 1996), writing—indeed writing, has become the ultimate goal in the activities. Thus, this shift in the educational paradigm influences the way academic writing is practiced and developed in the Indonesian context. English departments at universities have gradually implemented this approach by teaching genre in their syllabus and claimed to have improved their students’ English competence (e.g. Emilia, 2005) especially their writing skills (Emilia & Hamied, 2015). One of the advancements in the teaching academic writing in this new curriculum is the teaching of genres that explicitly raise awareness about the organisation and language features of texts. However, the comprehensive approaches from SFL to text and text development in the new curriculum often confuse student writers. In this case, the way one’s writing is viewed as a text that embodies an argument to negotiate becomes an innovation; yet it is very challenging. Particularly, to develop the argument of the text as a unified whole is demanding for them; yet, to negotiate stance through the utilisation of interpersonal language is even a real challenge.

1.3.2. Argument in academic writing

As aforementioned, the academic writing practices performed by the academics inspire student writers as novice to take part in the discourse community. As with the way academics communicate their ideas, their writings not only offer students with a well-
developed and supported argument in their academic texts; but their texts also exemplify their effective engagement with other. One particular genre primarily employed by academics in higher education is the argumentative/persuasive genre (Lee, 2006). This genre has become a major tool for negotiating meanings among both academics and students. The genre facilitates the dissemination of academic writers’ arguments, in promoting ideas, challenging others’ positions and seeking others’ support for the negotiated ideas. Consequently, learning to argue to persuade others has become a key academic skill (Coffin, Hewings, & North, 2012).

In the context of undergraduate education, writing tasks often demand students to write for argumentative or persuasive purposes (e.g. Coffin et al., 2012; Preiss, Castillo, Flotts, & San Martin, 2013). Students’ ability to argue a case is essential in the education activities and forms of assessment (Coffin & O’Halloran, 2008). Yet, writing in the argumentative/persuasive genre has been one of the main areas of academic writing ESL/EFL students have a problem with (Lee, 2006). In particular, these students commonly experience difficulties in constructing a well-developed and engaging argument in their academic texts (e.g. G. Thompson, 2001). One most challenging text to develop that represents lengthy argumentation is the undergraduate dissertation. This text is a significant challenge for many students as establishing, sustaining, and organising lengthy argument do not receive adequate attention and explicit teaching.

Each academic community has already had criteria for assessing good writing. There are numerous guidelines a new writer has to follow when she is about to write for a certain academic community, either for a conference paper or a journal publication. Furthermore, generally the quality of argument is a vital element in academic paper. As with the concern of this research previously mentioned, the ‘quality of argument’ is
pursued through the textual and the interpersonal zones in academic texts. These relate to the way convincing arguments is constructed that embody the organisation of the text as a unified whole, the staging of meanings to achieve communicative purposes, and their engagement with others in the literature. These suggest that the research will analyse the texts through three interrelated tools of texts analysis: Periodicity, genre, and Appraisal frameworks.

1.3.3. Argument in Indonesian academic writing

Within the Indonesian EFL context, argument has not been considered in students’ academic writing. Despite all the efforts being made to improve the teaching of academic writing, establishing and maintaining arguments remains problematic and very demanding for many undergraduate student writers in Indonesia. Several possible reasons may trigger this difficulty. Firstly, cultural differences between English-speaking countries and ESL/EFL countries (such as, in this case, Indonesia) may potentially influence the rhetorical practices of student writers in developing academic texts (as in Hyland, 2013a). Generally, students in Indonesia do not consider developing an argument to be an important aspect of writing academic texts. Rather, the dissertation is understood as a vehicle for reporting the results of their research without critiquing the work of others (Basthomi, 2009; Holliday, 2001).

In addition, interpersonal meaning presents more challenge to Indonesian undergraduate students. In the preparation for academic writing classes, interpersonal investment is presented as something that should be avoided in their own academic texts (Cahyono, 2000). This practice results in the development of less effective arguments in students’ academic writing, especially in their dissertations. Many Indonesian student writers assume and seek endorsement of their own academic writing from others’
academic work, and avoid critiquing others, as their culture does not encourage them to do so. In pedagogical practices, i.e. the teaching of academic writing, and during thesis/dissertation supervision, more attention has commonly been given to developing content related language and text organisation than to enabling students to build convincing arguments and developing and maintaining appropriate reader-writer engagement in their academic texts. Students rarely learn how to negotiate their relationships with the broader discourse community and how to represent these relationships linguistically in their academic texts. Furthermore, students appear to disregard the presence of others’ positions in their texts. They tend to refer to them in their writing without engaging with their positions.

Secondly, writing argumentative text employing evaluative language has not been generally practiced in the Indonesian academic context (Emilia, 2005; Emilia & Hamied, 2015). The teaching and learning of writing skills was restricted to a pedagogy favouring repetition of certain patterns for developing texts. The teaching of writing skills and writing exercises are mainly given at the sentence level, while writing above this level concentrates more on construing students’ experience (Cahyono, 2000). Despite writing being considered the most difficult language skill to acquire, this skill has been neglected within the secondary education system (Alwasilah, 2001), as well as in tertiary education, with the exception of language faculties or departments. The problem is even worse in the field of academic writing. Because of its absence in secondary school curriculum, most undergraduate student writers are relatively new to the skill of argumentative writing, resulting in low levels of student achievement. As a result, the use of evaluative language to develop convincing arguments has been neglected in formal education. Teachers may also contribute to the problem by not
developing an explicit understanding of how language generally works in such texts (Gebhard, Chen, Graham, & Gunawan, 2013).

Thirdly, developing a sustained argument over several chapters is something students have not encountered within their previous schooling. Undergraduate student writers have rarely developed lengthy texts in their secondary schooling or in their undergraduate candidature. Discussions in English classes at the post high-school level deal more with how to represent students’ experiences, and to arrange and structure the representations, rather than how to negotiate the meaning construed in the experiences. Even at the university level, the teaching of writing skills is dominated by discussions concerning grammar and theories of writing without adequate writing practice (Alwasilah, 2001).

Moreover, there seems to be limited understanding among Indonesian student writers about the context in which they are writing. Student writers often do not realise that their work should be developed according to certain academic conventions and meet certain expectations of a broader academic community (Lee, 2006; 2007). For example, many student writers approach the task as a search for supporting evidence for their own opinions rather than an opportunity to enter dialogue with others in the discourse community – whether it is agreeing with members of the community or not. It could also be argued that Western academics’ expectations for developing academic work appear to be different from those of Indonesian academics. This represents a double struggle for Indonesian student writers alongside their problems with academic English. Such differences influence the ways their argument is developed, as many students do not directly develop their meanings in English, but rather construct the
argument in their native language and then translate the meaning (Soedjatmiko & Widiati, 2003). This can make the arguments sound overly literal (Cahyono, 2000).

Furthermore, as an experienced academic staff supervising student theses in Indonesia, I have observed some of the difficulties encountered by students; especially in coping with the academic cultural “baggage” presented by the English language (as in Hood, 2004, 2010a; Lee, 2007; Martins Vieira, 2005). Many students in EFL or ESL contexts do not understand the fact that “academic argument and academic knowledge are socially constructed in and through discourse in dialogue with other knowledge and other knowers” (Hood, 2010a, p. 3). In a pilot project (Widhiyanto, 2012), although the student writer refers to others’ works, she does not use them as arguments to be agreed with, appraised or critiqued. They are used merely to support the “point” she argues. Yet such writing skills are essential for building solidarity with the academic discourse community, while at the same time constructing points of difference and making a space for one’s own research (Hood, 2004, p. 18; 2010a, p. 37).

In summary, the demands of developing an argument in academic texts have not been paid adequate attention. It is important to understand the choices made by students as they negotiate a complex argument throughout the different stages of dissertation development. In this thesis, the undergraduate dissertations developed by a student writer of Indonesian-speaking background in the four-year TESOL program, and the Honours dissertation by an ESB student in a four-year English Course education degree are considered as authentic linguistic events. In both contexts, each dissertation (text) exemplifies the final written accomplishment of the student, developed within academic, cultural, and situational contexts for further fulfilling the conventions and expectations of the academic community. In the Indonesian context, under the
supervision of (usually) two lecturers, student writers develop the dissertation as the outcome of a small research project. The meanings negotiated in the dissertation represent a social reality of the writers’ deepest perception of their experience (in their research) jointly constructed through the supervision processes. The academic context constructed through the processes of supervision resembles that usually found in the English academic discourse community. The Indonesian dissertation focuses on an additional hurdle in the form of a viva voce, or defence of the dissertation to a panel of examiners. Further negotiation of meaning takes place before it becomes the final text; that is, the revisions suggested from the examination are included. Though the processes may be dissimilar, the Australian dissertation also has to proceed through an examination.

1.4.  Aim of the study

This research is a linguistic investigation which aims to describe the quality of argument in undergraduate dissertations. As with this type of research conducted and as with the construct of ‘argument’ operated—as “a mode of thinking and composition” (Andrews, 2005) by which student writers create and organise meanings in the dissertations, the present research uses available theories to better understand how arguments in undergraduate dissertations are constructed through the employment of the linguistic resources. This research seeks the employment of the potential linguistic resources—the textual and the interpersonal language, used in lengthy academic texts to construct and organise arguments that engage with others in the literature. The quality in question is pursued through a range of linguistic aspects employed in hierarchically organisation and staging meanings that construe the research conducted and enact the writers’ negotiation with readers and the literature across the chapters of each dissertation. These
aspects revolve around the textual and interpersonal linguistic resources that are significant for developing successful argument. They include Periodicity framework, genre theory and Appraisal framework. The main argument for doing this research is that it seeks to uncover how unspoken conventions and expectations guide members of the academic discourse community in relation to the ways in which an argument is considered convincing and engaging. These conventions and expectations are often not explicitly accessible for student writers, especially those coming from EFL contexts. Moreover, though such conventions and expectations remain hidden, they play important roles in developing as well as assessing the quality of the arguments in the academic texts.

1.5. Focus of the study

This research examines the quality of argument in undergraduate dissertations. It focuses on the textual and the interpersonal zones in academic texts. These are the zone where the undergraduate student writers have to learn to construct and organise arguments in academic texts that engage with others in the literature. In the first zone, it relates to the ways meanings are structured and organised across the dissertations to easily follow their development to come to its valid conclusion. In this zone, two kinds of text organisational frameworks are employed: the way a text is organised as a unified whole, and the way meanings are organised to achieve the social purpose of the text. In the second zone, it relates to the negotiation and engagement which denotes what Thompson (G. Thompson, 2001; G. Thompson & Thetela, 1995) regards as the interaction between the writer and the reader and the literature in the text. The focus on these two zones suggests the scope of the research to investigate the whole texts. It is primarily to examine the development of the arguments across the dissertation in which
the three analysed chapters are the minimal parts of a complete dissertation that represent the main development of the argument, represented by the writers’ utilisation of linguistic resources in the texts. Accordingly, this research concentrates on seeking out and analysing these linguistic resources in both dissertations.

The research is underpinned by the model of argument by Toulmin (1958, 2003) and by Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) theory (Halliday, 1978a; 1994). The Toulmin’s model of argument provides tools for assessing the ways meanings are organised to see “… the progress of the argument from the initial statement of an unsettled problem to the final presentation of a conclusion” (Toulmin, 2003 p.87). In addition, the SFL offers tools for exploring the ways in which meanings are negotiated and organised to construct arguments in the two undergraduate dissertations. Within SFL, three frameworks: Periodicity framework (Halliday, 1985b; Martin & Rose, 2007); genre theory (e.g. Martin, 1992; Martin & Rose, 2008) and Appraisal framework (e.g. Martin, 2000a; Martin & White, 2005), facilitate the examination of the quality of argument in question. The genre theory is also supported by the one of Swales (1990). These frameworks are employed simultaneously to investigate the ways in which arguments for achieving the communicative goals of the dissertations are constructed across any level of the texts, by emphasising how linguistic meanings are organised and how positions about a topic are taken. These three frameworks represent the dissertation as a complete package of layers of meanings, as instantiations of certain genres and as realisation of negotiation between the writer and potential readers.

In the first instance, this research considers each dissertation as an instance of genre – a macrogenre. As a lengthy text, this dissertation represents a “complex institutionalised form of social practices” (Muntigl, 2006) in the construction and
organisation of its argument. Each text is systematically arranged following the patterns of the importance of the messages in the text that map the hierarchy of Themes – thematic development, signifying the text as a unified whole. Muntigl (2006, p. 234) explains that these social activities are in turn realised by employing more than one genre, and these unite to form the “macro-genre” (Martin, 1995b; 1997a, p. 16) of the dissertation. The organisation of the argument is sensitive to the staging of the genre (Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 198), which then relates to the analysis of genre in this thesis. Thus, this first analysis (Periodicity analysis) will lead to the following genre analysis. Therefore, in examining each dissertation the analysis is done in top-down manner employing Periodicity framework. It begins by exploring the way meanings are hierarchically organised across the levels of arguments. It includes analyses at the level of the whole dissertation; each of its chapters; and each of the sections/subsections of each chapter to understand how the argument is developed in more specific ways.

In the second instance, this research considers each dissertation as the analysed dissertations denote traditional types of thesis/dissertation with chapters centred around an introduction, literature review, methodology, results/findings, and discussion/conclusion, each may develop its argument differently as a genre, and as a part of the complete argument in the dissertation – the macro-genre. For instance, in establishing that the research is warranted, the introductory chapter (genre) is developed through three stages to argue (1) for the object of the study; (2) for the need for new knowledge; and (3) for the writers’ contribution (Bunton, 1998, 2002; Hood, 2006; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007; Swales, 1990; Swales & Feak, 2012). This first chapter is developed differently, using different stages to other chapters, as the communicative purpose of each, and the way to achieve it may be different. Consequently, as a macrogenre, the
complete meaning that one whole dissertation embodies, comprises the meanings that accumulate with each successful chapter. As an embedded genre, each chapter is, in turn, organised through complete stages and phases; that is, it usually takes readers more than one phase of meaning to work through a genre (chapter) (Martin, 2009).

In the last instance, this research investigates the way interpersonally oriented argument is developed via the writers’ adjustments of their own viewpoint against others’ which are realised by the deployment of interpersonal/evaluative linguistic resources in the dissertations. This investigation is important in the present research because it may uncover the student writers take up positions toward the topic, and toward readers and the literature in the text. In this way, the present research explores the ways in which student writers use those linguistic resources to more explicitly realise their inter-subjective presence as they take a stance, that is, when they evaluate an object (the topic of the study); position subjects (themselves and others); and (dis)align with other subjects (Du Bois, 2007, p. 163). In addition, the discussion also explores the way the writers build up the prosodies of interpersonal meaning that can inform our understanding of the construction of evaluative stance in their dissertations (Hood, 2006, p. 37). These prosodies may also inform the way student writers make use of interpersonal resources to indicate the staging of the macrogenre in any level as these resources function in the construction of argument (p.38). In this case, the research seeks to explore further the deployment of the interpersonal/evaluative values negotiated in each genre (chapter), stage or phase, as the writers construct arguments across the dissertation. This analysis provides insights into the way student writers develop means for their negotiation of their standpoints about the topic under discussion by their use of evaluative linguistic resources. To summarise, the focus of the research
is to explore the staging of the interpersonally oriented argument in two undergraduate dissertations by exploring the organisation of the stages and examining the negotiation of evaluative meanings.

1.6. Research questions

With regard to the concern of the research, the thesis addresses the following issue:

*How do student writers in different contexts build up arguments in their undergraduate dissertations?*

This question is responded to through the following inter-related sub-questions:

a. How are meanings in the two undergraduate dissertations organised in terms of their thematic development and staged in terms of their genres?

b. How do the interpersonal linguistic resources drawn on by the student writers to argue a position or point of view vary across the dissertations?

1.7. Significance of the study

The present study is an in-depth study of undergraduate dissertations, an under-researched area. Particularly, it examines the construction of arguments in these lengthy texts. The undergraduate dissertations represent a genre that students wishing to become academics need to be familiar with. The development of arguments in this genre has become a challenge especially for those coming from EFL educational context.

Nevertheless, the writing of this academic text is very important as it prepares students to continue further in their studies. It denotes a research assessment task that most undergraduate students are likely to find challenging and is the lengthiest piece of work that Indonesian undergraduate students have to develop in some universities in Indonesia.
The present research aims at making some contributions to current theories and practices in the field of academic writing, especially in the way arguments are effectively constructed. Studies within SFL in the field of academic writing (Hood, 2004; Lee, 2006; Woodward-Kron, 2002a, 2002b) have provided valuable insights into the nature of argumentation in certain kinds of academic writing. However, most studies focus on a particular or specific section (chapter) of the thesis/dissertation (e.g. the introduction) rather than the complete text. The present study will be significant in terms of revealing how the argument in a thesis is constructed across the whole undergraduate dissertation, looking in particular at (1) how meanings are hierarchically organised as a unified whole in order to map the texts with their Thematic development; (2) how meanings are staged to achieve communicative purposes of each chapter (as a genre), and (3) how the interpersonal resources are drawn on to enact the writer’s engagement with others in the literature and with readers.

The present study provides significant insights into the practice of academic writing at an undergraduate level. This insight will help design model pedagogical practice regarding the preparation of EFL student writers, especially in the Indonesian context, to develop arguments in academic texts. This study also will inform the development of teaching materials for training novice student writers. In the Indonesian educational context, these elements will be very important for enhancing student writers’ abilities in developing their undergraduate dissertation.

1.8. Overview of the thesis

This study examines how student-writers negotiate or package meanings and organise and stage the realisations of interpersonally oriented argument throughout their dissertations. The study focuses especially on the dissertation written within the EFL
context as in Indonesia and it is compared with a counterpart from an Australian university. The literature shows that the ways student writers negotiate stance is crucial in the advancement of an argument in academic writing. It represents one of the ways academic writing makes use of interpersonal meanings in representing the authors’ engagement in considering the presence of others and others’ stances within the subject matter discussed in the analysed texts. This evaluative language (the interpersonal meanings) denotes small parts of the whole organisation of meanings in academic writing; yet plays crucial roles in making the argument engaging.

The present chapter initiated the discussion by establishing a preview on the topic and concern of the study. The specific concerns of the study relate to the construction of argument that embody the organisation and the staging of meanings, and the negotiations of stance in the lengthy academic texts. It was then followed by an account of the background to and the context of the study where the study was conducted. The subsequent discussions focus on the aim and focus of the study that then leads to the formulation of the questions this research intended to cope with, in which the research questions and sub-questions were presented. The discussions on the significance of the research completed the discussions presented. Finally, the summary of the subsequent chapters ends the introduction.

Chapter 2 presents a review of the associated literature. It provides research-based literature as starting points for the current study. The chapter reviews previous studies in the field of academic writing, interpersonal meaning, argumentation, and so forth that are closely related to the current one. It is important to find a gap in the previous research for this current research to occupy. The theoretical foundations for approaching the issue are further explained in chapter 3. Here, the theoretical
foundations of Systemic Functional Linguistics and the Sydney school of genre are more fully explained and deeply explored to validate data analyses and interpretations.

The theoretical approach is also explained and applied in chapter 4, especially dealing with specific aspects within the overall description of research design. The chapter discusses the stages of how the research is conducted: details of data collection, analyses, and interpretation.

Results of the analysis are displayed in chapter 5 and 6, which will examine respectively the dissertations written by an ESB student writer from an Australian university (in chapter 5) and by a non-ESB (English-speaking background) student writer in the Indonesian EFL context (in chapter 6).

Chapter 7 discusses the findings and their relation to the theoretical foundation established. It also discusses the theoretical and pedagogical implications of the study. It recommends the need to develop the theory of Appraisal by considering the connection between construction of quality argument and its linguistic realisations through interpersonal/evaluative language.
Chapter 2  Literature Review

2.1  Introduction

This research examines the quality of argument in undergraduate dissertations. As with the focus of the study, the two interrelated aspects —the textual and interpersonal zones employed in academic texts, are significant in the investigation undertaken in this thesis. In the first instance—in the textual zone, the study concerns with the organisations of each dissertation as a unified whole and the staging of meanings to achieve the dissertation’s (text’s) communicative purpose. In the second instance—within the interpersonal zone, it is connected with the ways each dissertation enacts the writer’s academic engagement with readers and with other writers as they take a stance in the negotiation of meanings.

As studies in this specific area of argument in academic writing are few, the current study relies on a broader area of academic English in general. This chapter begins by contextualising the research by reviewing previous studies in the field of academic English. Within this field, the notion of the academic discourse community is studied thoroughly as it plays a central role in the development of academic English. The chapter then moves on to consider the construct of argument in academic writing, and to relate it to the concepts of text as a unified whole; genre and academic engagement. It also discusses the SFL approaches specifically in relation to those concepts. Finally, it concludes the discussion by locating this thesis among these broader interconnected fields.
2.2 Research into academic writing

Studies into the argument in undergraduate dissertations are situated within the complex field of English for Academic Purposes (EAP). The field encompasses a contested area of knowledge and research, as well as of association and affiliation, as the literature suggests (Coffin & Donohue, 2012; L. Flowerdew, 2002; Hood, 2004; Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002; Hyland & Polly, 2004; Jordan, 2002; Lillis, 1997, 2003; Lillis & Turner, 2001). The heated debates in this field include what is considered as academic English, and the politics surrounding its practices, including its role in the teaching of academic writing to English language learners (Lillis, 1997, 2003; Lillis & Turner, 2001), as well as the ways writers, researchers and experts are aligned to certain affiliations. The following subsections discuss these contestations in more detail.

2.2.1. The notion of English for Academic Purposes (EAP)

English for academic purposes (EAP) has been characterised as an all-inclusive yet widely spread field of study. Developed from its “theoretically and pedagogically eclectic parent” (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002, p. 2) of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), EAP is considered to be a broad enough discipline to assemble wide-ranging research within the ESP tradition (e.g. Dudley-Evans, 1994; Hyland, 1998, 2013b; Paltridge, 1995; Swales, 1990).

The concept of EAP covers more territories than it purports to comprise. This delineation appears to derive from “the comprehensive defining characteristics of genre compiled by Swales” (as cited in Lewin, Fine, & Young, 2001). Originally, the British Council officers used the term EAP in the mid-1970s (Jordan, 2002, p. 73). Some proponents use the term to mean all English teaching practices that enable English
language learners to study, to conduct research, and to teach in English (Flowerdew and Peacock, 2001; Jordan 1997; Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002).

As a field of study, EAP then spread rapidly around the globe. This expansion is a consequence of the spread of academic and pedagogic publications and the emerging of a global population of second language learners studying English in the English medium in undergraduate and postgraduate degrees (Hood, 2004, p. 2). From a fledgling field of study, EAP has become a major force in English language teaching and research in higher education around the world within the last three decades or so (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002; Jordan, 2002). This development owes much to the growth of English as the most prominent language for disseminating academic knowledge, and this knowledge is primarily communicated in the written form.

As the main endeavour of EAP, academic writing plays a crucial role in English academic practices in higher education. Higher educational bodies in many parts of the world have adopted academic writing as an important aspect of English language teaching (J. Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002; Li & Flowerdew, 2009). All university students, irrespective of their disciplines, are required to produce a range of written genres during their academic studies (Paltridge, 2004, p. 98). Most academic activities in higher education are disseminated and documented as archives of academic work in the form of either research reports, papers, or dissertations/theses, depending on their academic status; the most valued texts in higher education. Hyland (2013b) argues that ‘universities are ABOUT writing and that specialist forms of academic literacy are at the heart of everything we do: central to constructing knowledge, educating students and negotiating a professional academic career.’
However, in practice there has been unfairness in the way EAP serves different types of students. Despite EAP’s claims of wide-ranging definition and continued development, there is a tendency to constrain, rather than open up, the possibilities for meaning making by those traditionally excluded from this education (Lea & Street, 1998; Lillis, 1997). For instance, Lea and Street (1998), who researched student academic writing, found that there were conflicting interpretations and understandings between staff and students about what students were required to do in their academic writing. Although many staff considered *argument* and *structure* as two key elements for student writing, they were not able to specify exactly what they meant by those terms (Lea and Street, 1998, pp. 162-163). In addition, some less privileged members of the community, that is “non-traditional” students (including L2 learners, as in Hyland (2006)), experience frustration relating to the “hidden conventions” that exclude them from participation in classes. According to Lillis (1997), the idea of teaching academic writing should make those practices which are implicit explicit for the learners—for student writers, learning the conventions and expectations of the academic community is not as straightforward as academics often assume. Furthermore, Lillis (1997, p. 197) suggests student-writers need to be given opportunities to explore conventions in the context of specific moments of their meaning making in order to make sense of them.

As with its role and force in English language teaching and research in higher education globally, EAP has dominated the practices of academic writing especially those that relate to the teaching to ESL/EFL learners, including in Indonesia. The Indonesian academics as well as students, as parts of the global academic community, need to observe the typical writing practices of EAP. From this perspective, it is reasonable to assume that in writing the two analysed undergraduate dissertations
examined in this research, student writers must have observed similar academic conventions and expectations. Thus, despite the fact the two dissertations are produced by different student writers coming from different linguistic background and educational contexts (in which their differences in the conventions and expectations they experience in developing their dissertations are highly considered in the current research (as Hyland (2006) suggests)), their texts must conform to the norms of a single discourse community, that of the “English academic community”. This make the two texts are comparably similar though the present study is not a ‘comparative’ one.

2.2.2. The construct of Discourse Community

The concept of discourse community is central to studies of academic writing. Despite the various views about this term, membership of an academic discourse community provides novice writers a pathway into the conventions and expectations of academic texts they need to achieve within the community (Swales, 1990). Bizzell (1982) coined the term “discourse community” or “in-group” to refer to “shared discourse conventions, habits of language use, expectations, ways of understanding experience, and patterns of interaction with the world”. Many researchers concur with her account focusing on the importance of goals or purposes, and using communication to achieve these goals, as well as the significance of education and group interests to keep the community active (Hinkel, 2002; Swales, 1987, 1990). Others consider the term ‘discourse community’ to relate to the concepts of academic association and affiliation developed within academic literature (Hood, 2004; Hyland, 2002a; Prior, 2003). In fact, ‘discourse community’ denotes characteristic kinds of relationships and practices that are enacted in or through discourse (Hood, 2004), in which learning those practices is more than merely a matter of being overtly taught (J. Flowerdew, 2000, p. 128). Those
practices are integrated into common social functions which are crucial for the building-up, as well as dissemination of, new knowledge (Coffin, 2009; Hood, 2004). Thus, an understanding of the values and practices of a particular community requires members, especially novice writers, to become apprentices in the community, that is, to learn and practice the ways of doing, meaning, and valuing that distinguish that particular community.

In becoming apprentices within a discourse community, novice academic writers have to proceed in ways that challenge them. As each community stresses the participatory, negotiable nature of learning within a shared professional context (J. Flowerdew, 2000, p. 128; Hyland, 2000a, p. 1), newcomer writers need to appropriate the relevant practices. This way of learning is important as each academic community has particular purposes and ways of seeing the world that are associated with distinct practices, genres, and communicative conventions (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002; Swales, 1990). Thus, for novice writers, learning to appropriate particular text types is simultaneous with learning the processes of affiliation into targeted discourse communities (Hood, 2004, p. 25). However, dominant community conventions and practices surrounding academic writing often control student-writers in a complex way (Lillis, 1997, p. 197). As a consequent, novice student writers need to engage with the intended community and to become familiar with the nuances of its cultural practices and linguistic usage (Canagarajah, 2002, p. 29). Hood (2010a, p. 4) argues that one of the challenges in academic English for novice writers is to ‘recontextualise experiences or observations from an everyday and common-sense world into a world of abstraction and/or technicalised meanings’. However, the specificity of the discipline and the
variation in the discourses of the academy for each disciplinary field also challenge these apprentices (e.g. Hyland, 2000, 2002b; Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002).

Entering an academic discourse community presents a challenge to non-native speaking student writers. In particular, there are compelling pressures to produce academic texts as a way of taking part in the academic negotiations of an academic discourse community (J. Flowerdew, 2000; Hood, 2004, 2010a; Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002; Lillis, 1997; Lillis & Turner, 2001); even for those who are more privileged scholars (in J. Flowerdew, 2000). However, an understanding of the practices in a discourse community is beneficial for student writers in providing scholarly preparation for learning the conventions and expectations needed to participate in, and critique arguments and issues in their fields (Hood, 2004, p. 9; 2010a, p. 12; Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002, p. 6). For instance, this understanding may help novice and graduate student writers in developing convincing arguments (Hood, 2004; G. Thompson, 2001).

Understanding the nature of the academic discourse community is significant for this thesis’s aim to contextualise the two analysed undergraduate dissertations examined in the research. Although the two dissertations are produced in different institutional settings, both are expected to conform to the norms of a single discourse community, that of the “English academic community”. They are written as partial requirements of similar degrees and are organised within the parameters of the “traditional” type of dissertation (thesis) (Dong, 1998).

### 2.2.3. Studies on theses/dissertations

Studies on theses/dissertations have been of interest for many researchers. Most studies on such lengthy academic genres are more concerned with graduate and postgraduate
theses written by L2 writers, with focus on certain features of these academic texts (e.g. Belcher, 1994; Belcher & Hirvela, 2005; Bunton, 1998; Dong, 1998). All these studies relate to problems L2 writers experience in writing their theses. In the undergraduate degree, there have also been several studies on/related to the undergraduate dissertation (e.g. Dowd, Connolly, Thompson Jr, & Reynolds, 2015; Dowd, Roy, Thompson Jr, & Reynolds, 2015; Engstrom, 2015; Greenbank & Penketh, 2009; Hyland, 2002a; Jaldemark & Lindberg, 2013; Kriebel & Lapham, 2008; Paxton, 2011; Todd, Bannister, & Clegg, 2004; Todd, Smith, & Bannister, 2006; F. Webster, Pepper, & Jenkins, 2000). These studies have wide-ranging discussions, including assessment of undergraduate dissertations, experiences and perceptions of students and supervisors of undergraduate dissertations, utilisation of technology, and writers’ negotiation. The following discussions detail these studies.

Assessment of undergraduate dissertations has been a concern in some studies (e.g. Engstrom, 2015; F. Webster et al., 2000). Webster et al. (2000) examine the assessment of undergraduate dissertations by analysing documented material and interviews. Their study found considerable ambiguity as regards the use, meaning, and application of criteria. Engstrom’s (2015) study aims to create a unified model for conducting and assessing undergraduate dissertations from fundamentally different academic traditions. Examining texts across all disciplines involved in computer game development at one university in Sweden, but with differing technological orientations and aesthetic traditions, and with frequent meetings of the examiners, they developed a model that integrates process and assessment procedures while maintaining discipline-specific academic requirements. However, his study is limited to those dissertations written after the introduction of his model of evaluation, not the older texts.
Some studies have focused on the experiences and perceptions of students and supervisors of undergraduate dissertations (as in Todd et al., 2004; and in Todd et al., 2006). Todd investigated the experiences and perceptions of students (in Todd et al., 2004) and of staff supervising (in Todd et al., 2006) final-year social science undergraduates enrolled in a dissertation module in a post-1992 UK university. As both studies deal with experiences and perceptions, the data were collected from interviews and questionnaires. In the first study, it is apparent that “While students valued the autonomy, authenticity, and ownership they felt in relation to their dissertation, they also experienced considerable challenges, particularly in relation to ‘time’” (2004 p. 335). The second study (Todd et al., 2006) described the dissertation supervisors’ experiences to inspire other supervisors to work collaboratively. These two studies examine both students’ and supervisors’ experiences and perceptions in the development of the student dissertation. However, they did not examine the theses themselves in detail.

Several studies have dealt with the utilisation of technology in the development of undergraduate dissertations (e.g. Greenbank & Penketh, 2009; Jaldemark & Lindberg, 2013). Greenbank and Penketh (2009) explore the way students approach the dissertation process by interviewing a group of students. They found that the extent to which students operated autonomously depended upon a complex set of factors. They also suggest that tutors need to enter a dialogue with student writers to acquire a better understanding of the values underpinning their behaviour. Jaldemark and Lindberg (2013) investigate the application of technology to mediate supervision of undergraduate students’ dissertation work. They found that this mediation by technology helps students in their one-to-one and collaborative supervision processes
for developing their dissertation. These processes suggested more productive ways to improve students’ learning but did not look closely at the actual texts. Kriebel and Lapham (2008) investigate the use of print and electronic resources in advanced undergraduate research at Wellesley College. The study of honours theses bibliographies of a fourth year of social science project found that there were “(1) an explosion in use of non-periodical, non-book Web sources; (2) a rapid decline in the use of print journals; and (3) a persistent lack of use of e-books” (p.268). The study claims that student writers should be suggested to utilise more scholarly indexes and bibliographies to begin research to cope with overdependence on random Web searching and to enter in the scholarly publishing world.

Other studies have focused on writers’ negotiation in their undergraduate dissertations. Hyland (2002a) investigates the role of identity in ESL undergraduate theses in Hong Kong. Analysing several sources of data (such as the theses, interview with students and supervisors), the study found significant underuse of authorial reference by students and clear preferences for avoiding these forms in the contexts which involved making arguments or claims. The study also reveals that the use of ‘I’ for L2 writers is problematic. However, more analysis may be necessary on the context of the use of ‘I’ than merely quantifying its frequency in student reports. Hood (2004) investigates the construction of evaluative stance in the introductory sections of academic research papers. She compares “a set of four introductory sections from published research articles” to “six introductory sections from undergraduate student dissertations” (p. 64). Underpinned by a linguistic perspective, Hood’s study is concerned with “the linguistic analysis of academic texts” (p. 7) in which she examines the linguistic demands that expect students to “evaluate other knowledge and other
knowers as they construct an argument for their own research” (p. 7). The study identifies and describes a range of “evaluative strategies” that are used by academic writers to realise this evaluation. It also details and demonstrates the way different evaluative strategies shape the construction of knowledge. Hood’s studies represent a comprehensive investigation combining the linguistic and pedagogical perspectives to model the construction of evaluative stance.

Out of these studies which have broad discussions, there has been no discussion focusing the construction of argument in this kind of academic text. Linguistic analysis of the way argument is constructed is uncommon. Thus, the present research fills the gap available.

2.2.4. Research on genres in theses/dissertations

Genre analysis in academic writing (i.e. theses and dissertations) is a broad church drawing on various genre schools (e.g. Bunton, 1998, 2002, 2005; Kwan, 2006; Paltridge, 2004; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007; Swales, 1990; Swales & Feak, 2012). As with the limited number of studies on undergraduate dissertations, discussions are taken from those examining the graduate thesis or combination of both. The following discussion presents the explication of some studies that contribute to the analysis of the chapters in the dissertations under investigation in this thesis.

2.2.4.1. Introductory chapter

The Introductory chapter has been of interest to a number of researchers (e.g. Bunton, 1998, 2002; Hood, 2006; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007; Samraj, 2002; Swales, 1990; Swales & Feak, 2012). The opening chapter of an academic text in general plays a central role in instituting the topic and establishing the context in the dissertation, that is, its main purpose is to justify the research being reported (Samraj, 2002). The genre
of the introductory chapter functions to position the dissertation appropriately in relation to the field of the study and allow writers to explicitly acknowledge their intellectual ‘debts’ to the members of the community (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007, p. 84).

The initial work of Swales’ CARS (1990, 2004) has been influential in research articles. In his 1990 CARS model, he argues about the strategic importance of the chapter (Swales & Feak, 1994) “in the writer’s development of the central argument of the thesis” (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007, p. 89). There have been studies analysing the introductory chapter employing Swales’ CARS (Create a Research Space) (Bunton, 1998, 2002; Hood, 2006; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007; Swales, 1990; Swales & Feak, 2012). Yet it has been modified to be applicable to the introduction of a dissertation/thesis because while research articles present a literature review as part of the introduction, the dissertation/thesis usually has a separate chapter for it (Bunton, 2002; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007; Swales & Feak, 2012). There are at least two reasons why the introductory chapter is distinctively special. Firstly, almost all-academic writing, including theses/dissertations, have an introductory section/chapter (e.g. Bunton, 2002; Paltridge, 2002; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). Despite the emergence of ‘new hybrid types’, most academic texts employ an introductory chapter (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007).

Secondly, the introductory chapter/section is the chapter in which academic writers represent their first attempt in negotiating meanings to contextualise their own research within the relevant literature in the field of study. This is where they create a space for their research (Swales, 1990, 2004). For these reasons, this chapter has been the most researched of all chapters (Bunton, 2002; Paltridge, 2002; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). Employing various theoretical frameworks, researchers, linguists, and
educationists have all investigated this section of academic texts. Many have devoted attention to investigating how this opening part of an academic text is developed, and how it influences the unfolding of the whole text (e.g. Bhatia, 1997a; Bunton, 2002; Hood, 2004, 2006; Samraj, 2002, 2008; Swales, 1990, 2004). They are interested in exploring how student writers, especially those coming from English as a second/foreign language (ESL/EFL) backgrounds, structure the text to achieve its communicative purpose. These represent compelling reasons for conducting the analysis of this chapter.

In this thesis, the analysis of the introductory chapter of two dissertations makes use of the framework developed initially by Swales (1990), modified by Bunton, and adapted by Hood (2006). With the exception of Hood (2006), there is no evident SFL investigation of the introductory chapter. This means the research has not been concerned with the instantiation of the system (in this case the frameworks used in the current thesis) to explore the realisation of this genre. This becomes one important encouragement to include the chapter containing the analysis in this thesis, in addition to its importance in the construction of argument in the dissertation.

2.2.4.2. Literature review chapter
There has been little research on a literature review (LR) chapter of any thesis/dissertation. This chapter (LR) is often considered as a part of the introductory genre (e.g. Bunton, 2002; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007; Swales, 1990). For example, Paltridge and Starfield (2007) consider the LR as a part of background chapters (p. 99-113) together with the theoretical framework chapter. However, the LR chapter commonly stands independently especially in lengthy academic texts (Kwan, 2006), such as in a thesis or dissertation. The main purpose of the LR chapter is to contextualise the
student’s research (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007, p. 99); that is, to justify the significance of the research and show what makes the research exceptional amongst other examples being reviewed in the literature (Creswell, 2003). It should describe, summarise, evaluate, clarify and/or integrate the content of primary reports (Cooper, 1988).

Developing the LR is considered a difficult task in thesis/dissertation writing (Shaw, 1991); LR is often assumed as being a “boring but necessary” chore (Swales & Feak, 2000). Yet the work that student writers have to accomplish is very demanding. In writing their LR, student writers ‘are expected not just to know the literature on their topic, but also to critically evaluate it’ (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007, p. 113). Moreover, the LR performs two functions in student writers’ learning. In addition to be a vehicle for learning about the topic, the LR requires students to construct an argument for their research (Hart, 1998, 2001). Hart further explains the importance of doing the LR in one’s study, as for:

- identifying work already done...that is relevant to [the students] own work;
- preventing...duplicating what has been done already;
- helping [the student] to avoid [flaws] in previous studies;
- informing the student’s own [research design];
- enabling [the student] to locate a gap in existing research and thereby giving [the student] a unique topic (Kwan, 2006, p. 32)

This concept of the structure of the LR is taken from the development of the CARS model. There have been several studies on the way the LR is constructed (e.g. Cooper, 1988; Kwan, 2006). Cooper (1988) offers a straightforward organisation of the LR consisting of Introduction ^ Body ^ Conclusion. In this structure, the Introduction commonly initiates the discussion by presenting the metastructure of the LR and the questions the research seeks to address. In the Body, Cooper offers three ways of organising the review: chronologically – to highlight trends; thematically – to identify the scope and themes of groups of studies, and methodologically – to identify the types
of research methods used. The Conclusion may include a critique stating flaws and gaps in the literature to justify the author’s own work. Kwan (2006) employs the Swales’ CARS model; yet, her structure represents the same basic structure as Cooper’s model. The model of literature review section/chapter developed by Kwan (2006) will be utilised in the analysis of the LR of the analysed dissertations reported on in this thesis. So far, this model/framework is considered a suitable model for the analysis of the chapter. In LR chapter, as with the Introduction chapter, it seems likely that there are instances of negotiation between the writer and others in the literature. This gives good reason for including it in the analysis of this thesis, especially in the analysis of genre and of evaluative language.

2.2.4.3. Methodology chapter

Research on the methodology chapter has been limited. One of the reasons might be that ‘the Methods or Methodology chapter … is no longer mandatory, with writers having greater choice as to layout and formats, more specifically in regard to qualitative research’ (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007, p. 114). There have been some studies that do not mention the chapter; yet, the explanation of the way the research is accomplished is implicit in another section or chapter. The key functions of this chapter are to allow other researchers to conduct similar studies by replicating the methodology used in the study (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007) and to make the procedures of the research described in the thesis explicit to the readers. The following overview of the methodology genre is offered by Paltridge and Starfield (2007).
Figure 2.1 Typical components of a Methodology chapter (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007, p. 123)

Typical parts of this chapter include the justification of the methodology employed and the description of the methods of the data management in the study. The above figure is utilised in this thesis to analyse the two student dissertations.

2.2.4.4. Results/Findings

Studies on the results/findings section/chapter have dealt with structuring the presentation of the chapter (Brett, 1994; Bruce, 2009; Posteguillo, 1999; Ruiying & Allison, 2003). Brett’s (1994) study set out to ‘present a provisional, pedagogically usable description of the communicative categories or ‘moves’’ found in the Results sections. His study analyses 20 research articles from the discipline of sociology. The study reveals that as this largest section in the articles includes tables, graphs and figures that are used to accomplish ‘a wide variety of communicative intentions. It also uncovers a range of patterning of those intentions that are possible and acceptable to the
discourse community’ (p. 50). However, Brett’s study (1994, p. 52) then summarises the communicative purposes of the section in three major moves; those of Metatextual, Presentation, and Comment.

Employing Brett’s schematic structure, Posteguillo (1999) carried out a study in the field of computer science. His research, as a part of a project on scientific and academic English carried out at Universität Jaume I at Castello, Spain, found that ‘the IMRD pattern cannot be applied to research articles in computer science systematically’ (Dong, 1998 cited in Posteguillo, 1999, p. 139). Ruiying and Allison (2004) are interested in the rhetorical realisation of two sections in research articles: result and discussion/conclusion. As with the previous studies, their study found ‘The Results sections generally have a highly cyclic structure, and not only report results but also briefly comment on results; this appears to be a widespread practice in research articles across disciplines’ (Ruiying & Allison, 2004, p. 381). Bruce (2009), who undertook a similar study in the fields of sociology and organic chemistry, found that no clear conventionalised patterns of content organisation emerged (p.112). These findings seem to contrast with what Ruiying has previously claimed; yet this might be because Bruce analysed the research articles in terms of a social genre/cognitive genre model (Bruce, 2008) which went beyond the schematic structure of the texts. For this thesis, however, the general model proposed by Paltridge and Starfield (2007) is used to analyse the argument in the student dissertations.

2.2.4.5. Discussion chapter

The Discussion chapter denotes the second most researched chapter in general academic work (e.g. Basturkmen, 2012; Bunton, 2005; Holmes, 1997; Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988; Peacock, 2002; Ruiying & Allison, 2003; Swain, 2007; Swales & Feak, 1994).
Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988) attempted to establish a framework for a pedagogically useful description of the organisation of the discussion in research-focused articles and dissertations (p. 113). This model has become popular for those analysing this section or chapter (e.g. Bunton, 1998, 2005). The following excerpt presents a complex set of moves identified in Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988) as common to the discussion sections of articles and dissertations.

1. Background Information
2. Statement of Result (S.O.R.)
3. (Un)expected Outcome, in which the writer comments on whether the result is expected or not.
4. Reference to Previous Research (Comparison), in which the writer compares his or her result with those reported in the literature.
5. Explanation of Unsatisfactory Result, in which the writer suggests reasons for a surprising result, or one different from those in the literature.
6. Exemplification, in which the writer gives an example to support his or her explanation.
7. Deduction, in which the writer makes a claim about the generalizability of the particular results.
8. Hypothesis, in which the writer makes a more general claim arising from his experimental results.
9. Reference to Previous Research (Support), in which the writer quotes previous work to support his or her deduction or hypothesis.
10. Recommendation, in which the writer makes suggestions for future work.
11. Justification, in which the writer justifies the need for the future work recommended.

(Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988, p. 118)

Swales and Feak (1994) offer three main points that are commonly found as moves in theses and dissertations genres. These three items represent basic moves that writers employ in the discussion chapters of their academic texts. These moves offer research writers more freedom to develop the discussion chapter; yet can be problematic for novice writers. The moves consist of:

1. Points to consolidate your (one’s) research space (obligatory)
2. Points to indicate the limitations of your (one’s) study (optional but common)
3. Points to identify useful areas of further research (optional)

(Swales & Feak, 1994)
The last model employed is developed by Bunton (1998, 2005), especially for the case of the discussion chapter, and is the one used for humanities and social science theses and dissertations. Bunton’s model appears to merge those of Hopkins and Dudley-Evans’s (1988), and Swales and Feak’s (1994). With its simple yet comprehensive moves and steps, Bunton’s model proves to be easy to follow. For these reasons, this thesis utilises this particular model to explore the discussion/conclusion chapters in the analysed dissertations.

From the reviews of the studies on the chapters of theses/dissertations, it is evident that the three chapters—the introductory, the LR and the Discussion, are those employed to present the main argument and its components of the texts. This suggests that the current research need to focus the analysis on these chapters.

2.2.5. Academic English in Indonesia: The research

Research on academic writing in the Indonesian context has gained increasing attention in the last two decades. In particular, academic writing by Indonesian student writers has been of interest to a number of researchers both in and outside Indonesia. Several have studied the academic writing done by Indonesian students who come to English-speaking countries for their studies (e.g. Adnan, 2009; Mirahayuni, 2002; Safnil, 2013), and those who study English within the Indonesian EFL context (e.g. Alwasilah, 2001; Cahyono, 2000; Emilia, 2005; Emilia & Hamied, 2015). As we have seen, in academic writing practices in the English-speaking universities, two dominant schools of genre are evident. These schools of genre have also been adopted by researchers examining the practices of Indonesian student writers. The majority of the studies on academic writing by Indonesian student writers employ the ESP tradition (e.g. Adnan, 2009; Jubhari, 2009; Mirahayuni, 2002; Safnil, 2013) and analyse mostly introductory and
discussion chapters (e.g. Adnan, 2009; Mirahayuni, 2002; Safnil, 2013). With the exceptions of Emilia (2005) and Emilia and Hamied (2015), there is little evidence of studies examining student texts employing Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). This thesis is different from that of Emilia who took an action research approach ‘program evaluation’ (Emilia, 2005, p. iv). This thesis is a linguistic analysis of undergraduate dissertations aimed at describing the texts and arguing for a more explicit teaching of the genre of the dissertation and its linguistic features. While Emilia was interested in the process of text development through a critical genre-based approach when she taught academic English writing in a university at West Java, Indonesia; this thesis examines the dissertation as a form of the realisation of communication and negotiation of meanings in a longer text.

The ESP tradition is the most well-known approach for Indonesian researchers of academic writing. Alwasilah (2001) studied two groups of language learners at a university at West Java. Surveying 116 students (two groups of 54 and 62 students taking his Writing I subject), he found several practices that could be applied in the Indonesian context, such as (1) the benefit of writing in Indonesian before transferring into English; (2) sustainable awareness of these mechanics and spelling in writing; (3) the as writing presupposes reading, both need to be integrated; (4) the importance of teachers’ comments. Based on the findings he then proposed that (1) ‘College writing should empower the students’; (2) ‘Ownership suggests empowerment and recognition’; (3) ‘Self-correction is preferable to peer correction, and peer correction is preferable to teacher correction’; and (4) ‘It is then necessary that needs analysis be conducted before designing the course. The study, however, did not explain the ways in which students create and negotiate meanings. Further, the study appears to adopt mixed approaches,
such as the grammar translation method and writing as process, despite the claim of applying ESP.

Mirahayuni (2002) investigated the rhetorical patterns of what many Indonesian writers consider to be the most demanding parts of academic written work: the introductory and the discussion sections. She analysed three collections of the introductory sections of research articles (20 English texts written by native-English speakers, 19 Indonesian texts by Indonesian speakers, and 19 English texts by Indonesian speakers) in the field of language teaching. Based on the Swales CARS model (Swales, 1990), she found differences in the way texts are written by native English writers and Indonesian ones, especially in the ways they introduce and justify their research projects. Analysing 63 Indonesian research articles employing Swales’ CARS model, Adnan’s (2009) research interest involved the struggle of non-native speakers of English in winning over international editors. This research found similar results to that of Mirahayuni. The 63 articles analysed show that the Indonesian writers do not observe the ‘conventional’ rhetorical pattern of journal articles, particularly their obligatory steps which expect critical information, such as reviewing the literature to show the study’s innovative aspects and significance (p.120). Safnil (2013) who modified the subjects of the study from the previous studies (10 texts from engineering science, 10 from science and 10 from medical science) found similar results. This study led him to conclude that ‘[d]iscourse styles and linguistic features of English RA introductions by Indonesian speakers are different from the ones by English native speakers’ (p.1). These studies indicate that there is a need, firstly to analyse further the development of such academic texts, and secondly, to train Indonesian student writers to develop their texts in more meaningful ways. In doing so, this thesis intends to take
up the first challenge: analysing the way student writers develop the argument of academic texts, in this case the undergraduate dissertation.

There have been a number of other efforts by academics to deal with similar problems impacting on Indonesian student writers. Emilia (2005) and Emilia and Hamied (2015) investigate the effectiveness of using a critical genre-based approach teaching academic English writing to student teachers who were learning English as a foreign language in a state university, West Java, Indonesia. Her first study (Emilia, 2005) employed a qualitative research design, consisting of a case study and a program evaluation. She made use of data obtained from a questionnaire, classroom observations, and a collection of samples of students’ texts. Her detailed linguistic analysis found that despite some limitations, the teaching program was successful in many ways in the Indonesian EFL tertiary teaching context. She claimed that:

[m]ost significantly, the students’ argumentative writing skills in English improved in that they achieved enhanced control of the target argumentative genre, at greater length, with clear schematic structure and improved use of evidence and information in support of their arguments, using various linguistic resources, which also indicates their development in critical thinking and critical literacy. (p.279)

Emilia’s research suggests that there is an improvement in the academic writing practices of Indonesian academics, which leads to an improvement in the quality of the student texts. Yet, there may be some factors influencing this improvement, such as her intervention in conducting the program, as she was also the tutor for the course. In addition, as the study was undertaken at a single university, the improvement could be merely in this university. Consequently, studies from other universities or other participant groups need to be conducted.

There are more studies in academic writing, as well as in writing in general, among Indonesian researchers. These studies may employ similar approaches to the
aforementioned ones, yet they adopt a different focus in exploring the texts. Jubhari’s (2009) study focuses on the critical analysis of academic writing as a discourse practice of academic community. Her study employs a different perspective to Swales’ (1990) ‘academic discourse community’ and its role in academic writing practices. Jubhari’s study analyses the way argumentation is developed in academic writing within universities in Indonesia and Australia. It resembles this thesis as it seeks to understand those practices in the academic community shared by the two contexts: Indonesia and Australia. Yet, this thesis is different in that it offers a deeper exploration of the way argument is developed linguistically by focusing particularly on the interpersonal/evaluative language with which Indonesian student writers struggle.

One study that analyses a similar topic to this thesis – argument in academic writing, is that of Rusfandi (2015). He investigated the use of the argument-counterargument structure in English essays written by Indonesian EFL learners. This study surveys whether English proficiency influences the utilisation of opposing views in their essays and examines any correlation between the use of ‘English rhetorical structure’ (p.185) and the quality of the overall essay. Each of the forty-five student writers from an undergraduate English department of a university in Central Java were required to write two argumentative essays, one in English and the other in Indonesian using two different writing prompts. The study found:

[The majority of the students developed a one-sided model of argumentation in their L1 and L2 essays by focusing only on how to state their main claim and providing relevant justification for it. The students’ relatively low L2 proficiency was found to be one of the possible factors behind their inability to include other-side views in their essays. In addition, the participants’ use of rhetorical features affected the overall quality of their essays. (Rusfandi, 2015, p. 195)]
In spite of some similarities in the main topic of the research and the subject targeted; Rusfandi’s study is different from this thesis in some ways. The main difference is that Rusfandi’s study is not linguistic analysis; especially that it does not apply SFL theory. It is also dissimilar in the way the research was conducted (Rusfandi’s is quantitative study). Within its context the study pursues a general category, that is, the presence of ‘rhetorical features’ (p. 195); rather than adopting a more detailed approach to the ways in which arguments are developed. Moreover, though Rusfandi recommends the teaching of writing through a genre approach and a ‘dialogical process between a writer and her imagined readers’ (p. 195-196), no further suggestion that these two themes might be reconciled pedagogically was offered.

A final study relevant to this thesis is one conducted by Sanjaya Sitawati and Suciani (2015). Their study examined the ‘interpersonal’ feature of hedging, examining whether English and Indonesian research articles are significantly different. The study examines 52 research articles taken from the discipline of Applied Linguistics written in English and Indonesian by native speakers of the respective languages. The study assumed that when Indonesian scholars write in English, Indonesian scholars will deploy rhetorical features inherent in Indonesian academic writing (p. 209). Their analysis revealed that English research articles contain significantly more hedges than their Indonesian counterparts, suggesting that Indonesian scholars are indeed in need of instruction that specifically focuses on hedging propositions in English.

The present research aims to address the gap identified in this literature review. Despite the structural organisation of thesis/dissertation discussed beforehand, this present thesis offers a closer examination of language deployed - that is, interpersonal/evaluative language, which is utilised to indicate the writers’ engagement with others in
the field. This language is fundamental to the development of effective argument in academic texts, as argument is not only about the subject matter being discussed but it is also about the way to promote the discussion. The following section offers a comprehensive discussion of argument in academic writing, with a particular attention to the textual and the interpersonal linguistic resources in academic texts.

2.3 Argument in academic writing

In the higher education context, argument plays a very important role in the academic life. Argument (and the process for developing it: argumentation) is the soul of academic interactions, which are typically carried out in the form of written communication. The work of the academics is characteristically written in argumentative ways. In this sense, their texts are developed in a way that employs certain structural organisations and utilises particular lexical items for engaging with each other about the ideas negotiated. Thus, where “there is a strong underlying pedagogic intention to make the nature of the [evaluative] discourse more apparent, accessible, and available for novice academic writers” (Hood, 2004, p.2), argumentative/persuasive writing becomes the typical genre that undergraduate student writers have to write (Christie, 1997; Mei, 2006).

In the current thesis, the construct of argument signifies a broader phenomenon than that merely referring to such genre. This construct has been used in different fields to refer to different concepts, extending from the notion of premises and conclusions (Toulmin, 1958, 2003) to ‘a mode of thinking and composition’ – ‘metagenre’ (Andrews, 2005). In addition, the construct also signifies a complex field of study with many interconnected areas. Experts from different discipline describe it in different
ways suggesting by their expertise. Andrews (2005) summarises the complexity of the construct of argument, by saying:

“[i]f you dip your toe in the water of argument studies, you realize that you’re on the edge of a small sea, and that in turn the sea is connected to bigger seas of rationality—the seas you were aware of turn out to be connected to oceans: diverse in their view of the nature of rationality, diverse in their stance on the relationship between rationality, action, and feeling; and, inevitably, informing different views of argument and argumentation.”

Moreover, the notions of argument and argumentation have been differently conceptualised. These relate the ‘phenomenon’ (argument) to the process of developing it (argumentation) and have played important roles in developing academic writing (e.g. Andrews, 2005; Coffin, 2009; Coffin & O’Halloran, 2008; Veerman, Andriessen, & Kanselaar, 2002; Voss & Means, 1991). Blair (2004, p. 137) states ‘[a]n argument is a proposition and a reason for it’. Andrews (2005) makes a distinction between the two, by stating that argument refers to a mode of thinking and composition, or metagenre; and argumentation means the process of operating within that mode, that is, the way of developing the argument in question. Argumentation refers to the process of generation and evaluation of arguments (Andrews, 2005, 2009; Voss & Means, 1991). This concept is considered fundamental to the process of reasoning in the dialogue built in academic writing. Exchanges of argument in the dialogue are required in order to construct new knowledge (Coffin, 2009). The new knowledge indicates the outcome of the dialogue and is very much shaped by the dominant argument in the discourse. This new knowledge in the discipline is shaped in response to the dominant arguments in the discipline.

In the present research, the notion of argument refers to the way student writers develop and negotiate a claim or proposition in academic texts, by using evidences to support their proposition (Andrews, 2005). This thesis examines how argument is
constructed through the use of text organisation and the use of linguistic resources. Such research is important as argumentation is a form of discourse that needs to be appropriated by learners and explicitly taught through suitable instruction, task structuring, and modelling (Osborne, Erduran, & Simon 2004). In addition, the ability to construct a convincing argument is considered as one vital aspect of successful writing by most members of the academic discourse community (Lea & Street, 1998). In this sense, students are expected to demonstrate their ‘ability to display critical thinking and development of an argument within the context of the curriculum’ (Nesi & Gardner, 2006), that is, to present a point of view and defend it using supporting evidence.

Basically, the main purpose of argumentation is to persuade readers. Academic writers view readers’ perceptions and beliefs as the main targets of their writing. In doing so, writers work through various kinds of argumentation, within a text. They need to convince their readers about positions involved in making a claim and support it with evidence that the reader will find pertinent and believable. So, this implies that the writer has awareness of the reader’s beliefs about a topic. In an argumentative text, writers project their attitudes as well as their stance about the subject matter under discussion (Hood, 2006). Writers usually observe the standard conventions in use in the academic genre in question; one of which is the text structure. This relates to generic staging or structuring of an argument. However, schematic structure does not significantly influence how the goals of argumentation are achieved (Nakamura, 2009, p. 167). Conforming to the generic structure does not always lead to successful argumentation. Readers’ perception of the writer’s knowledge played a more significant role in persuasion outcomes than the knowledge they actually demonstrated (Alexander,
Thus, although this thesis examines how student writers manage generic structure of argumentation; developing a convincing argumentation is also of interest. In analysing the way that student writers develop compelling arguments in their dissertations, the language choices made by students are of central concern.

Moreover, as further developed in the subsequent section; interpersonal language plays an important role in constructing a convincing argument. Shaped by the tenor of the discourse, this language functions to enact the writer’s social relations and social identities (Fairclough, 1992) which are vital in the process of developing an argument or dialogue in academic writing. It is interpersonal meaning (language) that deals with the writers’ subjectivity as they position themselves in relation to both the subject matter they discuss, and others with whom they exchange meanings (Martin & White, 2005, p. 1). Thus, the role of interpersonal meaning in the success of argumentation is crucial. This meaning has proved a challenge for novice ESL/EFL student writers (e.g. Hood, 2004, 2006; Hyland, 2011; Lee, 2006; Nakamura, 2009). Managing interpersonal language is even problematic for student writers – English language learners, in Indonesian educational contexts as investing their personal presence in academic writing has often been discouraged in academic writing classrooms in Indonesia.

Many ESL/EFL student writers experience problems in dealing with interpersonally oriented argumentation (Bacha, 2010; Lee, 2006, 2010a; Nakamura, 2009; Swales, 1990; G. Thompson, 2001). Problems arise when they get involved in the practices of academic writing (Hood, 2004, 2006; Lee, 2006, 2010a; G. Thompson, 2001) and in test settings (Bacha, 2010; Nakamura, 2009), for instance. These problems may begin as simply as finding the accurate expression for a certain argument; and may
become as complex as finding reasoning for emerging phenomena that need scientific explanations. Developing convincing argumentation is no longer a straightforward cumulative process but is often linked to complex patterns of text organisation in which learners need to manage multiple concepts (Weinberger & Fischer, 2006, p. 75).

The field of argument in undergraduate degrees has not been much researched (Andrews, 2009). Gilbert (2005) claims that a variety of theoretical and epistemological perspectives on the notion of argument has contributed towards the development of numerous text analysis systems in contemporary argumentation research. These variations in the systems of text analysis have made the selection of an analytic model for the description and evaluation of arguments in natural language contexts a complex task for researchers. However, the systems or frameworks for conceptualising argument, and communicating its meaning, become important research tools and pedagogical devices (Simon, 2008). One major problem, as Hegelund and Kock (1999) summarise, is that many students fail to understand the genre of academic discourse – the overall purpose of the academic paper, its components, and how the components contribute to the overall purpose. Yet, to be convincing, arguments must anticipate readers’ expectations, difficulties and responses, as writers seek to balance their claims for the significance, originality, and certainty of their work against the possible convictions or confusions of their audience (Hyland, 2002c, p. 531).

In the Indonesian EFL context, undergraduate student writers struggle to develop convincing arguments. As Indonesian student writers were not well supported in developing academic writing in the past, there have been many recent efforts to train them through writing subjects (sentence-, paragraph-, and genre-based writing subjects). All have been devoted to improving students’ achievement in building sound
arguments. Each series of subjects deals in sequence with how to build well-developed arguments. However, problems still arise by the time they write their dissertations. Many issues have obstructed the progress of students’ development of argumentation skills. Students’ limited proficiency in English, their reluctance in observing the conventions and expectation of the academic discourse community, and other issues (such as the cultural aspect for avoiding arguing against others for students coming from some Asian countries (as in Lee, 2006)) have been blamed. That academic writing products, in this case dissertations, should sound argumentative (Lee, 2006) raises more problems, though ESL/EFL student writers do not seem to seriously consider it. Differences in command of language between English and Indonesian (Soedjatmiko & Widiati, 2003) have often been blamed, making this matter even worse. However, in many universities, student writers still keep on grappling to improve their argument development.

2.4 Systemic Functional Approach to Argument

This section concentrates on reviewing the three areas within SFL which are utilised to analyse argument in academic writing: recent advances in studies of text organisations (especially the Periodicity and genre) and the role of interpersonal (evaluative) language in enacting social relationship (engagement) in academic writing.

2.4.1 Text organisation: Periodicity

The textual zone, as one of the focus of this research, relates to text organisations: in this case, the organisation of meanings as unified whole arranged hierarchically (Periodicity) and the organisation of meanings to achieve its communicative purposes (genre, will be discussed in the subsequent section). In the analysis of this thesis, Periodicity framework relates to the unpackaging of the complete layers of meanings in
both analysed texts to uncover their ‘texture’ (Halliday, 1973b, 1978a, 1985b; Martin, 1992).

Theoretically, it is concerned with information flow: with the way in which meanings are packaged to make it easier for the readers to take them in. Periodicity framework links to textual metafunction which concerns with “organising clause as message” (Halliday, 2003; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). The framework relates to the way a text is considered as coherent. This coherence signifies one characteristic of written text as this type of text is “good at synoptic-type ‘product’ representations, with constituency as the organizing concept (Halliday, 2004 p.238). Halliday (2003, p.17) explains that

These are the systems which create coherent text — text that coheres within itself and with the context of situation; some of them, the thematic systems, are realized in English by the syntagmatic ordering of elements in the clause.

There have been studies in textual zone in many fields. Previous studies taking account of Periodicity include the discussions of Attitude (interpersonal language) as intrinsic aspect of the periodic or textual patterning of the discourse (Hood, 2004; 2010b); the role of Periodicity in language teaching (Piriyasilpa, 2009; 2012); how Periodicity contributes to genre analysis (Matruglio, 2014).

In the first instance, despite its focus on interpersonal/evaluative language in academic texts, Hood’s (2004) study is also concerned with the Periodicity of the texts. Her study examines the introductory section of undergraduate dissertations written in English as a second language and the introductory sections of published research papers. It explores the construction of evaluative stance in the sections to inform the academic writing practices in English. This study is primarily concerned with Attitude that becomes an intrinsic aspect of the periodic or textual patterning of the discourse
(Periodicity). Hood’s (2004) research becomes the one that motivates the current research. At least two points, that similar to the discussion in the present research: the focus of the study on the interpersonal and the textual zones of academic text and the use of two kinds of texts as the data. The main alteration of this thesis compared to Hood’s study is on the use of relatively similar level of the texts examined.

Piriyasilpa’s studies (2009; 2012) were motivated by the typical problem EFL learners experience in writing English texts. Several problems faced by the EFL learners includes among others, their literal translation from their L1 to their writing, their focus on form (especially in the sentence level) without paying attention to the discourse organisation of their texts, etc. One article (Piriyasilpa, 2009) argues on the basis of the role in language teaching that discourse organisation and grammatical structure are systematically related. In addition, the knowledge about periodicity assists EFL learners to enhance “the structure of their short texts and, subsequently, to combine and organize longer texts and thereby create text unity” (p.116). From these studies it can be argued that while the knowledge about Periodicity can improve the students’ texts; it can also be utilised to analyse them as well.

One latest study (Matruglio, 2014) confirms the utilisation of the three theories/frameworks for the analyses in the present thesis. Examining texts “written by final year students under examination conditions and were produced for half-yearly or Trial HSC examinations” (p.62), Matruglio is interested in the way “students are required to engage with knowledge through writing in senior secondary humanities subjects” (p.15). Her research is underpinned by the SFL, particularly the theory of genre and of Appraisal (p.17). In addition, Periodicity is also used in the analysis. In the first instance, the first interest in her study is concerned with Periodicity framework for
analysing texts that relates to the analysis of genre. It is found that Periodicity analysis “not only contributes to and helps confirm the analysis of genre but also provides a more detailed analysis of the register variables of field and mode as a context for the closer exploration of tenor” (Matruglio, 2014, p. 78). Thus, this finding supports the way the present research in analysing the two dissertations in the way as it is (as will be further explain in chapter four). Moreover, in relation with the students’ Engagement in the text it found that,

“ENGAGEMENT represented a particular challenge for students, with many disjunctive moments identified in texts across subjects. The disjunctions and lack of consistency involving the use of ENGAGEMENT were suggested as evidence of students’ difficulty in managing alignment and disalignment with significant voices in the field” (Matruglio, 2014, p. 248).

In the present research, this Periodicity framework is utilised to unpackage the two analysed texts to easily assess their meanings in any level of realisation. In doing so, this section reviews previous studies that employed this framework, especially in the field of written academic discourse.

2.4.2. The notion of genre

The concept of genre has raised interesting discussions in academic contexts. The term has been defined variously depending on the researcher’s focus and their theoretical orientations. Genre is considered as a communicative vehicle for achieving goals (Swales, 1990). Swales’ view echoes that of Martin (1985) who describes genre as ‘how things get done, when language is used to accomplish them’. Theories of genre have developed in different directions in three major academic traditions (Hyon, 1996). Differing in their theoretical underpinnings, the three schools—English for specific purposes (ESP) (e.g. Bhatia, 1997a, 1997b, 2008; Dudley-Evans, 1997; J. Flowerdew, 1993, 1999, 2001; Swales, 1990, 2004), North American New Rhetoric studies (e.g.
Bazerman, 1988, 1994; Freedman, 1993, 1999; Freedman & Adam, 1996), and Australian Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) (e.g. Christie, 1991a, 1991b; Christie & Martin, 1997; Martin, 1992, 2006, 2009; Martin & Rose, 2008; Martin, Zappavigna, & Dwyer, 2007; Rose, 2006)—expand genre theories in different directions. However, common to those theories of genre was the notion of staging communication with the view to achieve a social purpose. For many scholars, especially those from the theoretical perspectives of ESP and SFL, genres have an important impact on pedagogic practices in academic language and literacy programs internationally, generating text-based teaching resources, and generally encouraging attention to language from a social perspective (Hood, 2010a). Dudley-Evans (1997, p. 357) argues that an important role for genre analysis is the analysis of how genres differ from culture to culture.

Each of the aforementioned traditions, however, promotes the concept of genre distinctively. In doing so, each tradition sets distinguishing goals, views the context of its application idiosyncratically, and develops characteristic frameworks for what is considered genre pedagogy (for more on comparisons of genre theories see, for example, Freedman and Medway (1994a), Martin, Christie and Rothery (2010). In ESP traditions, proponents consider genre as a tool and technique for analysing and teaching English in educational and professional settings (e.g. Bhatia, 1997b, 2008; J. Flowerdew, 1993). In this sense, genres are communicative events characterised by communicative purposes and various patterns of structure, style, content and intended audience (Swales, 1990). However, this school of genre seems to pay more attention to the detailed formal characteristics of genre at the expense of the negotiation of meanings the writers intend to convey. In the North American New Rhetoric tradition, genre refers to ways of recognising, responding to, acting meaningfully and
consequentially within, and helping to reproduce recurrent situations (Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010, p. 3). Yet some scholars believe that genre pedagogy has not provided firm guidance on what constitutes a genre (Miller, 1984, p. 151). In contrast, the Australian Systemic Functional Linguistics School of genre (or simply the Sydney School) represents collaboration between educationalists and systemic functional linguists. Developments in genre theory closely shadow those in systemic functional linguistics (SFL) generally (e.g. Halliday, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Martin & Rose, 2007, 2008; Matthiessen & Halliday, 1997). The Sydney School’s version of genre theory applies SFL concepts in the educational sectors. Martin (e.g. in Martin, 1992, 2009; Martin et al., 2010) defines genre as ‘staged, goal oriented social process’. He explains that it is ‘social’ as genre is used among members of a culture interactively; ‘goal oriented’ as genres unfold to get things done; and ‘staged’ as it usually takes more than one step for participants to achieve their goals.

The field of EAP accommodates differences in genre theories by compiling the values from each tradition and thus offering a more complete picture than previous approaches, such as the ‘process’ approach, have proposed (Horowitz, 1986; Hyland, 2003). Genre-based pedagogies offer structure and shape students’ writing by providing obvious and organised accounts of how language functions in social context (Hyland, 2003, p. 18). In this way the concepts of argument and genre relate to each other and become the characteristic features of academic writing. ‘Arguments have to be made in ways that readers and most acceptable and convincing …’ (Hyland, 2001b, p. 209). Within SFL theory, convincing argument should employ an engaging language that simultaneously construes ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings (Halliday, 1985a, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, 2014; Martin, 1992; Matthiessen &
Halliday, 1997). In this thesis, the concept of genre is very important in the way it provides tools for analysing the dissertations. As with the work of Hood (2004) and Sheldon (2013), this research drawn on the work on genre by researchers from the ESP tradition and Sydney school of genre. The ESP tradition provides ways to analyse the dissertations via what it terms as the ‘moves’ and ‘steps’ of the genres (roughly interpretable as the ‘stages’ and ‘phases’ of the Sydney school’s perspective).

Moreover, this research is mainly concerned with interpersonal meanings and SFL provides a comprehensive toolset to explore in detail the roles of interpersonal meaning in academic writing.

**Macrogenres**

The concept of macrogenre is significant in the development and analysis of lengthy academic texts. This concept refers to ‘larger texts’ that are ‘made up of short genres’ (Martin & Rose, 2008). In fact, the research on social activities that consist of multiple genres, macrogenres, remains a relatively unexplored area in the linguistic sciences (Muntigl, 2006, p. 233). Thus, more research into texts comprising more than one genre, termed as ‘macrogenres’, is necessary, as most lengthy academic texts comprise multiple embedded genres. Particularly in relation to this thesis, the discussion of the embedded genres within dissertations or theses has focused on considering each chapter as a complete genre. For instance, in this thesis each dissertation is analysed for the chapters it has, considering them as the embedded genres. In organising academic texts, studies show that there are some models of their development. The most common model used in undergraduate dissertations is the traditional ‘IMRAD type’ (introduction – (literature review) – methods – results – and – discussion) (e.g. Bunton, 1998; Dong,
1998; Paltridge, 2004; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007), which provides a path to analysis by treating each chapter as a genre.

2.4.3. Interpersonal Orientation to Argument

Interpersonal or evaluative language in academic writing represents a wide-ranging field of study. As an important characteristic of a convincing argument, this language is generally used in an academic context to represent the writer’s engagement with, and evaluation of, the topic discussed, the literature, and other writers (Martin & White, 2005). This is the area that has developed research in academic contexts through such constructs as ‘hedges’ (Hyland, 1994), ‘directives’ (Hyland, 2002b), ‘interactive aspect’ (G. Thompson, 2001), ‘evaluation’ (Hunston & Thompson, 2000), and ‘stance’ (Biber & Finegan, 1988, 1989).

A number of studies have explored the importance of interpersonal language in academic texts crafted by university students from the two schools of genre discussed above (e.g. Hood, 2004, 2006; Hyland, 2000b, 2005a, 2005b; G. Thompson, 2001). Most studies in the area have been conducted on texts produced by English language learners. Within ESP traditions, the research discusses such concerns as ‘hedges, boosters and lexical invisibility’ (e.g. Hinkel, 1997; Hyland, 1996; Lewin, 2005; Peterlin, 2010; Silver, 2003). Within the SFL School of genre, some studies have explored the negotiation of the writer’s position by employing Appraisal theory (e.g. Chatterjee, 2007; Derewianka, 2007; Nakamura, 2009; Padmanabhan, 2011). Of interest is comparing achievement in English language skills compared to those of published writers (e.g. Hood, 2004) or to those of native English-born speakers/writers (Lee, 2006). In addition, some researchers from different schools of genre have collaborated on single studies (Hood, 2006; Sheldon, 2013). However, none of the studies mentioned
above has examined a complete lengthy academic text such as dissertation or thesis fully.

The dominant themes in the literature in relation to the notion of interpersonal meaning in academic arguments can be categorised into three main interrelated areas. Firstly, linguistically the principal discussion deals with how interpersonal meaning shapes the development of ‘prosody’ throughout the academic texts (e.g. Chang & Schleppegrell, 2011; Hood, 2004, 2006; Lemke, 1998). These studies are concerned with how interpersonal meanings spread across stages of the academic texts creating the flow of the discourse (Hood, 2006, p. 37). Secondly, looking at the functions of the interpersonal resources in academic writing, researchers have been interested in finding out how student writers work interpersonally in ‘managing social relationships and establishing authorial identity’ (e.g. Derewianka, 2007; Hyland, 2001a, p. 549; 2010, p. 125; G. Thompson, 2001, p. 58). Lastly, also of interest are topics examining the ways in which student writers gain control of written academic registers by maintaining ‘objectivity’ and critique in their texts (Hood, 2010a, p. 2).

In dealing with the development of argument, writers’ objectivity and technique of critique (Hood, 2010a, p. 2) play an important role in engaging with putative readers. Student writers need to demonstrate their skills and knowledge to engage with members of the academic discourse community while establishing differences and making/creating a space for their own research. In doing so, as there have been others already researching in similar fields, they need to objectively regard or critique previous studies properly. This is the moment where student writers employ interpersonal language resources while dealing with the topic they discuss and the readers. They need to show awareness of the audience in their argument structure and to make interpersonal
choices (Lee, 2006, 2010a, 2010b; Nakamura, 2009), which enable them to enter into
dialogic or inter-subjective engagement with the readers.

In SFL literature, there has been a strong demand to move the discussion of
interpersonal meaning from the areas of mood and modality towards a broader scope
beyond the clause, to the discourse semantics level (Hood, 2010a; Martin, 1992; Martin
& White, 2005). It is imperative to emphasise the importance of various aspects of
discourse organisation in shaping interpersonal meaning (e.g. Hood, 2010a, p. 22;
Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 74; Martin & White, 2005, p. 9). Discussions at the level of
discourse semantics enables us to go beyond the grammar of clause as an instantiation
to the system of meaning where the clause is only representation of it. This is how
meaning (system) is realized in the text (instance) (Halliday, 1994).

However, ESL/EFL students sometimes do not realise the demands they have to
meet in engaging with the academic discourse community. The community requires
novice writers to develop advanced academic texts. These texts have to display not only
discussions on subject matters, but also accomplish writer-reader engagement. What
they ‘need to know’ in order to succeed in the production of these texts is not, however,
always clear (Lillis, 1997; Lillis & Turner, 2001; Paltridge, 2004). On the other hand,
students themselves may still struggle with the language that makes academic writing a
difficulty for them. In their survey, Casanave and Hubbard (1992, p. 38) found that
graduate students coming from ESL/EFL backgrounds, often have difficulty in meeting
the demands of the kind of writing required of them at this particular level.

Whilst there is a growing body of literature about the role of interpersonal
meaning in academic texts, few studies have examined how stance spreads across the
body of lengthy texts. This evaluative stance is developed through the interaction of
ideational and interpersonal meanings (Hood, 2004, 2010a), while writers display the subject matter in their text. Building on previous research, this thesis will focus on a highly graded dissertation produced by one Indonesian student writing in English in an EFL educational context. It particularly focuses on the way student writers strive to develop interpersonally oriented argument throughout their dissertations to construct engagement with others while establishing their academic authority. This present study is motivated by earlier studies conducted by experts from different backgrounds that have informed the practice of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) programs for supporting ESL/EFL student writers especially.

2.4.4. The role of interpersonal meaning in academic writing

Interpersonal meaning is fundamental in developing sound argument in academic writing. Interpersonal meaning/language is critical in enabling writers to develop a stance towards the proposition being negotiated with regard to previous studies and those with whom they communicate – the putative readers (Martin & White, 2005). Also, interpersonal language choices are the means through which the writer enacts a presence in the text and engages with the audience. Interpersonal meanings unfold across a whole text (Halliday, 1994) rather than as bundles of clauses. In this way, they are said to build prosodically. The following paragraphs try to explore the concepts mentioned above: stance, writer’s presence and engagement, and prosody.

Stance is very crucial in academic writing. Stance refers to the standpoint or position a writer adopts toward the topic under investigation and towards others who also have knowledge about the topic (‘the literature’) (Martin & White, 2005, p. 1). A writer needs to take a stance in relation to a number of specific and generalised phenomena (Hood, 2010a, p. 2), such as persuading readers that there is a new case in
their study, and that their study will make a significant contribution to existing knowledge. A writer employs interpersonal resources in stance-taking to construct the arguments in the text. Moreover, discussions of stance in academic writing relate to the writers’ subjective and/or inter-subjective presence, and their engagement with others in their texts as ‘they adopt stances towards both the material they present and those with whom they communicate’ (Martin & White, 2005, p. 1). This thesis examines the stance taken by writers writing in different educational contexts. Both writers do take a stance and negotiate meanings, however, the differences in educational contexts impact on the way the writers accomplish this.

Writers’ presence and engagement with others in an academic text have played a significant role in the development of successful arguments. The two concepts are related closely to the main function of interpersonal meaning in academic writing. This negotiation results in the manner in which a writer is able to construct an authorial presence while he/she manages the social relationship with others in his/her texts (e.g. Derewianka, 2007, p. 142; Hyland, 2001a, p. 549; 2010, p. 125; G. Thompson, 2001, p. 58). The writer’s presence is concerned with the way writers establish and maintain their ‘subjectivity’ (Ivanič, 1998, p. 307) in developing their texts. It is how a writer portrays herself academically as she takes a stance. In so doing, she needs to be objective with the phenomena she discusses and at the same time he needs to critique others (Hood, 2004). Moreover, the latter issue is associated with ‘inter-subjective positioning’ (engagement): how writers take up linguistic resources for developing their texts in coping with ‘the various alternative social positions that shape the meanings texts share’ (White, 1998, p.13). In the context of the current study, the impact of the
interpersonal elements that signal the writers’ presence in their dissertations becomes a focus as it represents the main struggle ESL/EFL student writer commonly face.

The main reason for conducting the present research on two complete dissertations as whole texts relates to the prosodic nature of interpersonal meaning choices. The research provides a way to understand the flow of the discourse (the prosody of the text) that is crucial for developing sound argument. Prosody refers to how interpersonal meanings spread across phases of discourse, continuously ‘amplifying attitude wherever the potential for expressing attitudinal meaning is made available’ (Halliday, 1994; Hood, 2006, p. 37; Martin, 1992, p. 11). That is, it can inform us how evaluative stance is developed in academic texts (Hood, 2006, p. 38).

The current research relies on previous studies done in the field dealing with the roles of interpersonal language in academic writing. The analysis that will be applied follows examples used in the field as well as, but not limited to, those of mass media, which are facilitated by the system of Appraisal (e.g. Derewianka, 2007; Hood, 2004, 2006; Lee, 2006, 2007, 2008; Martin, 2004; White, 1998, 2003, 2006). From the SFL perspective, interpersonal language relates to negotiation of meaning that denotes the notion of ‘engagement’. It is ‘an alignment dimension’—with ‘resources … [that] position the writer with respect to the value position being advanced and with respect to potential responses to that value position’ (Hyland, 2005b, p. 176; Martin & White, 2005, p. 36; White, 1998; 2003, p. 259; 2006, p. 2).

2.4.5. Authorial presence and engagement in academic writing

Every utterance is not neutral; it is always ‘stanced or attitudinal’ (Martin & White, 2005, p. 92). It acts in response to the previously mentioned utterances and anticipates the response of the reader. In this case, engagement denotes the notion of ‘dialogue’
(Volosinov, 1973). This notion generally adopts a belief that all verbal communication, spoken or written, is dialogic (Volosinov, 1973, p. 95). Volosinov argues that every text makes its social meaning against the background of other texts, and the discourse of other occasions – in Lemke’s term (1992, p. 257), it is ‘intertextuality’. In the context of this thesis, intertextuality correlates to the ways student writers engage with others in negotiating ‘complex political relationships’ (Starfield, 2002, p. 121) and constructing authorial presence in developing the argument in their dissertations. The field is interesting as it has been underexplored (Derewianka, 2007; Starfield, 2002).

In presenting others’ ideas in academic texts, a writer must arrange them in a certain way that develops a suitably convincing argumentation. This argument is the new growth of knowledge that is never simply ‘matter of fact’. ‘Knowledge claims come in the form of arguments, and arguments have to be convincing if they are to elicit attention and support’ (Silver, 2003, p. 362). This is how engagement works in shaping arguments. In engaging with others in the text, the writer needs to be objective and critical. As discussed earlier, both are relevant in gaining control of written academic registers (Hood, 2010a, p. 2). This works in two ways: in reading, referring, citing and evaluating others’ texts as well as in presenting their interpretations, and guiding readers within the texts they write. Accordingly, student writers may agree with, or critique, what others have developed, and must predict and/or anticipate the possible responses and reactions their readers may exhibit in relation to what they present in the propositions in their theses (Lemke, 1992; Martin & White, 2005; White, 1998, 2003). By so doing, student writers have to negotiate a certain stance toward both sides: to the sources and other knowers, as well as to their intended readers. This discourse practice leads to ‘discoursal construction of writer identities’ (Ivanič, 1994, p. 3) and develops
voice as self-representation (Ivanič & Camps, 2001, p. 3) as the writers negotiate the argument in the dissertation.

2.5 Conclusion

This review of the literature reveals that differences in cultural and educational contexts in which students write influence the academic text each student develops. Thus, it is assumed that there are differences in the way the dissertations are developed by the Australian and the Indonesian student writers. In addition, studies on the academic writing especially those written by L2 student writers suggest wider discussions on other topics than examining the schematic structure of the texts. It is found that this structure does not significantly influence how the goals of argument are achieved. This justifies the employment of Periodicity framework to analyse the lengthy text targeted in the present research. This framework has the potential to reveal the texture of the dissertations. Moreover, research on argument construction (argumentation) in lengthy academic texts recommends an exploration of larger area than the linguistic analyses of argumentative/persuasive genre. Research on a range of other genres employed in these texts, such as those employed for recounting past studies in the literature, justifying the suitable theoretical framework to use, presenting and organising the results of the analysis, or offering suggestions in the discussion, are needed as those genres require ‘reasoning’ of the writer. In this case, analysing arguments across the chapters of the dissertations is needed to see the macro argument of each dissertation. In addition, more comprehensive analyses of other aspects of linguistics—such as those realising the writers’ negotiation of meaning, are needed to consider as they may reveal more complete results on how argument is compellingly developed. Moreover, studies on the ways academic texts are developed through certain patterns of periodicity which realise
the writer strategy in constructing arguments (such as Hood, 2010a) reveal that the patterns represent the writers’ strategies in their argumentation. These strategies imply the employment of interpersonal language that realises the writers’ negotiation with others in the literature.
Chapter 3 Theoretical Framework

3.1. Introduction

This chapter positions this thesis within its underpinning theories. As stated previously, this research is interested in examining the quality of argument in lengthy academic texts: the undergraduate dissertations. This quality of argument is pursued through the textual and the interpersonal linguistic resources utilised in the analysed texts. Underpinned by the Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) theory, the thesis assesses the meaning organisation through (1) the textual zone, that is, how each text is organised as a unified whole, and how each text stages meanings to achieve communicative purposes, and (2) the interpersonal zone focusing on how the writers’ engagement with others in the literature is enacted in each text. In addition, in exploring the argument layout in each dissertation, a model of argument layout by Toulmin (1958, 2003) is considered.

The present chapter is organised into two main parts. The first part begins by detailing the Toulmin’s model of the layout of argument. It justifies the utilisation of this model in the present research and explains the layout of argument and its application. In the second part, it details the SFL as the underpinning theory for the linguistic analyses. It discusses the reasons of the choice of SFL and, details and clarifies the exploration of the three tools for texts analysis that are cooperating: Periodicity, genre, and Appraisalal frameworks.
3.2. The Layout of Argument: Toulmin’s model of Argument

Several crucial reasons promote the utilisation of the Toulmin (1958; 2003) model of argument in this thesis. The main reason for adopting this model of argument in the present thesis is that it has the potential to reveal the argument built up in each dissertation. This model is utilised in the present research as a tool to seek how each dissertation fulfils and organises the components of argument and how the components relate to each other in the development of effective argument. In addition, the model has also been extensively employed for describing the development of arguments in academic English (e.g. Erduran, Simon & Osborne, 2004; Gilbert, 2004, 2005; Hegelund and Kock, 1999; Lunsford, 2002; Simon, 2008; Wingate, 2012).

There have been studies utilising the Toulmin model of argument in evaluating academic texts. Firstly, Hegelund and Kock (1999) propose the application of the Toulmin’s model of argument as structural guideline in academic writing, and claim “students’ problems with genre and task definition in the writing of academic papers may be significantly reduced if we adapt the Toulmin model to explain the genre requirements of the academic paper.” Using a summer composition program for high school students, Lunsford (2002) problematises the notion of context in work deriving from Toulmin, and claims that it is a complex, multifaceted phenomenon. She summarises that the model is attractive because it provides a framework within which students and teachers from different fields and disciplines can compare and contrast their argumentative practices; yet, it only achieves full application when it is grounded in particular contexts. Gilbert (2005) adapts a modified model of Toulmin’s argument to conduct both a macrostructural and microstructural analysis of written argument in the coursework essays of L1 and L2 students. Wingate (2012) further argues that there is a
need to teach argumentation explicitly to students. She specifies that “the teaching of writing should have the development of argument as its starting and central point” (p.153). From the studies mentioned, with careful application the model of layout of argument is useful for analysing the arguments the student writers developed in their dissertation.

The Toulmin’s model of argument (or, Toulmin’s Argument Pattern (TAP)) is originally developed in 1958 and is further updated in 2003. One interesting update of the model is that it has been adapted by communication theorists, discourse analysts, and lecturers/teachers (Andrews, 2005). TAP illustrates an interconnection between argument components that facilitates a conceptualisation of the meaning of argument (Simon, 2008, p. 278). Hegelund and Kock (1999), and Blair (2004) suggest that Toulmin’s (2003, pp. 87 - 100) model of the “layout of argument” may contribute to addressing ‘students’ problems with genre and task definition in the writing of academic papers’. The Toulmin’s model of argument is represented by the following figure:

![Figure 3.1 The Toulmin’s model of Argument (Toulmin, 2003, p. 97)](image)

As shown in the figure above, the layout of argument consists of six components in which the “claim” is the goal of the argumentation. The claim is “conclusion whose merits we are seeking to establish” (Toulmin, 2003, p. 90). In a typical academic paper,
the claim is commonly located in the conclusion. Hegelund and Kock (1999) argue “a
good paper does make a claim”. To make a claim we have to have the “data”, or “the
facts we appeal to as a foundation for the claim” (Toulmin, 2003, p. 90). Data establish
the body of the paper, which according to Hegelund and Kock (1999), consist of three
kinds: (1) Theoretical data, i.e. theories, concepts, definitions derived from authorities,
or current paradigms; (2) Specific data, drawn from studies by others; and (3) Specific
data, drawn from one's own study. The next component is the “warrant”, “correspond to
the practical standards or canons of argument” (Toulmin, 2003, p. 91), or “means by
which the claims are related to the grounds” (Andrews, 2005). One component which is
related to warrant is the “backing”. This backing is “justification for the warrant within
disciplinary or other contexts” (Andrews, 2005). On the other words, the "backing"
should “contain something about how we are justified in interpreting our data in support
of our claim” (Hegelund and Kock, 1999). The “rebuttal” indicates “circumstances in
which the general authority of the warrant would have to be set aside” (Toulmin, 2003,
p.94). Andrews (2005) further explain that “a rebuttal might be included to challenge
the relationship between the grounds and the claim, either helping to reinforce the
relationship or challenging it to change (and, for example, be qualified).” The last
component is the “qualifier” that mediates between the claim and the grounds (data),
“so that ‘in certain circumstances’ or ‘under certain conditions’, the relationship
between the claim and its grounds can be adjusted” (Andrews, 2005). These all
components simultaneously operate to construct an effective argument.

In conclusion, the Toulmin model of argument (or TAP) has valuable
applications in academic writing. As used to define the quality of argument, TAP shows
the way a convincing argument is developed, in which convincing claim is the main
point of the argument. All other components are employed to support the claim. This model can be adapted ‘to explain the genre requirements of the academic paper’ (Hegelund & Kock, 1999) that in turn, it can be used to train student writers develop academic papers with convincing argument. On the other hand, this model can also be used to analyse academic papers. In this case, the model is used to explore whether academic texts develop their arguments completely and convincingly. For the explication of the components of this model and the way they work together, see Toulmin (2003, pp. 87 - 100).

3.3. Systemic Functional Linguistics as a Theoretical Framework

This thesis is underpinned by SFL theory for several critical reasons. The primary reason to adopt the SFL model of language is that in theorising the complexity of language or linguistic phenomena, SFL offers a rich description of language as a resource for making and exchanging meaning in social situations (Halliday, 1978a, 1994; Halliday & Hasan, 1985; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Martin, 1992; J. Webster, 2009). Besides its orientation to the social aspect of linguistic practices, it also offers rich insights into the role language plays in expressing, maintaining, and transmitting the social system (Halliday, 1985b, p. 185) in various domains of the context of culture. Almost all of human activities involve language, so that ‘we are constantly required to react to and produce bits of language that make sense’ (Eggins, 2004, p. 1), that is, to negotiate meanings to develop ‘texts’. In SFL, ‘text’ refers to ‘language functioning in context’ (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014); that is, ‘any instance of language, in any medium, that makes sense to someone who knows the language’ (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). More importantly, SFL seeks to develop both a theory about language as social process and an analytical
methodology which permits the detailed and systematic description of language patterns (Eggins, 2004, p. 21). Thus, SFL theory offers a coherent approach which informs the interpretation of the analytical work as well as the principled framework for examining texts.

Particularly, in the context of the present research, SFL suggests considering undergraduate dissertations as instantiations of an academic genre (system) (Halliday, 1991). The analysed dissertations (the instances) should be positioned within the broader ‘system’ of academic genres for authors to develop and examiners/researches to analyse. As part of the system, these genres provide ‘meaning potential’ (Halliday, 1973a, p. 29); the contexts for the instances, the dissertations. This intricate relationship exemplifies Halliday’s conception of language as a ‘social semiotic’ in which meaning-making is the ‘acting out’ of different social contexts (Bartlett & Honglin, 2012, p. 3). Halliday (1996, p. 4) describes, ‘[a] semiotic system [a]s meaning potential together with its instantiation in acts of meaning’.

Unlike the cognitively-based, or formalist, linguistics which regards language as a ‘system of rules’ (Chomsky, 1969, p. v), SFL considers language as a resource for making meaning. It focuses on the linguistic aspects of language at work in society, that is, how language acts out the contexts of its uses. For formalist linguistics, language plays out as a ‘complex system with many and varied inter-connections between its parts’ (Chomsky, 1957, p. 60). In this case, ‘grammar’ provides ‘a description of the ideal speaker-hearer’s intrinsic competence’ (Chomsky, 1969, p. 4) which is different from the speaker’s actual use of language, or ‘performance’. Alternatively, sociolinguists (e.g. Wardhaugh, 1992, p. 1) discuss the relationship between language and society from anthropological and sociological dimensions and define a language as
‘what the members of a particular society speak’. However, still under the shadow of Chomsky’s linguistics, knowledge of language is defined as ‘a knowledge of rules and principles and of the ways of saying and doing things with sounds, words, and sentences’ (Wardhaugh, 1992, p. 2). In contrast, in Hallidayan linguistics, grammar is not a separate entity from meaning, in the sense that ‘the overall meaning potential of a language is organized by the grammar on functional lines’ (Halliday, 2003, p. 18). The patterns of language use depend on and simultaneously construe the situational contexts (e.g. Halliday & Hasan, 1985). Thus, meaning – ‘semantic’ (Halliday, 1994) or ‘discourse semantics’ (Martin, 1992)) is realised by wording (lexico-grammar) that in turn is realised by sound/writing (phonology/graphology).

In the case of the present research, texts produced by language learners are analysed to examine how a number of factors, primarily social, influence their production of linguistic realisations. The texts (in this case, the physical task of producing the written dissertations) are the graphologies that have to be analysed to see the meanings negotiated, through the lens of lexico-grammar. Thus, SFL is an appropriate theoretical framework to underpin this thesis. In summary, SFL provides a powerful framework for describing and explaining linguistic practice. The current study makes use of SFL as it offers “complementary lenses for interpreting language in use” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 7) to identify the choices available to the student-writers. It provides “a comprehensive map” (Martin, 2000a; Martin & White, 2005) to identify and analyse the wording of meanings the student-writers construct in their texts. As SFL offers a “rich conception of language as a meaning making system, involving phonology/graphology, lexico-grammar, and discourse semantics” (Martin, 2009, p. 11), it will enable rich description of the linguistic realisations of arguments negotiated.
in texts. In the present research, each individual dissertation is considered as a text that realises the negotiation of meanings through choices in patterning of choice at the levels of text, clause and phrase or group. These dissertations are developed as instantiations of a specific genre. The development of the texts, and each of its stages and phases, involves development of arguments. These represent the units of the analysis in this study.

3.4. Perspectives from Systemic Functional Linguistics

Two central tenets of SFL underpin the present research. They are “its focus on grammar (language, my addition) as a meaning-making resource” and “its focus on text as semantic choice in social context” (Martin, 2009, p. 11). In the first foundation (in the system level, my addition), unlike more traditional/formalist approaches (e.g. Chomsky, 1957, 1969; Palmer, 2000), SFL views language as a semiotic system, a system for meaning making. This means that language is that “by which meaning is created and meanings are exchanged” (Halliday, 2003, p. 2). It deals with what writers (which may also apply for speakers in the subsequent discussions) “might and tend to do” (Martin, 1992, p. 3) in negotiating their experiences with linguistic choices available to them. It is how writers construe experiences and relationships and realise them in text through lexicogrammatical resources so that the meanings (the experiences construed) become accessible to others. Accordingly, readers access the negotiated meanings through the clauses in the written texts. Here, how they achieve a level of meaning depends upon several factors, including how they consider the texts, their level of language development, and how culture shapes their perceptions of the texts (Martin, 1997a) – their “reading position” (Martin, 1995a). In the second foundation (at the instant level, my addition), texts are social processes and need to be analysed within the
(social) cultural context as manifestations of the culture they construct (e.g. Martin, 1992, p. 493; 1997a, pp. 8-9), and thus have some identifiable rhetorical function with reference to that context (Halliday, 1981, p. 226). Correspondingly, the analysis of texts is oriented primarily to experiential, interpersonal and textual meanings (Halliday, 1964) to consider what a writer does, as against what they might have done, with language. In this sense, the analysis of the context in which undergraduate dissertations are developed should be considered in order to interpret the meanings the student writers intend to exchange.

Before discussing the perspectives in SFL, the model of language – ‘language as social semiotic’, is represented in figure 3.1 and will be discussed in subsequent sections.

![SFL model of language](image)

*Figure 3.2 SFL model of language (Martin, 2009, p. 12; Martin & White, 2005, p. 32).*

### 3.4.1. Language and its context

SFL posits that language construes meanings in its context. Meanings emerge as a product of the connection between language, as a semiotic system, and its environment—another wider semiotic system, and the culture (Halliday, 1985b). The negotiated meanings reflect the social and cultural context in which they are exchanged.
(Eggins, 2004, p. 3). This assertion is in line with what Halliday (as in Halliday, 1996, p. 117; Matthiessen & Halliday, 1997, p. 39) argues – that SFL considers culture as fundamental as it influences a writer’s use of language, as this linguistic system is embedded in a context of culture or social system. Halliday further explains that:

… since language evolved as part … of every human culture, it functioned as the primary means whereby the deepest perception of the members, their joint construction of shared experience into social reality, were constantly reaffirmed and transmitted. Thus, in this sense, the culture provided the context within which words and, more generally, grammatical systems were interpreted. (1991, p. 273)

Related to Halliday’s explanation above, language use and language development in an individual are shaped by the culture and cultural context in which the individual lives (Martin, 1997a). Moreover, patterns of language use are also determined and influenced by, and at the same time construe, the situational context (context of situation/­register) (Halliday, 1985a; Halliday & Hasan, 1985). SFL further details the context of situation through the notion of register. In this case, the notion of register encompasses three major components that influence the choice of language use in certain situations, namely: field (the subject matter), tenor (the roles and relationships between the interactants), and mode (the means of the interaction). The three components of register are interrelated to each other to enable a rich description of meanings shared by a text. These components relate to the organisation of meanings within the text. This will be discussed further in subsection 3.4.2 below.

### 3.4.1.1 Context of culture (Genre)

At the cultural level, language operates depending on the social purposes behind its use (Martin, 1992). The cultural context of language within SFL refers to the notion of genre that has been developed by Martin (as in Christie & Martin, 1997; Martin, 1993, 2009; Martin & Rothery, 1980, 1981). As the way in which language is employed and
structured depends on the genre, different genres involve distinctive kinds of language and organisation that suit their specific social purposes (Eggins, 2004, p. 9).

In the case of the present research, these purposes relate to those that student writers have to achieve, which are very much influenced by the academic culture surrounding the development of dissertations. This academic culture plays a significant role in shaping the way language is used in representing the meanings of the student writers. The purposes are described in terms of systems of social processes at the level of genre (Martin, 1992, p. 503). In this sense, genre represents culturally and linguistically realised or institutionalised activity types or representations of meanings (Martin, 1985, p. 250). Martin describes a genre as “a staged goal-oriented social process”, in which it is:

- staged: because it usually takes us more than one phase of meaning to work through a genre,
- goal-oriented: because unfolding phases are designed to accomplish something, and we feel a sense of frustration or incompleteness if we are stopped, and,
- social: because we undertake genres interactively with others. (e.g. Martin, 1993; 2009, p. 13)

Within SFL, a key goal of research into genre is to identify the range of activity types that constitute the practices of meaning making within a culture (Martin, 1985). Generally, genre develops within, and serves, a culture of a community. It principally provides a means for achieving particular purposes (such as recounting events, persuading others, or arguing about phenomena) by employing certain ‘rituals’ (stages) agreed upon by the members of the culture over times. Thus, genre theory provides a global or ‘macro’ perspective on textual unfolding or logogenesis (Muntigl, 2006). Conventions and expectations of the community shape its development so that missing any part of the rituals (stage/phase) may result in miscommunication.
Consequently, within the context of academic writing, an undergraduate dissertation (and academic writing texts, in general) should be developed as one whole text and considered as an instance of a genre as this dissertation is written to achieve a certain goal (such as recounting what has been done in the research, or convincing readers about certain phenomena). In this sense, a dissertation is developed through stages and phases to exchange meanings a student writer anticipates having to negotiate. In its development, moreover, there are conventions and expectations of the academic discourse community that a student writer should observe in constructing an academic text that will be ‘approved’ by expert members of the community. These conventions and expectations of the dissertation are relevant to all academic contexts, especially that of the Indonesian academic context in which they will facilitate the improvement of the quality of undergraduate dissertations. Thus, a key reason to analyse the Honours dissertation is its development in the context of the Western academic community – a community where most Indonesian students intend to pursue their academic career. It is also this community’s academic values that the Indonesian academic adopt within tertiary educational context.

Within the theory of genre, the dissertation may be considered as a macro-genre (Martin, 1994; Martin & Rose, 2008; Muntigl, 2006). It represents “big text” (Martin, 1994), that is, of multiple genres consisting of several embedded-genres that may stand alone yet are connected to each other to develop the overall macrogenre. As a macrogenre, a dissertation is developed through several chapters (in this case considered as embedded-genres), sections and subsections that then may represent the stages and phases within each of those genres. In addition, argumentation – the way in which argument is established in the dissertation – denotes the core quality of academic
writing. That is, in writing this dissertation a student writer should take various stances to establish certain positions and work through stages of meanings advocated by the discourse community to achieve the main goal: persuading their putative readers about phenomena being negotiated within the argument. In this case one genre is typically employed within the academic setting – the argumentative/persuasive genre (as in Lee 2006). Thus, the analysis of genre in the present research deals especially with argumentation and persuasion, and with the way it facilitates the construction of student writers’ arguments in their dissertations.

Moreover, the analysis of the way a dissertation is developed as a message or series of messages becomes very crucial in the present study. The analysis examines a text for its textual components, particularly it is done as the analysed dissertations in this thesis are lengthy texts. The analysis uncovers the Theme – “the peak of the prominence” (Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 190) of the text, that is positioned at the beginning of the text, and the New (Rheme) – “a different kind of textual prominence having to do with the information we are expanding upon as text unfolds” (Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 192). This kind of analysis reveals the “hierarchy of Periodicity of smaller units of discourse ‘scaffolded’ with larger units” (my bold emphasis) (Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 199). This analysis is significant in exploring lengthy texts as it can predict the phases of discourse of the texts. This analysis observes the pattern of textual development, as shown in the following figure.
The Periodicity’ analysis (Halliday, 1985b; Martin & Rose, 2007), is needed in the present research as it offers insights into the ‘texture’ (Halliday, 1973b, 1978a, 1985b; Martin, 1992) of both analysed dissertations, that is, the organisation of information into a coherent ‘whole’. In doing so, each of the text is fragmented into its composing parts: the Themes – ‘the points of departure’ in each level of hierarchy, and the Rheme – the New. Knowing the points of departure, and how they then are developed helps readers to understand the way the dissertation’s information flow is organised and staged, as a macro-genre. Thus, within this perspective of textual meanings, all chapters and sections systematically work together to develop the “discourse flow” (Halliday, 2003, p. 7), or ‘information flow’ (Martin & Rose, 2007), within the whole dissertation. The way the macroThemes, hyperThemes, and Themes are organised is critical to what the text intends to share as its messages. This becomes important especially in ‘higher level’ academic texts (i.e. masters or doctoral theses) (e.g. Halliday, 2001). From the highest level of macro or text level of Themes to the lowest level clause Themes, meanings are packaged for readers to signpost the argument. In this way, the organisation of those types of macroThemes, hyperThemes, and Themes signify both the staging of the meanings and the stance(s) taken by the student writer. Thus, attention
to this type of organisation or Periodicity (Halliday, 1973b, 1985b; Martin & Rose, 2007) is an important task of the discourse analyst.

In my personal experience in supervising students in writing dissertations, undergraduate student writers are guided to develop their dissertations as one complete macro-genre. Both constructs of Periodicity and genre are used to assist students writing their dissertations. We train students to use them as references for scaffolding the development of their argument. Each chapter and section have to support the development of, as well as be guided by, the major Themes or the ‘theses’ of the argument in the dissertation. Accordingly, in the present study, the role of these constructs is reversed, by them acting as tools for analysing students’ dissertations to see how far they observe or violate the conventions and expectations of the academic discourse community in their work. In doing so, these constructs are useful for examining whether or not each section works to develop the overall discourse flow and the genre of the dissertation. In this thesis, analyses of discourse (information) flow was undertaken prior to the genre analysis as it helped to confirm the stages and/or phases evident in each instance of the genre. In this sense, analyses of the macro- and hyper Themes as well as hyper- and macro-News provide ways for exploring the staging of meanings in the dissertations in question.

3.4.1.2 Context of situation (register)

As we have seen, in SFL theory, specific uses of language are said to be further shaped by the more specific context of situation. The context of situation influences the language choices made among available alternatives within the cultural context, in which linguistic choices from the language system construe meaning under the influences of certain features of the particular situation. It is the context which helps
readers/listeners understand the choices made in a text (Malinowski, 1935, p. 258). This context includes variables that relate the text to its surrounding “meaning potentials … in a given social context” (Halliday, 1978a, p. 111). These are the variables that represent the ‘register’ of the text – “a kind of subsystem which rebounds with the properties of context in terms of field, tenor and mode” (Halliday, 1997, p. 260). Register is “the meta-functionally organised connotative semiotic between language and genre” (Martin, 1992, p. 502). It is “a functional variety of language—the patterns of instantiation of the overall system associated with a given type of context (a situation type)” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 27). Register represents how language means what it does within a given social context; that is, how the system (of language) is realised in a specific instance (text) within the boundary of its immediate context (see the representation figure in Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 28).

Halliday and colleagues (e.g. Halliday, 1978a, 1985a, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Martin, 1992, 2009) offer a tripartite framework for interpreting register. The framework takes account of: (i) the nature of the social action that is taking place – ‘what is going on’ (field); (ii) the nature of the participants, their statuses, and roles – ‘who are taking part’ (tenor); and (iii) what part language is playing; what is it that the participants are expecting the language to do for them in the situation – ‘what part the language is playing’ (mode). Martin (1992, p. 502) explains that these variables can be read to collaboratively work to achieve the goals of the text. These are the goals that, in the level of genre, shape the systems of social processes. This indicates methodologically that in the analysis of texts, all the variables should be considered, but more emphasis may be given to one or two variables over another.
Furthermore, texts vary in accordance with how they realise field, tenor or mode. In some genres (e.g. narrative cf. recount), the variations may be greater than the others (e.g. scientific report cf. explanation). The roles of these variables may also play out differently in different types of genre. In the case of academic genres, there are more limited variations, especially in their tenor. However, in spite of these limited variations, writers may still ‘play’ with language. Academic texts are not entirely impersonal. Selecting references, referring to certain experts and their ideas, and choosing wording are ways in which writers imbue their academic texts with their personal interests. Deciding what or what not to put in the texts may resonate with the particular ideological backgrounds of the writers. This indicates how interpersonal meaning, despite limitations in the space to play, can be used to persuade the audience (readers). Yet, as aforementioned, texts draw simultaneously on language resources for enacting tenor relations and for expressing field and mode related meanings, often occurring as constellations of choices. For example, in academic writing, the writer attends to all three variables, but this thesis will argue that textual organisation or the way meanings are packaged is particularly important to the rhetorical success of the dissertation. In other ways, mode and tenor work very closely together to persuade the reader to the student writers’ position.

In this thesis, the data are taken from two undergraduate dissertations in which the diversity of the variables is relatively low. The Australian Honours (Sue’s) and the Indonesian (Sri’s) dissertations are concerned with a relatively similar field (i.e. discipline-specific educational fields) and the same tenor (i.e. novice writers writing to experts) and mode (i.e. written, and at the highly reflective end of the mode continuum). However, the current study will examine how interpersonal language operates in
academic texts written by student writers with different linguistic backgrounds and in
dissimilar educational contexts. In more specific terms, it concerns how student writers
establish and maintain interpersonally oriented argument throughout the various stages
of their dissertations. It is the tenor that, in the current study, is the major point of
interest.

3.4.2. Stratification of the content plane of language

SFL offers stratification as a means of theorising the layering of language from meaning
to expression. In SFL, meaning is inaccessible unless it is realised in its forms, in this
case, phonology or graphology, through a further organisation—the wording. This
stratification comprises two levels of content plane: the level of discourse semantics and
the level lexico-grammar, and a third level of expression plane—the level of
phonology/graphology (Halliday, 1994; Martin, 1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>Technical Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meanings</td>
<td>semantics (Halliday, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wordings</td>
<td>(discourse semantics (Martin, 1993))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexico-grammar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPRESSION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sounds/letters</td>
<td>phonology/graphology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.4 Level or strata of language (taken from Eggins, 2004, p. 19)*

The three levels are connected through realisations, depicted by an arrow (→). Meaning
at semantic level (Halliday, 1994) (or, discourse semantic level (Martin, 1992)) is
realised through the choices available at lexico-grammatical level, to be expressed
through the systems of phonology/graphology. As discourse semantic level signifies a
very abstract system of meaning (more abstract than lexico-grammatical level), one type
of meaning in this level may allow for a number of choices available in lexico-
grammatical level. This, in turn, allows analyses of meanings to consider broad
resources of lexicon and grammar. Martin (1992, p. 19) makes it clear that
Stratification … gives rise to a model in which the discourse semantics both generalises across grammatical resources and accounts for relations between as well as within clause complexes. The discourse semantics is therefore more abstract than, and deals with larger units than, lexico-grammar.

Stratification develops as human language develops ontogenetically and phylogenetically. Ontogenetically, “when our primary semiotic evolved into a higher-order semiotic, a space was created in which meanings could be organised in their own terms, as a purely abstract network of interrelations” (Halliday (2003, p. 14). In early development of the children’s language, there is ‘protolanguage’, in which meanings are closely related to signs – as the expressions. In this sense, Halliday (2003, p. 12) explains that “an infant's protolanguage – the “child tongue” that children typically construe for themselves towards the end of their first year of life – consists of an inventory of simple signs”. The relationship between meaning and expression is very direct. On the other hand, in adult language there is mediation between meanings and their expressions allowing speakers/writers to employ different expressions suited to the specific situational context. Phylogenetically, language also develops as civilisations develop. Primitive languages seem to have closer linkage between meanings and their expressions. The layering of language is often a simple one: meaning→expression. In contrast, in modern language the stratification becomes obviously more complicated. In some genres (such as literary texts), one meaning may be realised in different forms. In this sense, one meaning may be realised through different types of expressions; alternatively, each expression we read may trigger multiple interpretations. In other genres (such as in legal language) each meaning is understandably explicitly realised in its expression; there should be no room for ambiguity in the interpretation.
Thus, this thesis considers the analysed dissertations (the subjects of the study) to represent the graphology level: the level of expressions. The texts signify the realisations of meanings that denote argumentations that the student writers intend to negotiate. These expressions are then analysed in an effort to interpret and understand the choices made by writers as they represent their stance or position apropos the propositions made. In other words, the present study focuses on the way actual language choices construe the intended goal of the dissertation. Moreover, as the focus is on how student writers struggle with information flow and with the staging of interpersonally oriented argument, this thesis examines in detail the way student writers package the meanings of the dissertation, stage meanings in developing the argument, and employ interpersonal meaning-making resources in taking their stance, through the lenses of Periodicity, genre and Appraisal theories. The simultaneous analyses begin by exploring the way meanings are packaged by the organisation of their macro- and hyper-Themes as well as hyper- and macro News. The results of this first analysis provide a good deal of insight into the stages and phases of the genre in the development of the argument of the dissertations. Finally, the analysis of Periodicity also provides an environment for further analysis of the employment of evaluative language through the attitudinal values that may be presented in the macro- as well as the hyper-Theme. For a better understanding of the way the overall analyses are conducted, Chapter Four details the methodology.

3.4.3. Metafunctional organisation of language

The concept of ‘metafunction’ associates the register variables with the basic functions of language (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp. 29-30; Martin, 1992, pp. 8-9; 2009, p. 11). It refers to functionality: “the notion of kinds of meaning” (Martin & White, 2005,
that is thought to be intrinsic to language. Metafunction resonates with the theoretical construct that the entire architecture (the overall meaning potential) of a language is organised by the grammar on functional lines (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 31; Martin & White, 2005, p. 7). The following is a representation of the metafunctions and their relation to the Framework of Periodicity and of Appraisal that are employed in the present research.

![Figure 3.5 Metafunctions in relation to field, mode and tenor (Martin & White, 2005)](image)

Originally, referring to his research on his own son, Halliday (1975, p. 162) suggests two basic functions of language: language as reflection (experiential meaning) and language as action (interpersonal meaning). Later in child language development, he observed (e.g. 1978b, p. 117; 2003, p. 18) and added another “mode of meaning that relates to the construction of text”. In SFL, these are considered as a model involving “a trinocular conception of meaning” (Martin, 2009, p. 11). The three register variables relate to the language system as follows: The field of the discourse correlates with making sense of our experience through language to express and connect ideas. This is known as the ideational metafunction within which a number of linguistic systems have been identified including the systems of Ideation at the level of discourse semantics,
Transitivity and Logico-Semantics at the level of lexico-grammar. The tenor of the discourse concerns the enactment of our social relationships through the Interpersonal metafunction. Interpersonally orientated systems include that of Appraisal and Negotiation at the discourse semantic level and Mood at the lexico-grammatical level. The Mode of the discourse is associated with the building up sequences of discourse, the organisation of the discursive flow, and the creation of cohesion and continuity as it moves along. Here, the relevant metafunction is the textual, associated with Periodicity at the level of discourse semantics and Theme at the level of lexico-grammar.

In relation to the discussions of the metafunctional organisation of the clause above, this trinocular conception of meaning may be considered as the basic resource for text analysis. Each of the metafunctions influences each clause in a text relatively independently. Accordingly, in this thesis, though the analysis will focus on interpersonal language; the ideational and textual ones are also considered.

3.4.4. Analysis of the evaluative linguistic resources: Appraisal

Evaluative linguistic resources play a significant role in enhancing the quality of the interpersonally oriented argument in Sue’s dissertation. According to Hood (2006) evaluative meanings radiate through the text; that is, they do not reside in any particular stage or phase or at any particular rank but rather build prosodically. Here, the analysis is guided by Hood’s suggestion that:

An appreciation of the functioning of prosodies of interpersonal meaning makes an important contribution to our understanding of the ways in which writers do persuasive work, especially in the context of discourse that relies minimally on overt and explicit attitude. (2006, p. 38)

In academic writing, an overt and explicit attitude is not generally valued. It is through the covert and indirect evocation of attitude that the interpersonal negotiation takes
place. The following subsections present the often-implicit prosodic patterns that are evident in Sue’s dissertation.

The present research draws on Appraisal theory (Martin, 2000a; Martin & Rose, 2007; Martin & White, 2005) as the underpinning theoretical framework. As we have seen, Appraisal theory represents a model for analysing evaluative/interpersonal language in SFL at the discourse semantic level. Appraisal theory provides a comprehensive framework for analysing the linguistic resources utilised in the negotiation of meanings in the examined dissertations. This analysis relates to the evaluation accomplished by the writers, which is considered essential in academic writing (Hunston, 1994) in taking up their stances from among other positions available. The resources of Appraisal are used for negotiating ‘sociality’ between speakers/writers and listeners/readers, to express opinions and attitudes and to align with some positions and not others. (Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 26). A brief summary of Martin and White (2005, p. 1) shows that Appraisal theory is concerned

… with the interpersonal in language, with the subjective presence of writers/speakers in texts as they adopt stances towards both the material they present and those with whom they communicate. … with how writers/speakers approve and disapprove, enthuse and abhor, applaud and criticise, and with how they position their readers/listeners to do likewise. … with the construction by texts of communities of shared feelings and values, and with the linguistic mechanisms for the sharing of emotions, tastes and normative assessments. … with how writers/speakers construe for themselves particular authorial identities or personae, with how they align or disalign themselves with actual or potential respondents, and with how they construct for their texts an intended or ideal audience.

The Appraisal framework has been associated with other various models of evaluative language analysis and has contributed to the development of research in academic genres, such as in Hood (e.g. Hood, 2004, 2006, 2010a); Lee (2006, 2007, 2010a); Lee (2010b); Nakamura (2009); Padmanabhan (2011).
The system of Appraisal is categorised in three sub-systems as attitude, graduation and engagement (See figure 2.2). The system of attitude enables writers to explore the kind of values that are encoded in the discourse, realised as affect, judgment, or appreciation. The system of graduation embodies options for grading meanings, which enables writers to investigate how values about phenomena are upgraded or downgraded. Lastly, the system of engagement encompasses a variety of options for engaging with others and with knowledge – “a web of professional and social associations” (Hyland, 2004). This system enables us to investigate how writers manage the dynamic organisation of representing themselves, others (others’ voices) and their stance towards knowledge in their texts as they interact with their reader and the broader discourse community. Thus, the Appraisal system offers an important foundation for analysing the constructions of interpersonal meaning at the discourse semantic level.

![Figure 3.6 Appraisal resources (Martin & White, 2005, p. 38)](image_url)

The choice of the Appraisal system as the most appropriate underpinning theory for the current study is based on several considerations. Firstly, this system operates at the discourse semantic level, which models how interpersonal language plays roles in
the development of entire texts. The options provided in the network of attitude, graduation and engagement denote semantic options; that is, their values may be realised through varied grammatical items that enable us to trace the realisation of Appraisal values through a wide range of options from the lexical and grammatical items. It means that Appraisal theory provides us with a means of examining how interpersonal meanings are negotiated in the students’ dissertations.

Secondly, compared to what other systems offer e.g. syntactic analysis, the Appraisal system develops a relatively complete system network of interpersonal meaning choices. This allows us to approach the (interpersonal) meaning through maps that interrelate to and support each other. It characterises an arrangement of interpersonal meanings connected in system networks comprising varying levels of subtlety and according to the level of writers’ intensity. As a system of choices, Appraisal describes options that writers can choose in expressing, exchanging and negotiating their stance.

Lastly, as a part of a wider SFL system network, the Appraisal analysis is able to be undertaken alongside other analyses; for example, Periodicity. These parallel investigations enable us to investigate the texts from different angles. In the sense that the analysis of interpersonal meaning, lies at the core of this theory, this thesis will benefit from the help of this textual analysis. This work is very important as the system of Appraisal recognises various realisations of interpersonal meaning that may relate to ideational and textual options in the discourse. Hood (2004) points out that “an understanding of the characteristic patterning of different metafunctions in discourse informs an analysis of how interpersonal meanings are distributed in the discourse, how they are foregrounded or backgrounded, and how they interrelate with each other”.

3.5. Conclusion

In this chapter, the research has been positioned within its theoretical frameworks. In the first instance, the analysis of the quality of argument explores the organisation of the argument in each dissertation observing the Toulmin’s layout of argument. This analysis aims at providing general descriptions of the way undergraduate student writers in different contexts build up arguments in their dissertations. In the second instance, the thesis seeks a deeper understanding on how linguistic resources are employed to realise, organise, and stage meanings to develop the argument in question. The comprehensive theory of SFL, which focuses on language as a meaning-making resource and on text as semantic choice in social context, enables comprehensive linguistic analyses of the analysed dissertations, to provide insights into the way student writers organise meanings in the two undergraduate dissertations in terms of their thematic development and staged these meanings in terms of their genres, and employ interpersonal linguistic resources drawn on by the student writers to argue a position or point of view vary across the dissertations. Thus, the linguistic analyses are guided by the theories of Periodicity, genre and the Appraisal System, as the three contribute to the development of the argument in the texts. In achieving the desired description of the realisations of meanings in the texts, all the three theories are simultaneously applied in examining the graphology of the texts (the dissertations) to lead the interpretation of discourse semantic meanings that the student writers attempt to negotiate. The units of analysis for this study will be a combination of text ranging across strata: clauses, groups, and words that trigger values being evaluated. The complete discussion of how these analyses were undertaken will be presented in Chapter 4, Methodology.
Chapter 4  Research Methodology

4.1. Introduction

This thesis investigates the quality of argument and argumentation in lengthy academic texts. It examines the arguments presented in undergraduate dissertations written by two student writers coming from two different linguistic backgrounds and educational contexts: one written by an Australian (Honours) student writer from an Australian university – Sue’s dissertation, and one written by a bilingual Indonesian student writer from an English department at an Indonesian university – Sri’s dissertation. In order to better understand how the two neophyte-writers manage their tasks, analysis focused on the textual and the interpersonal zones in the development of argument. The textual zone relates to the organisation of the text as a unified whole and the staging of meanings to achieve communicative purposes. Whilst, the interpersonal zone deals with the writers’ use of evaluative linguistic resources to engage with other voices in the literature.

This chapter aims to describe and justify the methodology for research—the processes of inquiry undertaken in conducting the research. It provides rationalisations for the selection of the paradigm, specifically in relation to qualitative research, the steps taken in the processes of data collection/selection, as well as data analysis and interpretation. In validating the processes undertaken, the research also relies on the results from a pilot study conducted in a similar area.
4.2. The Qualitative Research Paradigm

A qualitative research paradigm is the most appropriate approach to conducting this research for several reasons. Firstly, it is in the traditions of qualitative research that most detailed linguistic analysis can be found. Within this tradition, analysing individual texts is crucial with in-depth exploration becoming the main focus of the analysis (Hood, 2010a; Martin & Rose, 2007). The number and kinds of data sought give further reason for the application of this approach. As the study focuses on just two dissertations, a qualitative approach provides an in-depth understanding of the phenomena of interest rather than easily generalised results.

Furthermore, the underpinning linguistic theory, that of SFL is justified. Indeed, as has been demonstrated in the previous chapter, SFL provides tools to analyse the organisation of the textual and interpersonal meanings in the dissertations’ arguments. SFL has been considered not only ‘a theory about language as a social semiotic’ (Halliday, 1978), but this school of linguistics also suggests ‘an analytical methodology which permits the detailed and systematic description of language patterning’ (Eggins, 2004, p. 21). The methods SFL typically offers focus on detailing the meaning making processes rather than counting the number of occurrence of words or phrases that contain certain values under investigation in drawing conclusion of the study.

The present study is specifically interested in exploring the construction of argument in lengthy academic texts where undergraduate student writers organise meanings to engage with others in the literature and negotiate convincing arguments across stretches of the texts in order to take up their positions in the discourse community. As with the focus in this study, pursuing the textual and interpersonal meanings require this thesis to explore each dissertation whole. It is because the
frameworks employed (Periodicity, genre and Appraisal) theorise that the meaning making may occur at any level of the text. Thus, this study is to explore the multiple features of the texts that interact across the text, and the construction of arguments (meaning making) that processes throughout the dissertations. This implies the study concentrates on an in-depth analysis of a relatively small number of data (two dissertations) rather than on analysing the corpus of a compilation of dissertations that functions to look over a small number of features across a large set of data.

The main advantage for conducting in-depth study of a small number of data is that it has the potential to uncover manifold features of meaning realised throughout the dynamic choices of the lexicon and the grammar (lexicogrammar). This kind of research enables to better understand the way language progresses across the meaning develops across a text. This is in line with what Martin and Rose (2007) emphasise,

[i]n contrast to some views on analysing discourse, we do believe it is important to analyse instances in individual texts. What is unique about a specific text may be just what matters; we don’t want to lose what’s special by only valuing generalizations across a text corpus. Beyond this, as discourse analysts generalize, the tendency at this stage of our work is to lose sight of how texture is construed as a text unfolds, through its particular logogenetic contingencies.’ (p. 312)

One important point that this study has to compromise is that it may sacrifice the generalisability of the findings as each text is composed within certain cultural and situational contexts.

In summary, the research employs a qualitative approach in the form of textual analyses in seeking to answer how student writers in the two very different contexts of Indonesian and Australian universities strive to build arguments across the stages of their dissertation. The summary table below presents an explanation of the key
characteristics of qualitative research (data) (Merriam, 2009, p. 18), as well as how these are realised in the present study, beside those that are previously mentioned.

Table 4.1 The characteristic of the present study compared to typical qualitative research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points of comparison</th>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
<th>The Present Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus of research</td>
<td>Quality (nature, essence)</td>
<td>The quality and nature of argument as developed across stages in the students’ dissertations. Within the perspectives underpinning theory for the study, the meanings the students exchange become a major point of interest for the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated phrases</td>
<td>Field work, ethnographic, naturalistic, grounded, constructivist</td>
<td>Naturalistic: the study examines the data produced by the student writers in regular academic settings where the authors did not receive any unusual treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of investigation</td>
<td>Understanding, description, discovery, meaning, hypothesis generating</td>
<td>Understanding how student writers in different linguistic and academic contexts build up interpersonally oriented arguments throughout the various stages of their dissertations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design characteristics</td>
<td>Flexible, evolving, emergent</td>
<td>Flexible, emergent, iterative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Small, non-random, purposeful, theoretical</td>
<td>Purposive, non-random sampling of the high-graded student writers’ dissertations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Researcher as primary actor, interviews, observations, documents</td>
<td>Researcher as primary information source (actor).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary mode of analysis</td>
<td>Inductive, constant comparative method</td>
<td>Textual/linguistics analysis, descriptive-interpretive, comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Comprehensive, holistic, expansive, richly descriptive</td>
<td>Comprehensive, rich, descriptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current study is specifically designed to examine the two undergraduate dissertations. With the small number of data being analysed, the findings, as previously mentioned, are not intended to make any generalisation about the phenomena under investigation. Rather, the findings may be specifically applicable only in the contexts or
similar contexts to, where this research was conducted. Moreover, within the two contexts where the data were taken for this study, there may be differences that influence student writers in constructing the arguments, such as the specific cultural values/practices surrounding the writing of each dissertation; the training each student received before writing her dissertation; the criteria used for developing and/or assessing each dissertation; and so on. The differences are considered in the present study, but the intention is not to compare the two theses. The aim of the study is to notice similarities and differences in the ways that the student writers managed the task of writing a lengthy argument.

4.3. Piloting the Research Project

A pilot study for this present research was very important and was conducted to gain familiarity with the methodology and the underpinning theory and to gain a ‘broad-brush’ understanding of one Indonesian undergraduate student’s dissertation, as a sample. Motivated by a concern that student writers in this context experience difficulties in ‘bringing others into’ their academic texts, this pilot study (Widhiyanto, 2012) was a preliminary attempt to examine the way undergraduate student writers in the context of English as a foreign language (EFL) in Indonesia engage with others in establishing their academic stances through their dissertations.

In order to trial the methodology and analytical framework, the study focused particularly on applying the Engagement framework of Appraisal theory—as a part of the complete analyses of the research reported in this thesis. In addition, the theory of genre pedagogy also supported and facilitated the analysis of the dissertation. This supporting genre analysis examined the dissertation (as a macro-genre) by dividing it into its embedded genres, each of which was then, in turn, divided into stages and
phases. Then, each stage/phase was subdivided into single clauses, and the clauses were categorised as per Martin and White (2005).

This pilot study analysed written data collected from an undergraduate dissertation submitted by a student writer, Clara (a pseudonym). Her dissertation was selected from a collection of dissertation in English department of an Indonesian university. It was one of two best dissertations shortlisted from the department for the research reported in this thesis. Clara wrote this an at-least-sixty-page dissertation as part of the requirements for the degree of “Sarjana Sastra” (Bachelor in Literature) from the university. Her dissertation is an exploration of Charles Dickens’ critique of education practice during Victorian era found in David Copperfield, Great Expectations and Oliver Twist. The dissertation consists of five chapters: introduction^ review on related literature^ method of investigation^ data analysis^ conclusion and suggestion. Sri’s dissertation was reserved for the thesis because Sri’s topic was close to Sue’s topic. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to juxtapose the two.

The processes of data collection and analysis for the pilot study project—as also for the present research, were conducted systematically. In this pilot study, the data were collected from one dissertation, out of the two shortlisted-dissertations carefully selected from English department within the period of 2008-2011. The selection of the dissertations involves: firstly, recording all the dissertations in the department; secondly, assorting them by the grade they got; thirdly, classifying them based on the topic discussed and the interpersonal language used; and finally, shortlisting the ideal dissertations for the analysis. It was found that two dissertations (Clara’s and Sri’s) were the best suited to the criteria for the present research, Clara’s dissertation was ideal for the pilot study. The analysis of Clara’s dissertation was done by dividing each
chapter into sections; each section into paragraphs, and each paragraph into sentences (clauses), in which the categorisation of the clauses follows Martin and White (2005). In this pilot project, attention was focused on heteroglossic clauses and since context plays a very much influence in determining a proposition/proposal of a clause, even monoglossic ones. The analysis carefully considered the context surrounding each clause in interpreting the proposition/proposal conveyed.

This study found that the dissertation investigated was a typical traditional type of academic text. Clara’s dissertation was structured conventionally in terms of an introduction (literature review) ^ methodology ^ results ^ discussion (IMRAD) (e.g. Bunton, 1998; Dong, 1998; Paltridge, 2004; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). This was not surprising as most student writers in the context of the study were trained in this standard structure of academic texts. In addition, the pilot study was significant in revealing the ways the writer negotiated her positions with others. This study examined the student writer’s use of engagement resources; that is, how she positioned herself in relation to the discourse community. The engagement framework analysis focused especially on ‘heteroglossic’ language choices; that is, how the student writer negotiated other voices in the text (Martin & White, 2005).

In this analysis, there were relatively equal distributions between monoglossic (single perspective) and heteroglossic (multiple perspective) language choices used in the analysed dissertation. About half (47.6%) of the total number of clauses were monoglossic and they were almost equally distributed throughout the chapters. The use of these type of clauses in appropriate contexts may function to contextualize shared assumptions and/or show the writer’s authority (Lee, 2010a, p.187). In chapter II, for instance, the clause, “Literature, moreover, is also classified into three categories”, read
as it is her who has the authority. It is the author that is stating that she is organising the text in that way. However, this clause may be ambiguous as Clara appears unknowingly uses this monoglossic clause (bare assertion) inappropriately. The clause may also read as it states a shared knowledge by using “Literature” that seems to refer to any text; not only her literature review text. In this case, this ‘bare assertion’ (Martin & White, 2005) was used represents the student as either confident in stating facts or opinions, or, perhaps unknowingly not recognising the importance of acknowledging other relevant academic positions. A closer look into linguistic analysis suggested that she was reluctant to make space for dialogue.

In a wider perspective, it is common for inexperienced writers to take for granted solidarity with readers without acknowledging other sources (Derewianka, 2007). This is also evident as in the following clause: “However, during the Victorian era, the two classes have developed into three social classes”. There is no reference for both clauses which indicates that Clara did not realise the importance of acknowledging others or others’ knowledge for her propositions. Even clauses that appear to be heteroglossic at a preliminary reading do not necessary open up space for dialogue with the reader, for example, "Extensive reading of literature is needed to enrich references of worldwide writers". This involves an "objective" metaphor of obligation (Martin and White, 2005), that the proposition can be read as subjectively conveyed via the modal "must" which is construed experientially via the verbal process "to need". Therefore, this form of the directive might be analysed as a bare assertion—a proposal of Monogloss.

The analysis also suggests that the student writer misread the authorial stance required by the task, often assuming an authoritative voice rather than the more
measured and at times tentative one required. The heteroglossic clauses were then subcategorised in each chapter, with 21.6% under ‘dialogic expansion’ and 30.8% under ‘contraction’ categories. The analysis revealed that although the student opened up a dialogic space in the discourse, these clauses acted to narrow the space by appearing to exclude certain dialogic alternatives for the readers and the sources (Martin & White, 2005). For instance, as ‘disclaim’ proliferates in many parts of the dissertation, Clara seems to reject various facts by offering propositions against what she reads from the novels as such in the clause “Workhouse is a house for poor people who did not have money and nowhere to live”. She indicates her disalignment of what she read against what is as a common expectation. In the instance, “It (i.e. reading as an activity) did not exist in working class life”, she denies the fact in the novel and challenges with a view that reading habit should be in everyone’s life.

By using ‘proclaim’ which acts to limit the scope of dialogistic alternatives, with ‘endorse’ subcategory, Clara uncritically warrants her propositions by referring to other voices (Martin & White, 2005); e.g. “In line with that [the data she reads], a fact about education practice also appears in the third book that is Great Expectations. Moreover, by ‘concur: affirm’, she seems to project herself confident with her propositions, announcing to her readers her position, as in “It was typically industrial revolution in Victorian era that employed children as factory labours”.

The ‘entertain’ sub-category which projects clauses as dialogically expansive, as in “Only some could feel formal education with a very small scale”, there is some space for negotiation with the readers and/or other knowers. This clause can be clearly read as implying a sort of grammatical metaphor - specifically a metaphor of probability (assuming). It may read as the writer is not quite sure about her proposition that she is
open for other voices, or she is willing to negotiate with others’ different views. Thus in “I assume that the stories have something to deal with Dickens’ personal life”, we can read it as metaphorically related to "Maybe, probably, or possibly, the stories have something to deal with Dickens’ personal life." These kinds of “subjective” modals of probability explicitly ground the assumption in an explicit subjectivity.

Lastly, by applying ‘dialogic expansion: attribute’, Clara formulates her authorial voice by attributing it to some external sources (Martin & White, 2005). It is used mostly in chapter two in which she needs support for her propositions, such as in “Marxism supports the idea of classless which means no offenses or forces from one social class to the other”, she shows that her position is based on another well-developed theory. It is her voice, but it is strengthened by reference to others: she disassociates her own authorial stance by attributing it to other voice, though without necessarily entering into a critical dialogue with them.

In summary, the fact that the student used greater incidences of monoglossic than heteroglossic clauses may indicate that she was trying to establish her authority, though some clauses were not appropriately deployed. Her use of heteroglossic clauses, on the other hand, also appeared to limit the dialogue and did not represent a critical struggle with alternative positions. In other words, her writing tended to be ‘externally authoritative discourse’ not ‘internally persuasive discourse’ (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 344).

In this pilot study, several issues emerged that were relevant for the study proper. First of all, understanding how students engage with others in their writing went beyond consideration of the Engagement system, to include the whole Appraisal system. It became clear that Engagement resources are not the sole way of enacting the writer’s engagement with the audience. In order to investigate the nature of the
interpersonal force of the writing it is also necessary to consider how writers employ language choices from the frameworks of Attitude and Graduation to engage with readers, and with the literature, as well as with other writers. Such an analysis needs to go beyond instances to identify the ‘syndromes’; that is, a concurrence of related developments, that has helped to shape the engagement into a prosodic flow leading the reader to a certain position. In this way, the pilot study informed a refinement of the methodology for this current study, including data selection and analyses. Further analysis of how prosody developed across the students’ dissertations was needed, as it will enable me to more fully explain how they struggled with interpersonal language. Another important point is that differences in cultures should also be considered as they influence the genre. Thus, attention to the ways in which the two student writers have been and are being enculturated into ways of writing, reading, and valuing was important during the analysis and interpretation phases of the research. Lastly, as the present thesis deals with lengthy texts, mapping the texture of the texts is crucial. Thus, based on this pilot study, the present research adds another tool from SFL for mapping the thematic development of the texts to facilitate the investigation of the argument, particularly the macro-argument of each dissertation.

4.4. Data for the Study

As mentioned before, this research investigates two dissertations, one written by an English-speaking background (ESB) Honours student from an Australian university, and one written by an Indonesian student writer studying English as a foreign language (EFL) in an English department at an Indonesian university. The former is used as a model of an academic dissertation at the level of undergraduate degree from an English-speaking educational context. The latter represents the current achievement of students
at a similar educational level at an Indonesian university. These two dissertations were analysed in terms of the ways the arguments were organised and interpersonal/evaluative language was deployed. The analysis then examined the manner in which each student writer engaged with members of the academic discourse community. However, while it was possible to draw comparisons between the two dissertations, the point was not to judge the quality of one against the other; as that would not be fair considering differences in linguistic background and educational context of both writers.

Each of the data (dissertations) for this study represents the best text in each context. Each of the two dissertations was taken from top grade student writers within each of their linguistic and educational contexts. The first dissertation analysed was an Honours dissertation, which got high grade from the examiners. It was written by ‘Sue’, an English-speaking background (ESB) student and reports on a project exploring the transition of home to school literacy practices of two Australian children. It was written in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood) Honours. The second one, the Indonesian dissertation, was also an ‘A’ graded dissertation out of the compilation. It was written by ‘Sri’ and it reported on a project which researched the development of assessment criteria for a news reporting competition for senior high school students in central Java. Sri’s dissertation was submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree Bachelor of Education.

The two dissertations analysed for the present research are similar. As with the criteria for analysing the arguments, in determining the similarity of the dissertations the present research relates to the variables of the quality of arguments: Periodicity, genre,
and Appraisal. Thus, these variables are employed exploring both dissertations for their similarities. Firstly, within the Periodicity framework, the results of the skimming of both dissertations showed that both texts are similarly structured traditionally. The dissertation analysed for the present study follow the IMRAD type of organisation. This similarity becomes the basis for analysing the texts in which it then considerably relates to the basic analysis of the genres in each text. This second analysis, as it compares the selected chapters to the typical ones in the literature, also found that each related pair of chapters are organised following the basic components of the typical genre. The last variable (Appraisal framework) is not really used to see the similarity of both dissertations. However, as the textual structure of each selected chapter is similar; it is assumed that each pair of text use similar language in constructing convincing argument. The subsequent discussion further explains the way both dissertations were obtained.

4.4.1. Selection of the Honours Dissertation

In the present study, the selection for the potential Honours dissertations for the analysis was done purposefully. The selection was conducted in accordance with the aim of the research. As there was inadequate access to the collection of the Honours dissertations, the selection focused on a number of dissertations accessed from the faculty of Education in an Australian university. Having skimmed the collection, Sue’s dissertation finally was chosen as it was best-suited to the criteria of the present research. Sue’s dissertation was the best among the other dissertations as it the best grade it got from the examiners. In addition, it was found that her dissertation was written under supervision of a team of senior linguists and experienced researchers in the university. As a result, the text well-structured and the arguments were convincing.
These well-structured text and convincing argument establish Sue’s dissertation could potentially be used as a good model of such texts in the Indonesian context. This means that the way the text was developed and organised by Sue could become the benchmark to analyse similar text from the Indonesian university.

Sue’s dissertation represents a typical academic text written within the English academic cultural context. Her dissertation follows dissertation writing guidelines laid down by the university (as in Honours Program Handbook for Students and Supervisors, 2015). Despite its traditional structural organisation (as will be further elaborated), the dissertation is comprehensive in discussing the topic. The dissertation, as the result of its examination shows, represents a high-graded academic work with detailed description of the research conducted, and the writer’s successful engagement with the academic discourse community. She maintains her voice as being humble in spite of her comprehensive discussion on the topic she discusses. For instance, she admits that

“As this study is being undertaken by a novice researcher, in partial fulfilment of an Honours year, the nature of the project (including its scope and duration) will not enable it to be influential in changing current practice on a large scale. However, the findings will contribute a more recent example to previous literature on this topic.” [A.1.1]

The Honours dissertation is written as partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood) Honours at a university in Australia. The program aims at providing students with research training and an opportunity for ‘making an important contribution to society and their chosen field’ (Honours Program Handbook for Students and Supervisors, 2015). In the case of The Early Years Honours dissertation, a student is required

[t]o complete a thesis of approximately 15,000 words in length based upon a course of supervised study on a topic chosen by the student and approved by 2 supervisors and the Faculty Honours Assessment Committee. This
thesis can take the form of a qualitative, quantitative or mixed-mode research project. (Honours Program Handbook for Students and Supervisors, 2015)

As a part of the University graduate outcomes, the Honours program is said to contribute to such student qualities as being informed, independent learners; problem solvers; effective communicators; and responsible scholars. Such characteristics of graduates of the Honours program resemble the criteria for developing the Indonesian undergraduate dissertation. It suggests that an Honours dissertation denotes a useful model for Indonesian undergraduate students in developing their dissertations.

The Honours dissertation examined in this study is structured traditionally. Sue’s Dissertation is traditionally organised observing the five-chapter structure known as the ‘IMRAD’ type (e.g. Bunton, 1998; Dong, 1998; Paltridge, 2004; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). The first chapter creates a research space (Swales, 1990). The literature review chapter then follows it. This chapter is written to locate the study within other recognised studies in the field. The third chapter, the methodology, explains the way the research is conducted. Chapter Four presents the findings of the analysis. Finally, the last chapter presents the discussion and recommendations for future research. As previously mentioned, the overall text of dissertation A (Sue’s dissertation) is a well-structured model for Indonesian student writers.

The research reported on in the Honours dissertation was motivated by the writer’s broader interest in children who have differing home and school literacy practices, and therefore differing cultural capital which may or may not align with what schools typically value (p.5). The Honours thesis provides a very rich, ethnographically oriented description of children’s literacy practices at home and in school. Such a deep and thick description of the phenomena studied has the potential to be a challenging
model of research for the Indonesian students. More importantly, her examiners have acknowledged the way Sue engages with others in the field. In sum, the Honours dissertation has been considered the one most suitable for the objectives the present study intends to achieve.

4.4.2. Selection of the Indonesian Undergraduate Dissertation

The Indonesian (Sri’s) dissertation was the best suited for the current study. It was selected from a collection of dissertations within the English department as it represented one of the best-written samples for the aim of the present research available within the collection. This collection of dissertations in the department represents the range of dissertations that students in the department write to complete their degree in the Bachelor of English Education as well as Bachelor of English Literature. The selection processes for the best suited Indonesian dissertation for the present study were done very carefully. The processes consisted of: firstly, identifying all the dissertations in the period of 2008-2011, then, exploring both the topic discussed and the language used to preliminarily document consistencies in theme and mode of presentation, and then finally, shortlisting the ideal dissertations from the analysis. The final main reason for choosing Sri’s dissertation was its closeness in the kind of the study to that of the Honours dissertation.

An undergraduate dissertation in the Indonesian context is the lengthiest academic text for a student writer. Termed a ‘skripsi’, it is defined as ‘a scientific work prepared on the basis of literature studies, field studies, and/or laboratory tests as training for scientific writing in an undergraduate degree with 6 credits’. This is in line with the Guidelines for Writing and Thesis Examination’ from the Faculty of Language and Art in the Indonesian university under study, which reads as the following:
Table 4.2 The Indonesian undergraduate dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indonesian</th>
<th>English equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Skripsi adalah karya ilmiah yang disusun atas dasar kajian kepustakaan, penelitian lapangan, dan atau uji laboratorium sebagai latihan penulisan ilmiah pada program studi jenjang Strata I (S1) dengan bobot 6 SKS’ (&quot;Pedoman Penulisan dan Ujian Skripsi,&quot; 2014).</td>
<td>‘Undergraduate Dissertation is a scientific paper prepared on the basis of literature studies, field studies or laboratory tests as an exercise on scientific writing in an undergraduate degree (S1) with 6 credits’ (‘Guidelines for Writing and Thesis Examination’, 2014).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The guidelines referred to were developed by the faculty and provide general parameters for writing a dissertation. They do not specify the detail of the requirements and procedures to write the dissertation, the processes of the supervision and the way to write it. Rather there is general information regarding the ways a student prepares, writes, defends in front of the examiners and revises it after the examination for submission to the university.

In the English department (as well as other departments at this university), the undergraduate dissertations have always been written in a uniform five-chapter-traditional format. The possible reason for such practice is that in “Academic Writing” subject students are trained to follow a similar textual organisation in their academic writing practices. It is also the case with the graduate degree theses in the university, for which student writers are trained to produce a similar organisation of text. What is special for the English department is that the dissertation must be written in English by observing the typical conventions and expectations from the English for Academic Purposes (EAP). In this case, it is an expectation of the English department that students follow conventions and expectations of textual construction in English taught in EAP course. As an academic staff member, I could access the whole collection of dissertations from the English Department. However, I limited the search within the
years of 2008-2011 of their completion, as they were sufficient to provide insights into the research questions and the levels of achievement. In the process of data selection, maximum variation sampling, that illustrates the range of variation in the phenomena to be studied, was undertaken so as to help ensure that the data being collected are sufficient to address the aim and focus of the study. Gall, Gall, & Borg (2007, p. 182) argue that ‘this strategy serves two purposes: to document the range of variation in the projects and to determine whether common theme[s], patterns, and outcomes cut across this variation’. However, the final choice of dissertation was based on the approximation of its topic, methodology, and the length of the text. In spite of the ‘A’ grade Sri’s dissertation got, the dissertation was also chosen by a thorough process of selection, with the researcher undertaking a preliminary reading of the texts in terms of the ways dissertations are used to package meanings, to stage the argument, and deploy their language resources to engage with others. The result is that her dissertation represents the best text for the present study.

4.5. Data analysis

Underpinned by SFL theory, the linguistic text analyses draw specifically on Periodicity theory (e.g. Halliday, 1970; Martin & Rose, 2007), genre theory (Martin, 1992, 1997b, 2009; Martin & Rose, 2008; Swales, 1990), and Appraisal framework (Martin, 2000a; Martin & Rose, 2007; Martin & White, 2005). These three theoretical frameworks authenticate the data for the analyses, in which as unit of analysis for the present research is ‘text’ – a unit of “language in use” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 1). This ‘text’ may refer to different sets of units of meaning, depending the phases of the analyses conducted. Approaching text as a unit of analysis allows linguists/researchers to examine meaning at several levels – that of genre, of text or discourse, of clause, of
group, and of word, depending on the level of delicacy of the analysis and the types of data required.

Each of the three phases of analyses: Periodicity, genre and Appraisal analyses, requires different types of text for the analysis. In the first phase, the Periodicity analysis requires each dissertation as a whole as the data, which is then, as with the level of delicacy of the analysis, divided into its textual parts: chapters, sections, subsection up to paragraph level, depending on the level of hierarchy of the Theme. Each is labelled as its level of thematic development, as will be further elaborated in the next section. The Genre analysis, as the second phase, examines three chapters from each dissertation. This analysis requires each of the three chapters from each dissertation as a complete genre (text type) for the analysis. Each genre (chapter) is further divided into moves/stages and steps/phases of the genre. Then, these parts are compared to the moves/stages and steps/phases of typical academic texts. The last phase of the analyses (Appraisal analysis) requires data in the level of discourse semantics, considering that the realisations of stance-taking and negotiations of meanings can be in various abstractions beyond the clause (Martin & White, 2005). In this case, the analyses dealt with relevant data in the forms of semantic and grammatical patterning within the text at the levels of the stage, phase, clause, group and word. As the summary, the data for each phase of the analysis are texts, in various realisations depending on the type and the delicacy of the analysis.

The three phases of analysis correlate to each other. Because of the lengthy nature of the dissertations, textual analysis was initially conducted employing Periodicity theory to map the hierarchy of Themes, or thematic development, which is sensitive to the staging of the genre (Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 198). Genre analysis on
three selected chapters from each dissertation was then undertaken to investigate the way each student writer staged meanings in developing the arguments in the dissertations. In addition, as the mode of academic writing has been of interest to researchers from other schools of genre—especially ESP, the present research also considers some concepts in genre analysis used in ESP perspectives (e.g. Bunton, 1998, 2002, 2005; Kwan, 2006; Paltridge, 2004; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007; Swales, 1990; Swales & Feak, 2012). These are the concepts used for analysing some chapters or sections of academic work. Finally, an Appraisal analysis was undertaken, as it is crucial in this study to pursue in-depth the deployment of evaluative linguistic resources. This helps to highlight the stance-taking of the dissertation writers and their engagement with others in the literature, which are indicators of the quality of arguments in the texts.

All three types of analysis are meant to seek the way arguments in the analysed dissertations are organised by each writer. These arguments are analysed by comparing them to the one model by Toulmin (1958; 2003), as the following:

![Figure 4.1 The Toulmin’s model of Argument (as in Andrew, 2005, p. 115)](image-url)
Thus, data analyses of the present research consist of three phases: Periodicity, genre and Appraisal analyses. The subsequent figure indicates the way the Periodicity influences the genre analysis that in turn provides the environment for the Appraisal analysis.

Figure 4.2 The complete linguistic analyses

The following subsections discuss further the phases of the analysis in the present research. The sections are arranged based on the order of the phases of the analysis.

4.5.1. Step 1: Analysing the Discourse Flow – Periodicity Analysis

As each dissertation represents a lengthy academic text with complex development of arguments, analysing the hierarchy of Themes in each is necessary. This Periodicity analysis aims to reveal the ways student writers construct their argument in each level of the hierarchy. This analysis was conducted to investigate the ‘texture’ (Halliday,
1973b, 1985b; Martin, 1992) of the dissertations, which relates to the way strings of words realise ‘a living message’ in context (Halliday, 1973b, p. 317). This texture is provided or realised by the periodic, wave-like patterns of discourse (Halliday, 1985b, p. 194). The analysis is significant as it has the potential to track multiple layers of meanings throughout each dissertation where arguments are constructed. The analysis is also key to the facilitation of the other steps of analysis — genre and Appraisal analyses. These layers of meanings ‘construct the method of development of a text, and … this development is particularly sensitive to the staging of the genre’ (Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 198). Furthermore, Martin and Rose explain that a text with well-signposted progression of Themes helps to orient readers as to what the text is about and how it develops.

In exploring the arguments in the two dissertations, two major steps are undertaken in the analysis. The first step is exploring the macro-argument in each dissertation. This macro-argument refers to the way each dissertation as a whole is seen as one complete argument. Thus, the analysis is meant to figure out the main argument each writer is trying to construct by the employment of evaluative linguistic resources. Following what Halliday (1985b, p. 194) explains about the prominence of argument that is achieved by the openings and final parts of the text, the analysis is done with particular focus on these two chapters. In addition, as both dissertations are conventionally, both are analysed with this same model. The analysis is presented as the following figure.
The second step of the analysis explores arguments in each dissertation in the levels below the dissertation as a whole. This analysis investigates the meso-argument of each chapter, samples of section, sub-section, and up to paragraph level. In doing so, each dissertation is dissembled into its five chapters, each of which is divided into several sections, subsections, and paragraphs. The paragraph is the level where stages or phases of the genre of the chapters are typically flagged. Thus, the first level of the hierarchy (the highest macroTheme) in Sue’s dissertation is the five chapters. Each chapter is then divided into several sections that form the second level of the hierarchy (the lower macroTheme, often the section). The third level is the subsection (the lowest macroTheme), and paragraph is the lowest level of analysis (the hyperTheme).

Sometimes, there is no subsection within a section of a chapter; the paragraph forms the penultimate stage of this textual analysis. The analysis of the Periodicity of the dissertation is presented as the following: The highest macroThemes are in a larger font and in bold. These are followed by lower layer macroThemes. The more nuanced or specific discussion is presented in the boxes that are indented and in smaller fonts (subsection and paragraph). The use of “indentation in the first instance outlines something of the relation of these larger waves of information to the smaller ones” (Martin & Rose, 2007, p.188), that is, indentation indicates the layers of the text that are predicted by previously occurring text (as used in Matruglio (2014, p.96)).
4.5.2. Step 2: Analysing the Staging of Arguments – Genre Analysis

In the first place, genre analysis began by exploring the structure of each complete dissertation as a whole, thus seeing the dissertation as a macrogenre. In this way, the analysis was concerned with the ways Sri and Sue staged the complete dissertations in their constructions of the argument. Then, the next round of genre analyses was undertaken, treating each chapter as an independent genre. Each chapter was analysed for its stages and phases by examining the realisations of meanings in each chapter. In doing so, each dissertation underwent the sub-phases as described below. This top-down analysis was refined as the more detailed linguistic analysis undertaken in Phase 3 either confirmed or challenged the original genre analysis.

4.5.2.1. Analysis of the Introductory Chapter

The analysis of an introductory chapter plays a central role in exploring the staging of the discourse of the whole text. The analysis aims to explore the way the writers justify the research being reported (Samraj, 2002), locate their work adequately in relation to the field, and acknowledge their intellectual ‘debts’ explicitly (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007, p. 84).

The analysis of the introductory chapter in this research drew on a framework developed initially by Swales (1990) and Bunton (2002 (as modified version of Swales'
model)) and combined with the way Hood (2006) did. With the exception of Hood’s (2006), there was no detailed genre analysis on the chapter that was underpinned by SFL. Thus, the present research adopted the phasing offered in Bunton (2002) with some modification as per Hood (2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staging in CARS model for introductory chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1. Arguing for the object of the study</strong> by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1: showing that the general research area is important, central, interesting, problematic, or relevant in some way (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: providing background information about the topic (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: introducing and reviewing items of previous research in the area (obligatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4: defining terms (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2. Arguing for the need for new knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1: indicating a gap in the previous research, raising a question about it, or extending previous knowledge in some way (obligatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: identifying a problem/need (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3. Arguing for the writer’s contribution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1: outlining purposes/aims, or stating the nature of the present research or research questions/hypotheses (obligatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: announcing principal findings/stating value of research (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: indicating the structure of the thesis and providing mini-synopses (previews) of each subsequent chapter (obligatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4: outlining the theoretical position (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5: describing the methods used in the study (optional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.5 Stages and phases in typical introductory chapter (Bunton, 1998, 2002; Hood, 2006; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007; Swales, 1990; Swales & Feak, 2012)*

**4.5.2.2. Analysis of the Literature Review Chapter**

Analysing the literature review chapter (LR) of the two dissertations was an important step as the chapter plays a very important role in the development of the whole argument, the chapter (LR) is often considered a ‘boring but necessary chore’ of the any academic text (Swales & Feak, 2000, p. 116). Also, the position of the LR may be inconsistent, either belonging to the opening part or ‘background to the study together with theoretical framework to a study’ (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). To analyse the LR of both dissertations, the present study employed a framework developed by (Kwan, 2006), as the following.
Staging for literature review chapter

### Stage 1. Opening

### Stage 2. Body, Phases:

**Phase 1.** Establishing one part of the territory of one’s own research by:
- Strategy A# surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims
- Strategy B# claiming centrality
- Strategy C# surveying the research-related phenomena

**Phase 2.** Creating a research niche (in response to Move 1) by:
- Strategy A counter-claiming
- Strategy B gap-indicating
- Strategy C asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed
- Strategy D asserting the relevancy of the surveyed claims to one’s own research
- Strategy E abstracting or synthesizing knowledge claims to establish a theoretical position or a theoretical framework

**Phase 3.** (optional) Occupying the research niche by announcing:
- Strategy A research aims, focuses, research questions or hypotheses *
- Strategy B theoretical positions/theoretical frameworks *
- Strategy C research design/processes *
- Strategy D interpretations of terminology used in the thesis *

### Stage 2. Conclusion:

*Figure 4.6 Stages, phases and strategies in LR (Kwan, 2006)*

#### 4.5.2.3. Analysis of discussion chapter

Analysing the discussion chapter was important in the present research as it enabled me to explore the way student writers correlated the relevant theories, the research of others, and their own findings in developing a complete argument. There have been studies of the discussion chapter, and the present analysis employed the following framework (Holmes, 1997; Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988; Ruiying & Allison, 2003; Swales & Feak, 1994). The stages and phases in this framework provide methods commonly used by academic writers in developing the discussion chapter of their studies, as shown in the following.

*Table 4.3 Stages and phases in typical discussion chapters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usually present</th>
<th>Occasionally present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 1: Introductory Restatement of Purpose, research questions or hypothesis</strong></td>
<td>Centrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Niche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 2: Consolidation of Present Research usually many lower</strong></td>
<td>Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.3. Step 3: Analysing the Writers’ Engagement with Others

This last step of the analysis investigates the way the two writers employed evaluative meanings in their dissertations. As the major concern of the study was how the writers engaged with readers and other writers in the field, the Engagement system dealing with ‘sourcing attitudes and the play of voices around opinions in discourse’ (Martin & White, 2005, p. 35) that the writers showed in negotiating meanings in their texts became the major focus, rather than the other two systems in Appraisal framework – Attitude and Graduation. However, it is important to remember that the Appraisal analysis was driven by the system of Attitude, as the core of the framework, and this system then leads to the analyses of Engagement and Graduation systems. Thus, the two systems – the system of Attitude (concerned with the resources employed to realise the writer’s alignment (or otherwise) with respect to the information being negotiated) and the system of Graduation (referred to the linguistic options for grading the evaluative values) were referenced when they indicated and supported the writers’
engagement. The following is the framework of Appraisal that shows how the focus of the analysis positions between the other two systems.

![Appraisal System](image)

*Figure 4.7 Appraisal System (Martin & White, 2005, p. 38)*

This step of the analysis was done at the level of discourse semantics, considering that the realisations of stance-taking and negotiations of meanings can be in various abstractions beyond the clause (Martin & White, 2005). In this case, the analyses dealt with relevant semantic and grammatical patterning within the text at the levels of the stage, phase, clause, group and word. The analysis was done by observing the Engagement framework as per (Martin & White, 2005) below:

![Engagement framework](image)

*Figure 4.8 Engagement framework: contract and expand (Martin & White, 2005, p. 104)*

In the first analysis, the engagement was examined to see whether a Monogloss or Heterogloss value was in play. This was to see if any part the analysed sentence suggested any source of the proposition being negotiated. When it was monoglossic
value, the analysis was terminated in this point; yet the value of engagement might still have to be examined further. On the other hand, when it was the heteroglossic value that was in play, further analysis examined the kinds of engagement displayed, as per categories named by Martin and White (2005, p. 134):

Figure 4.9 Complete Engagement System (Martin & White, 2005, p. 134)

For instance, the analyses of the dissertations were conducted as per this example.

**Purpose of the Study**

[A.1.a] This study concerns early literacy transitions between home and school (*Monogloss*). It aims to describe the relationships between the home and school literacies of two Australian children, who are credited with differing degrees of competency (*Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Distance and (-) Judgment: Capacity*) with school literacy in their third year of schooling. The study has been designed to identify ways in which the students could be further assisted (*Heterogloss: Entertain + Graduation*) in their school literacy learning.

The first sentence is a *Monogloss* statement that is the writer’s own proposition being negotiated. This *Monogloss* sentence is typical in the opening of a paragraph and used to state the point the writer will negotiate in the paragraph. The second sentence is
Heterogloss: Expand, that functions to open a space for other possible voices to negotiate. This is also the case with sentence three. This analysis is followed by examining the possible ‘point’ the writers negotiate and its potential impact.

4.6. Conclusion

This chapter has described and justified the methodology for the research. As the ways in which argument is developed in academic texts are various, the theories and frameworks for analysing the development are also varied. The present research concentrates on the textual and interpersonal zone of the quality of argument, as it is manifested through the way meanings are organised as unified whole and staged to achieve the communicative purposes (as genre), as well as the way stances are taken, and student writers carry out negotiations. Thus, there is a principled consistency among the different features of the analytical framework in terms of discourse purpose and text staging.

The following two chapters describe the findings of the analyses of the Australian and Indonesian dissertations consecutively. The presentation of the findings will be organised firstly by the assistance of Periodicity analysis for the aforementioned reasons. It then is followed by the analysis of genre and evaluative language simultaneously.
Chapter 5  Argument in Sue’s Dissertation

5.1  Introduction

This chapter examines the arguments presented in Sue’s dissertation. In particular, it details how the dissertation is used for constructing convincing arguments that embody the organisation of the text as a unified whole, the staging of meanings to achieve communicative purposes, and her engagement with others in the literature where she takes up their positions in the discourse community. This chapter examines the range of linguistic resources in Sue’s dissertation employed to construe the development of quality argument. As a preview, this dissertation is a lengthy (38,950 words) text written by an English-speaking background student from an Australian university. The dissertation, written as part of the requirements of a Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood) Honours, reports on an investigation entitled ‘Home/Community and School Literacies: Transitions for young learners’. It is structured observing the ‘traditional-five-chapter type’ thesis or dissertation (Bunton, 1998; Dong, 1998; Paltridge, 2004; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). It comprises five chapters: Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Findings and Discussion.

The chapter here in this thesis presents an analysis of the argument presented in Sue’s dissertation using the theoretical underpinnings described earlier (see Chapters Three and Four). A three-fold analysis of Sue’s dissertation is presented as follows: The first step, the textual analysis, utilises the ‘Periodicity framework’ that focuses on how the arguments are organised across the whole dissertation as a ‘thematic hierarchy’. 
This analysis is conducted to better understand the flow of information throughout the dissertation that culminates in the Claim of the macro-argument. The second step of analysis investigates the generic structure of three selected chapters, as these are the chapters where most of Sue’s negotiations with the literature and with the readers take place. This section will deconstruct the staging of the dissertation into smaller, more detailed moves and steps, in order to examine the way in which the argumentation is managed. The final step of the analysis, focusing on the employment of evaluative linguistic resources, is concerned with more delicate realisations of the arguments and enactments of the author’s engagement with the literature.

In presenting the excerpts taken from Sue’s dissertation, the thesis employs a straightforward coding system. This coding refers to the sources from which an excerpt is taken, presented within a pair of square brackets. For instance, an excerpt coded [A.2.ad] means that it is taken from Sue’s dissertation, that is: Dissertation A /A/, chapter 2 /2/, and paragraph /ad/ – the numbering of the paragraph, which starts from /a/ to /z/, then continues from /aa/ to /az/, /ba/ to /bz/ and so on. In addition, to represent the results of evaluative linguistic (Appraisal) analysis, excerpts in **bold** font are instances of attitude; *underlined* excerpts are for graduation; and excerpts in *italics* indicate engagement values.

### 5.2 Step 1: Mapping the Macro-Argument in Sue’s Dissertation

Mapping the textual organisation of a lengthy piece of writing is a challenging task yet important for understanding how the text – Sue’s dissertation – achieves its coherence. The analysis of Periodicity offers insights into the ‘texture’ (Halliday, 1973b, 1978a, 1985b; Martin, 1992) of Sue’s dissertation, that is, the organisation of information into a coherent ‘whole’. Specifically, a Periodicity analysis describes the hierarchy of Themes
that assists readers to predict the development of the arguments at different levels of structure in the text. Each level of structure has the potential to contribute to the construction of the main argument in the text. As a result, the most effective dissertations are characterised by high levels of attention and planning (Martin, 1992, p. 444). Thus, the texture of Sue’s dissertation can be perceived through its ‘periodic, wave-like patterns of discourse, in which the prominence is achieved by the beginnings and endings’ (Halliday, 1985b, p. 194) of its chapters, sections, and paragraphs.

In analysing the hierarchy of Themes, Sue’s complete dissertation is partitioned into its textual elements in a hierarchical order, as explained in Sub-section 4.5.1 of the Methodology chapter. The analysis in this section here focuses on the dissertation as a whole (macro-argument) and the way “macroTheme should predict the argument’s development through the text” (Matruglio, 2014, p.95). The discussions on meso-arguments are presented in the subsequent section (Section 5.3) through genre analysis, and more delicate linguistic analysis focused on the micro level is presented in section 5.4 below. This layering of meanings assists the writer of a lengthy text to map the text’s arguments, in this case focusing on the main argument. The following discussion describes the hierarchy of Themes that construct the macro-level argument.

As one whole text, Sue’s dissertation denotes a complete macro-argument,\(^5\) constructed through a number of chapters, each of which fulfils a particular function contributing to the overarching argument. The text construes the typical argument structure of a dissertation (e.g. Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). The following table (Table 5.1) indicates the development of Themes in Sue’s dissertation. The Theme, according

---

\(^5\) Macro-Argument is closely related to macro-genre (Rose & Martin, 2012). Here the term is preferred to demonstrate the complex relationship between various levels of argument.
to Halliday (as in, Halliday, 1970, p. 191; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 58; 2014, p. 83) is the departure point of message; in other words, an analysis of Theme or thematic patterning offers important insight into meanings. A text is patterned through hierarchies of meaning which become increasingly more delicate. In this case, the presentation of Periodicity is shown in the indenting, indicating the layers of the text that are predicted by previously occurring text. This hierarchy is captured in Table 5.1 below.

**Dissertation Title:** Home/Community and School Literacies: Transitions for young learners

**Chapter One: Introduction:**
- Announcing the overarching or macro-argument in the dissertation
- Establishing warrant for Sue’s research that home and school literacy transition is worthy of investigation

**PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**
- Stating the MacroTheme of the dissertation as well as of the chapter: The main point that will be developed in the macro- and meso-levels of argument
- Outlining the purposes/aims, or stating the nature of Sue’s study

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

**CONTEXT OF THE STUDY**

**RATIONALE/SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

**PERSONAL ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY**

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

**DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

**LOCUS OF THE STUDY**

- Participants
- Sites

**THEORETICAL LOCATION OF THE STUDY**

**DEFINITION OF TERMS**

- Literacy
- Literacy Experiences, etc.

**PRESUPPOSITIONS SURROUNDING THE STUDY**

**THESIS OVERVIEW**
- Presenting MacroNew of the chapter
- Foreshadowing how the topic of the study is further developed beyond this introductory chapter

- **Chapter Two: Literature Review**
- Contextualising Sue’s research
- Reviewing studies and theories of literacy transition

**INTRODUCTION**
- Setting scope and structure of the review
- Reminding readers about the theme and topic of the study

**WHAT IS LITERACY**

Socio-cultural Approaches to Literacy
Multi-literacies

**HOME/COMMUNITY LITERACIES**

**SCHOOL LITERACIES**

School as a Socialising Tool
The Development of Literacy Education

**TRANSITIONS BETWEEN HOME AND SCHOOL LITERACIES**

Previous Research on Children’s Early Literacy Transitions

**TEACHING: EFFECTIVE PRACTICES AND RELATED ISSUES**

Discovering Children’s Home Literacies
Practical Ideas for Assisting Literacy Transitions
Preventative Factors in Assisting Literacy Transitions

**CONCLUSION**

- Summarising the discussion
- Restating the gap/niche, and
- Occupying the identified gap/niche
- Foreshadowing the way the chapter influence the design of the study (methodology chapter)

- Chapter Three: Methodology
- Justifying the methodology: qualitative and case study
- Detailing the methods

**INTRODUCTION**

- Outlining the boundaries of the chapter
- Orienting readers with the research (aims) and the chapter’s boundaries.
- Restating the research questions

**STUDY DESIGN**

Constructivist Research Paradigm

**METHODOLOGY**

Qualitative Approach
Case Study Approach

**LOCUS OF THE STUDY**

Sites of the research
Participants
Ethical Procedures

**DATA COLLECTION METHODS**

Entering the Field
Explanation and Justification of Methods
- Interviews
- Observations
- Artefacts and Texts
- Role of the Researcher
- Working with Young Children

**SEQUENCE OF DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES**

Pilot Study
Phase One: Entering the field
Phase Two: Descriptive observations and artefact collection
Phase Three: Focused observations and first interviews
Phase Four: Specific focused observations and interviews

DATA ANALYSIS
- Data Management
- Content Analysis
- Informal Data Analyses
- Formal Data Analysis and Reporting the Findings

ISSUES OF AUTHENTICITY AND TRUSTWORTHINESS
- Thick Description
- Triangulation
- Chain of Evidence

CONCLUSION
- Restating the underpinning paradigms
- Summarising the methods
- Foreshadowing the subsequent chapter

• Chapter Four: Findings
• Describing and detailing the data about literacies of the two subjects: home and school
• Evaluating the literacy practices between the subjects of the research

INTRODUCTION
- Justifying the presentation of literacy practices
- Setting up the way the data are presented and structured

THE SCHOOL: Wabel Park Primary School (WPPS)
THE TEACHER: Mrs Davies
THE CLASS: 2D

LITERACY AT SCHOOL
- Available Texts
- Literacy Experiences and Activities
- Purpose, Value, and Associated Boundaries

CONNECTIONS
- Home-School Relationships
- Teacher-Teacher Relationships

CASE STUDY: NEIL
- Neil’s Home

NEIL’S HOME AND SCHOOL LITERACIES
- Available Texts
- Experiences and Activities
- Value, Purpose and Associated Boundaries

CONNECTIONS
- Brenda and Brian’s Knowledge about School
- Mrs Davies’ Knowledge about Home
- Mrs Davies’ Knowledge of other Current School Learning
- Brenda’s and Mrs Davies’ Knowledge about Past Learning
- Generational Patterns

NEIL’S LITERACY: SUMMARY

CASE STUDY: JADE
- Jade’s Home
# JADE’S HOME AND SCHOOL LITERACIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiences and Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value, Purpose and Associated Boundaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CONNECTIONS

- Anna’s Knowledge about School
- Mrs Davies’ Knowledge about Home
- Anna’s and Mrs Davies’ Knowledge about Past Learning
- Generational Patterns

## JADE’S LITERACY: SUMMARY

### CONCLUSION

Summarising the findings and appraise the chapter

Previewing the following chapter

- Chapter Five: Discussion
- Generalising from the findings
- Consolidating all information to reconstruct the macro-argument

## INTRODUCTION

Referencing to previous research

Orienting readers and justifying the presentation of the discussion

### SECTION ONE: TRANSITIONS BETWEEN HOME AND SCHOOL LITERACIES

- What are the Children’s Home/Community Literacies?
- What are the Children’s School Literacies?
- What are the Similarities/Continuities across these Contexts?
- What are the Differences/Discontinuities across these Contexts?
- What are the Current Home-School Connections and Lines of Communication?

### SECTION TWO: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING PRACTICE

- How might the Information Obtained about Students’ Literacies be used to Enhance their Acquisition of School Literacy?

Neil

Jade

- What does the Literature (Particularly Professional Advice for Teachers) Suggest about Assisting Students’ Literacy Transitions?

Two-way Home-School Communication

Meaningful Connection/Homework

Integrated Units and Digital Texts

### SECTION THREE: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

### CONCLUSION

Consolidating all components of macro-argument to reach the Claim

Presenting suggestions for further research

---

Figure 5.1 Hierarchical Layers of Meanings in Sue’s Dissertation

The dissertation comprises five chapters, each of which is developed to serve an essential role in the construction of the macro-argument. The ‘Introductory’ chapter which provides the ‘hypothesis’ (as in Andrews, 2005; Hegelund & Kock, 1999;
Toulmin, 2003), is vital in the construction of the macro-argument. This term refers to the Theme of the text, where the ‘point of departure’ of the dissertation is located. The chapter announces the overarching or macro-argument in the dissertation. In doing so, the chapter does two things: it argues for the study to address a research gap (Purpose of the study) and it foreshadows how the topic is further developed beyond the introductory chapter (Overview of Thesis). The first role relates to the claim of the macro-argument that ‘home and school literacy transition for young children is worthy of investigation’. This claim is not explicitly stated but readers may easily infer it from the opening part of the introductory chapter. Because, in many cases, the claim is not restricted to a single sentence or passage’ (Hegelund & Kock, 1999). Consider the following excerpt:

**Purpose of the Study**

This study concerns early literacy transitions between home and school. It aims to describe the relationships between the home and school literacies of two Australian children, who are credited with differing degrees of competency with school literacy in their third year of schooling. The study has been designed to identify ways in which the students could be further assisted in their school literacy learning.

[A.1.a]

The opening of Sue’s introductory chapter – ‘Purpose of the Study’, plays a significant role in the development of the arguments in the chapter as well as in the dissertation as a whole. In the excerpt above, Sue states the concern (the relationships between home and school literacies), the scope (two students in year 3) and the aim (to identify ways to enhance students’ literacy learning) of the study. It also suggests the nature of the design; that is, case study or qualitative research. All of these ideas anticipate the content of the subsequent sections of this introductory chapter and other chapters of the dissertation. The way the student writer presents these topics in the above paragraph indicates that she intends to guide and lead readers as to what they may expect from
their reading of the dissertation from the very beginning. This presentation of the topic is further developed in the final section of the chapter – ‘Thesis Overview’, which relates to the second role of the chapter – to guide readers to the development of the subsequent chapters. In this case, the end section of the introductory chapter acts as the macroNew of the chapter; that is, it provides a map of how the thesis will unfold in order to report the research.

The ‘Literature Review’ (LR) chapter is significant in the construction of the macro-argument. The chapter provides theoretical grounds (theoretical Data) and specific Data taken from other studies (Hegelund & Kock, 1999). The chapter is closely related to, and further advances, the argument in the ‘Introductory’ chapter, that is, to further develop evidence of a gap in the research. In this sense, it contextualises the study that is, justifying its significance and displaying its uniqueness compared to those identified in the literature (Creswell, 2003; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). In doing so, it reviews the previous studies and theories in the literature. Within the macro-argument, the LR typically represents a ‘necessary core’ (Swales & Feak, 2000) in the development of the dissertation. For this reason, the literature review is typically a challenging chapter to develop.

The ‘Methodology’ chapter accomplishes a similarly important task yet often remains invisible in the argument structure. It is closely related to the ‘Warrant’ in the macro-argument in that it rationalises and explains in detail the ways the study was conducted. The chapter also functions to provide other researchers with sufficient detail to enable them to replicate the study (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007; Swales, 2004). In doing so, justification and description of the research methodology are necessary.
The ‘Findings’ chapter is similarly important in the development of the macro-argument. This chapter further develops the arguments presented in the introductory and LR chapters by locating them in the data collected for the study, and it enters into a dialogue with other voices in the field. Within the dissertation, the chapter functions to provide ‘specific Data’ (Hegelund & Kock, 1999) drawn from Sue’s own study. In doing so, it details the children’s literacy experiences at home and school. It also provides some contextual information about the children’s home and school environment.

The final ‘Discussion’ chapter also plays a dual role within and beyond the construction of the argument in the dissertation. In Sue’s dissertation, it finalises the construction of its macro-argument by consolidating all the lines of the argument deliberated on in previous chapters. It develops the argument further by restating the Claim, synthesising the ideas presented throughout the thesis and generalising from the findings as it responds to the research questions to construct a convincing overarching argument. The implications and the suggestions for further research go beyond the thesis argument presented here and into its legacy for the field. As a summary, the following figure portrays how the Themes are developed within Sue’s dissertation.

Table 5.1 Thematic Development in Sue’s Dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>MacroTheme</th>
<th>MacroNew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Announcing the overarching or macro-argument in the dissertation</td>
<td>Foreshadowing how the topic of the study is further developed beyond this introductory chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Contextualising Sue’s research</td>
<td>Restating the gap/niche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Justifying the methodology</td>
<td>Foreshadowing the subsequent chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Describing and detailing the findings</td>
<td>Summarising the findings and appraising the chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Consolidating all information to reconstruct the macro-argument</td>
<td>Consolidating all components of macro-argument to reach the Claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestions and further research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The thematic development in Sue’s dissertation indicates complex relations between MacroThemes and MacroNew across the chapters. For instance, the MacroTheme of the introductory chapter is further developed in its MacroNew, which suggests the development of the MacroThemes of the subsequent chapters. At the same time, the MacroNew of one chapter foreshadows the development of the MacroTheme of the chapter that follows it. The different arrows indicate the way one part, either Theme or New (Rheme), suggests the development of the other one.

The above thematic development closely links to the structure of its macro-argument. Identifying how the macro-argument is realised through the hierarchies of meaning in alignment with Toulmin’s model (see Figure 5.2 as also presented in page 104) is challenging.

![Figure 5.2 The Toulmin’s model of Argument (in Andrew, 2005, p. 115)](image)

Generally, an argument is structured based on a claim that lies in the ending position of texts – the conclusion. Thus, in analysing argument, the conclusion is the prominent part of the case, the high point or the peak of ideational and interpersonal meanings towards which the other components of argument are leading.

However, finding the components of argument in Sue’s dissertation is challenging because the Claim (C), Data (D), Warrant (W), Rebuttal (R), Backing (B), and Qualifier (Q) of the argument spread across the text. Further, Periodicity analysis found that some of the components are not obviously evident. These argument
components as those which are identified by Toulmin, do not readily align with the layers of thematic development. For example, locating the Claim (C) requires an analysis of the whole ‘Discussion’ chapter as with the typical Claim which ‘cannot be located to one single passage’ (Hegelund & Kock, 1999). The following table summarises the results of the analysis of Sue’s dissertation in regard to the components of argument.

Table 5.2 Macro-Argument in Sue’s Dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of argument</th>
<th>Text extracts from Sue’s dissertation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>Overall, the case studies have highlighted for teachers the importance of not making generalisations and assumptions about students’ literacies. [A.5.ba]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifier</td>
<td>… the importance of not making …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Theoretical data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. A broader perspective encompasses literacy as social practice. This perspective points out that a range of skills - other than solely … [A.2.d]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. A major feature of the current socio-cultural milieu is digital technology. The complexities of modern communication techniques and technologies have added to the need to … [A.2.h]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific data drawn from studies by others</td>
<td>1. Literacy is highly controversial and, as will be shown in the review of the literature, its evolving definition is regularly contested. The results of both international and national assessments of literacy … often generate considerable concern …. However, Freebody (1997) highlights that there has not actually been a decline in the results of Australian …. [A.1.e]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. There are many who argue against the view of literacy as a set of skills which can be learned. Freebody (1997), for example, compares …. In the last two or three decades, definitions of literacy have continued …. Despite the gradual broadening of what literacy is thought to involve…. [A.2.c]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific data drawn from Sue’s own study</td>
<td>1. In summary, the close observations of Neil at home and school…. The data show that many of the literacies …. However, the complexities of literacy also became apparent…. There were also many literacy experiences occurring at home …. Although Brian was assisting with reading groups at the time of research, it did not seem that …. [A.4.at]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Jade’s case study data reveals a less successful and uneven process of school literacy acquisition thus far. This is despite the relationship which has been built …. There appears to be considerable disjuncture between her home experiences, and those at school …. [A.4.cd]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 The excerpts are coded accordingly to facilitate easy referencing, as aforementioned. For instance, an excerpt coded [A.5.ba] means that it is taken from Sue’s Dissertation /A/, Chapter Five /5/, and paragraph /ba/ that refers to the numbering of the paragraph.
On one hand, one component can be realised by one paragraph, one section or even one chapter (see Table 5.3). For instance, the ‘Literature Review’ chapter presents a major form of Data for the argument (discussed in detail below). On the other hand, one layer of thematic development can contain several components of argument. The ‘Introductory’ chapter is a good example of this as some lower levels of Theme realise different components of the macro-argument. The following deliberations elaborate the ways in which the components of the macro-argument are realised.

The Claim is a vital component of an argument in academic writing. It is typically located at the conclusion of the text. The main claim of Sue’s dissertation is located in Chapter 5, The Discussion chapter: “Overall, the case studies have highlighted for teachers the importance of not making generalisations and assumptions about students’ literacies”. This statement summarises the whole discussion of the case study data, the theories and other studies as well as the controversies in the field of literacy the dissertation has presented. It conforms to the features described by Hegelund and Kock (1999), that the claim is something that the author (Sue) ‘has to say – a statement that is hers, not just a reiteration of statements made by one or several scholars she has studied’. Located in the Discussion chapter of Sue’s dissertation, the
Claim also functions as the MacroNew (Halliday 1985, p.124) in that it highlights the new information contributed by the research to the field of study.

As a dissertation is an academic text, grounds or Data that refer to ‘the facts we appeal to as a foundation for the claim’ (Toulmin, 2003, p. 90) become significant in making the Claim. In Sue’s dissertation, three kinds of data (as described by Hegelund & Kock, 1999) are evident. Firstly, the theoretical data include a part of the discussion in the Literature Review chapter when theories such as ‘multi-literacies’ and ‘sociocultural literacies’ are explained. These data function to provide a theoretical basis for the claim to be valid, and in turn, the argument becomes convincing. Secondly, the specific data drawn from studies by others are presented in the Introductory Chapter (Chapter One) and in the Literature Review chapter and revisited in other chapters such as the Findings and Discussion chapters alongside the data collected by Sue. These data validate the claim by providing comparable data from others’ studies. The specific data drawn from Sue’s own study refer to the findings of her study as well as some facts that she found to support her study. Most of these data are – but not all, presented in ‘Findings’ and ‘Introduction’ chapters.

In addition, the other four components are there to support argument development, to make the argument more convincing and stronger. Firstly, the Warrant and Backing work in the same context, in which the former links data and other grounds to a claim, legitimising the claim by showing the grounds to be relevant; whilst the latter support the warrant. The Warrant relates to the ‘general, hypothetical statements, which can act as bridges, and authorise the sort of step to which our particular argument commits’ (Toulmin, 2003, p. 91). In the case of the present argument, the statement ‘[A.1.d] Although we often think of literacy as a set of all-purpose skills and
strategies… it is more complex, more local, more personal, and more social than that’, seems to legitimise the statement warning against ‘… not making generalisations and assumptions about students’ literacies’, as literacy is a very complex term. Thus, the warrant guarantees the data presented to support the conclusion (the Claim). The Backing is needed to support the Warrant; in this case by giving a broader sense of the relationship between literacy and children’s lives. By querying whether ‘the literacy taught in schools make meaningful connections to children’s lives’, the writer makes further links between the literacy taught at school and its role in children’s lives. This connection seems to provide further complexity around literacy practices.

The last two components – the Qualifier and the Rebuttal – play opposing roles in the argument. The Qualifier is concerned with the way a writer qualifies her conclusion based on the grounds she has. It refers to ‘some explicit reference to the degree of force which our data confer on our claim in virtue of our warrant’ (Toulmin, 2003, p. 93). In the case of the argument in Sue’s dissertation, the phrase “… the importance of not making …” indicates that claim is not strongly affirmed. The writer seems to express doubt regarding her own claim as some data she has may confirm it, while some others may contradict it. On the other hand, the Rebuttal deals with the potential for objection to the claim because of certain conditions of exception. Toulmin (2003, p. 94) explains that Rebuttal refers to ‘circumstances in which the general authority of the Warrant would have to be set aside’. In the first excerpt, the fact that Jade’s experience includes some features (for instance, as in [A.4.bf]: ‘Jade was on-task for over 90% of the lesson and finished first out of the group of six children’, and in [A.4.ay]: ‘at home, Jade shares approximately 200-250 books with her two younger brothers’) that could lead her to be a high achiever in literacy (which in fact she is not)
becomes an exceptional condition. On the other hand, Neil proves to be as successful as we might expect with all of the benefits he has. Thus, though this Rebuttal represents a condition that may not align with the Claim; a counterclaim is that, in this case, we cannot make any generalisation about literacy practices as Sue states. In this way, the Rebuttal actually acts to support the claim. This capacity to anticipate and address counter-arguments or opposing points of view is an important mark of sophisticated argument.

5.3 Step 2: Staging meanings in the meso-level argument

The study recognises that each chapter in Sue’s dissertation represents a genre; that is a distinct patterning of meaning, fulfilling a purpose that contributes to the overarching argument. As we have seen, three chapters were selected as those are most critical to the quality of the argument. Observing the view of genre offered by Martin (e.g. Martin, 1993, 2009; Martin & Rose, 2008), the analysis enables a deeper exploration of how meanings are staged to enact Sue’s negotiation and stance taking in the ‘Introduction’, ‘Literature review’, and ‘Discussion’ chapters. This genre analysis is conducted as complementary to the previous textual analysis that examined the layering of meanings, as genre is considered ‘as a configuration of meanings realised through language and attendant modalities of communication’ (Martin & Rose, 2008). Thus, the Periodicity analysis served to initiate what the genre analysis intends to achieve. Each targeted chapter is considered as an independent genre (Kamler & Thomson, 2006), and will be further analysed to see how it develops interpersonally oriented arguments.

These three chapters are selected as they represent the chapters which, after careful analysis, emerged as those where the writer’s main negotiation with readers, through the use of evaluative meanings as the main aspect of quality argument, took
place. The Introductory chapter, as we have seen, is the macroTheme – the point of the departure of the dissertation where the writer states what the research pursues. The literature review is the site where Sue contextualises her study by presenting the controversies in the field and further clarifies the research gap indicated the introductory chapter. Finally, the Discussion chapter represents the high point of macro-argument of the dissertation, where justifiable conclusions can be drawn out (Toulmin, 2003) by stating the Claim, providing data as evidence, and synthesising all the elements of the argument. These three key chapters are now discussed in detail. In addition, in examining the genre of each of the three chapters, the analysis identifies the social purpose and the generic staging of the chapter.

5.3.1. ‘Creating a space for the research’ through the introductory chapter

The introductory chapter plays a significant role in the argument construction of an academic text. According to Hegelund and Kock (1999) “the introduction should attempt to show that the problem is a relevant one that calls for an answer and may be plausibly addressed by the paper.” The introduction highlights the problem that at the end of the dissertation will be addressed in the Claim.

Analysing the genre of Sue’s introductory chapter provides ways to explore the staging of meanings as they contribute to both the macro-argument as well as meso-arguments. As we have seen, in the development of the macro-argument, the chapter provides the macroTheme that becomes an indication (with its hypothesis or research questions) that the problem is worth researching. This macroTheme relates to and will be restated as in the Claim of the macro-argument.

This chapter of Sue’s dissertation was broadly developed according to the CARS model. It employs the three typical points of persuasion: ‘arguing for the object of the
study’, ‘arguing for the need for new knowledge’ and ‘arguing for the significance of the author’s contribution’ (see Hood, 2006; Swales, 1990). Table 5.4 below presents the genre analysis of Chapter 1.

**Table 5.3 Stages and phases in the introductory chapter of Sue’s dissertation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headings and subheadings in Sue’s Introductory chapter</th>
<th>Classification based on genre analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSE OF THE STUDY [A.1.a]</td>
<td><strong>Phase 1</strong>: Outlining the purposes/aims, and research questions of Sue’s study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH QUESTIONS</td>
<td><strong>Stage 1</strong>: Arguing for the object of the study that home and school literacy transition is worthy of investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT OF THE STUDY: Quotation [A.1.d] and Paragraph 1 [A.1.e]</td>
<td><strong>Phase 2</strong>: Arguing that the area of literacy education is problematic and worth researching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 2 [a.1.f], 3 [A.1.g], 4 [A.1.h], and 5 [A.1.i]</td>
<td><strong>Phase 3</strong>: Providing background information about how controversial literacy is and how its definition is regularly contested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATIONALE/SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY, Paragraph 1 [A.1.j] and 2 [A.1.k]</td>
<td><strong>Phase 4</strong>: Introducing and reviewing the debates on literacy practices from previous research in the area of literacy education in Australia (especially in NSW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 3 [A.1.l]</td>
<td><strong>Stage 2</strong>: Arguing a need for new knowledge Sue’s study in literacy transitions will pursue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY [A.1.m] [A.1.n]</td>
<td><strong>Phase 1</strong>: Indicating why the research on literacy transition is important in the changing context of the use of technology; Multi-literacy and its implication for school literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY [A.1.o]</td>
<td><strong>Phase 2</strong>: Identifies the need of the study to strengthen home-school literacy transitions for their students, amidst the current social and technological climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY [A.1.p]</td>
<td><strong>Phase 1</strong>: Explaining the specificity of Sue’s research: personal motivation and refinement of the project, limitation and delimitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCUS OF THE STUDY [A.1.q], [A.1.r], [A.1.s]</td>
<td>Phase 2: Explaining the subjects of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEORETICAL LOCATION OF THE STUDY [A.1.t]</td>
<td>Phase 3: Explaining the adoption of sociocultural theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFINITION OF TERMS [A.1.u] … [A.1.ab]</td>
<td>Phase 4: Defining terms related to literacy such as ‘multi-literacies’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESUPPOSITIONS SURROUNDING THE STUDY [A.1.ad]</td>
<td>Phase 5: Admitting the subjective assumptions that can influence the results of the Sue’s study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS OVERVIEW [A.1.ae] … [A.1.ah]</td>
<td>Phase 6: Indicating the structure of the thesis and providing mini-synopses (previews) of each subsequent chapter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information provided for each stage was sufficiently broad for the reader to grasp the topic of the research proposed. This information functions as a warrant for her study, as well as to foreshadow the development of the argument, as revealed in the previous analysis. Particularly, Sue’s Introductory chapter has been shaped to establish space for the contribution the study will offer by reviewing previous work in the field of literacy, evaluating the emerging problems in the current Australian literacy education scene, and promoting ways to advance literacy transitions between home and school. This concern is indicated by the three main arguments realised in the three stages of the genre. The present study adopts Swales’ (1990) CARS model as a tool for analysis. Accordingly, the introductory chapter can be said to have three stages that correspond to Swales’ terminology of Moves and Steps.

Stage 1
In the first instance, **Stage 1** is used to effectively argue for the object of the study. As with the thesis hourglass model (Atkinson & Curtis, 1998 as cited in Paltridge & Starfield, 2007), this opening stage of the introductory chapter has the important function of guiding readers to the topic of the study, ‘the transition between home and
school literacy’, and arguing that this topic is worthy of investigation. This is where Sue leads readers to the distinctiveness of the topic in her research. To achieve these purposes, the stage is developed through four phases that organise meanings accordingly, as shown in the above table.

Stages are made of smaller bundles of meaning or phases. A change in phase is determined, in this research, by a significant change in language choice in either Field, Tenor or Mode (or a combination of these). Most frequently however, a marked Theme signals a new phase in this analysis. The first phase (Table 5.2) is specifically significant for the development of the meso-argument (as well as the macro-one). This accords with what Halliday (1985b, p. 194) argues about the importance of the beginning (and of ending) of a text, with what Hegelund and Kock (1999) have argued about the close relationship between the beginning of the text and the Claim (that is located at the end of the text). This phase announces what the study aims to achieve (in this case, ‘to describe the relationships between the home and school literacies of two Australian children’ [A1.a]). It is presented at the beginning to address the readers’ expectations about the study. Two sections of this phase are used to establish the introduction of the ‘purpose of the study’ and ‘the research questions’ indicating the objectives of the overall dissertation. The phase briefly outlines the purpose of the study and provides guidance for the readers in terms of the argument to be expected in the dissertation, as was explained in the previous section.

*Table 5.4 Stage 1 Phase 1 in the introductory chapter of Sue’s dissertation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts extract from Sue’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of the Study</strong>&lt;br&gt;This study concerns early literacy transitions between home and school. It aims to describe</td>
<td><strong>Social Purpose</strong>&lt;br&gt;Highlighting the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Stages/Phases</strong>&lt;br&gt;Stage 1: Arguing for the object of the study that home and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the relationships between the home and school literacies of two Australian children, who are credited with differing degrees of competency with school literacy in their third year of schooling. The study has been designed to identify ways in which the students could be further assisted in their school literacy learning. [A1.a] concern, aims, and design school literacy transition is worthy of investigation Phase 1: Outlining the purposes/aims of the research and research questions of Sue’s study

By its position and function in the text, the **Purpose of the Study** plays a role as the peak of the chapter and the dissertation as a whole. Thus, it is central. The topic, ‘early years literacy transition between home and school’ (represented by the paragraph) is the central Theme of her study. Following this, the study’s aim is asserted to describe the topic (‘It aims to describe….’), with an attempt to offer suggestions to further assist students in early years to achieve better rates of literacy learning. These first three sentences work to argue the need for the study. This phase outlines the nature of Sue’s study – the aims and concerns of the dissertation, and a synopsis of what readers may anticipate.

The **Research-questions** section in [A.1.b] and [A.1.c] also plays a significant role in this phase and beyond. These research questions and sub-questions further elaborate the discussion by detailing the purpose of the study. In addition, these questions also direct the researcher to the methodology discussed in the subsequent chapter. These questions clarify and detail the **Purpose of the Study** and link it to the methods, as they ‘provide an opportunity to encode and foreshadow an approach to inquiry’ (Creswell, 2007, p. 107), by helping the writer decide the approaches and the methods used in the study. Consider the following extract:

What is the nature of the transition between the home/community literacies and school literacies of two children, who have been identified as having differing levels of school literacy acquisition?
1. What are the children’s home/community literacies?
2. What are the children’s school literacies?
3. What are the similarities/continuities across these contexts?
4. What are the differences/discontinuities across these contexts?
5. What are the current home-school connections and lines of communication? [A.1.b]

How *might* the students be further assisted with their school literacy learning?

1. How might the information obtained about students’ literacies be used to enhance their acquisition of school literacy?
2. What does the literature (particularly professional advice for teachers) suggest about assisting students’ literacy transitions? [A.1.c]

The research questions also connect the present and the future (expected) states of the literacy transitions. They indicate the author’s conceptualisation of the present conditions of literacy education in the early years, and Sue’s intention of researching how its acquisition can be enhanced. They also preview what possible advances in the field the study might offer. The use of the agentless passive – ‘who have been identified as having differing levels of school literacy acquisition’ is interesting in that it avoids naming the identifier at the same time as it suggests a negative evaluation of those who do so. We understand that Sue’s position does not align with those who made this distinction. The second questions [A.1.c] confirm this and indicate her agreement to efforts to improve the transition, at least by relying on her research findings and the work of others (i.e. teachers). To sum up, this initial phase plays a significant role in introducing the chapter as well as the research project as a whole. To organise the argument further, the subsequent sections and subsections are developed within the framework presented in this phase.

As they are closely related to each other, the next two phases are merged (see Table 5.2b). Phase 2 argues that the area of literacy education is problematic, and Phase 3 provides background information that indicates the controversy in the field, and the
disagreement over its definition. This is evident in the following extract from Sue’s dissertation:

Table 5.5 Stage 1, Phase 2 and 3 in the introductory chapter of Sue’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sue’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context of the Study</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy is highly controversial and, as will be shown in the review of the literature, its evolving definition is regularly contested. The results of both international and national assessments of literacy, such as Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) (Snyder, 2008) often generate considerable concern about the rate of students’ literacy acquisition in the early primary school years (Freebody, 2007; Hammond, 2001). [A.1.e]</td>
<td>Setting up the context for the research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, Freebody (1997) highlights that there has not actually been a decline in the results of Australian standardised literacy testing since the mid-1970s. Recent reports additionally indicate that nearly 95% of Australian students are achieving the benchmarks for reading and writing (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA), 2006), which does not seem indicative of serious problems in students’ early literacy acquisition. Regardless, concerns are regularly publicised through the media and by governments - leading to a public discourse of literacy crisis (Gee, 1990; Freebody, 1997; Street, 1998). This rhetoric provides governments with increasing leverage to impose greater control over the teaching and assessing of literacy. [A.1.e]</td>
<td>Phase 2. Arguing that the area of literacy education is <strong>problematic</strong> and relevant to the current Australian educational context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3. Providing background information about how controversial the field of literacy is and how its definition is regularly contested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, the two phases (Phase 2 and 3) work to construct an argument about the literacy controversies. These phases present Sue’s argument about the general topic – ‘Literacy’, employing attitudinally-loaded expressions (‘highly controversial’ and ‘regularly contested’) in the topic sentence, which will be discussed
further in the Appraisal analysis. In this case, while she argues about how problematic the topic is, the author supports her claim with background information about how controversial the field is, and how its definition is regularly contested. It is typical for academic writing to argue about a research gap – the controversies, what factors are under-researched – to support the need to construct this particular argument. This strategy is important in the writer’s effort to argue for the object of the study. This in turn relates to the following stages for arguing how the research is worthy of investigation.

The next phase (Phase 4) is closely linked to phases 2 and 3. It is typically used to introduce and review items from previous research in the area of literacy education related to the topic in supporting the argument developed. The following extract shows the way Sue does so in this dissertation:

*Table 5.6 Stage 1, phase 4 in the introductory chapter of Sue’s dissertation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text from Sue’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
<th>Stages/Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governments tend to define literacy in terms of certain skills, mainly related to print texts, which they consider to be measurable. According to the Curriculum Corporation (2000) literacy benchmarks ‘do not attempt to describe the whole of literacy learning, nor the full range of what students are taught’. However Nixon (2003) argues that the skills tested often reflect those which are valued. Freebody (1997, p.7) points out that the view of literacy as a ‘unitary construct’ means that the importance of it (and the cost to the country of lacking it) can be asserted more easily. The crisis view can thus result in school literacy being reduced to the teaching of particular discrete skills associated with reading and writing (Angus, Olney &amp; Ainley, 2007; Luke &amp; Freebody, 1999; Nichols, 2003). This argument highlights that the way in which literacy is viewed and assessed in schools can actually contribute to literacy crises. [A.1.f]</td>
<td>Communicative Purpose</td>
<td>Phase 4. Introducing and reviewing the debates on literacy practices from previous research in the area of literacy education in Australia (especially in NSW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The phase [A.1.f] further develops the argument by examining the debate surrounding the topic of literacy. In doing so, Sue reviews several points from prior studies in the field. She begins by reconsidering the way the government defines literacy, and the way some researchers respond to it. She compares and contrasts the government’s position in relation to the definition of literacy to those provided by scholars in the field. This evaluation phase is significant in Sue’s dissertation. In this case, her evaluation reveals what is missing in the ‘problematic’ Australian literacy practices for her study to provide a ‘solution’ to. In doing so, she portrays the view as an unfavourable one. For example, she suggests, education systems ‘… tend to define literacy in terms of certain skills …’ which indicates that Sue is distancing her view from that of the government. The use of reference (Corporation (2000)) suggests that the government has a strong position, which in turn boosts the negative value attached to the government. Yet, by directly challenging this position, some researchers imply that the government’s position is questionable. As her position does not appear to be in favour of the government, she has a chance as well as a challenge to develop it further through her research. She then presents the disagreement between the definitions provided by the government and other researchers in the field in the rest of the paragraph. She concludes the paragraph by indicating a concern about the ‘literacy crisis’. So, in terms of genre, Sue’s introductory chapter follows the typical structure represented by the CARS model (Swales, 1990), especially in this first stage; that is, it comprehensively argues for the object of the study that home and school literacy transition is worthy of investigation.

Stage 2

In arguing for a need for new knowledge, Stage 2 of the introductory chapter critiques previous studies in the field, thus confirming to the CARS model. The stage begins by
critiquing previous studies – their limitations (only adults and minority groups), then establishing/pointing to the gap, and finally, occupying the space/gap in the literature: two children from mid-SES background. In this case, employing a section entitled ‘Rationale/Significance of the Study’, Sue argues that the knowledge in the field of early year home-school literacy transition is incomplete. In doing so, previous studies in related areas are reviewed, signalling her awareness of the complexities of the field by identifying the research trends and comparing the studies to what she is doing. The main purpose of this stage is to reveal a gap that her study intends to occupy. Consider the following extract (see Table 5.8)

Table 5.7 Stage 2, Phase 1 and 2 in the introductory chapter of Sue’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts extract from Sue’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale/Significance of the Study</strong>&lt;br&gt;Many of the studies conducted … have been concerned with either adults or minority groups (see Barton &amp; Hamilton, 1998, p.14; Freebody, 1997, p.15). Of those which focus on children’s literacy, there has been a tendency to examine …. This research will provide a different perspective; that of two children from …. There are more similarities between this research and an Australian study which was conducted on a larger scale (Cairney &amp; Ruge, 1998). However, it is unknown whether the recommendations made by these researchers have influenced educational policy and practice [A.1.j]</td>
<td><strong>Stage 2:</strong> Arguing a need for new knowledge Sue’s study in literacy transitions will pursue Phase 1: indicating why the research on literacy transition is important in the changing context of the use of technology; Multi-literacy and its implication for school literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further, social and technological changes have occurred since the studies mentioned above. Marsh (2003, p.380) states that there is ‘an urgent need for research which examines the out-of-school literacy practices of young children in a rapidly changing landscape of communication (Kress, 1997, p.160) in which multimodal forms of meaning-making are prevalent and shaped in part by technological changes.</td>
<td>Occupying the gap and stating the areas that have not been researched so far such as social and technological changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
innovations’. This study thus differs from the aforementioned studies, including Cairney and Ruge’s (1998), in that it focuses on the literacies occurring in the current day. [A.1.k] multimodal forms of meaning making and so forth social and technological climate

The preliminary literature review in chapter 1 resembles a typical literature review structure. The text is employed to assess the work of others that are different from her research. The studies are singled out since Sue claims the previous studies have certain relevancies to her own study, but they are different from hers in terms of their subjects of the study. It begins by synthesising previous studies so as to show how the trend in the research is different from hers, as in the opening sentence, ‘Many of the studies conducted on … with either adults or minority groups’ [A.1.j]. Here, the text reviews those studies examining adult or minority groups, such as the work of Barton and Hamilton (1998, p.14) and of Freebody (1997, p.15). It then continues to evaluate the similar studies; yet still argues for the differences between her research and those studies she has presented. In this case, the text refers to bigger projects on literacy by experts in the field (for example by referring to the work of Cairney and Ruge (1998)).

However, it is obvious that her text is used to assert that her research is different even from that of Cairney and Ruge (1998), which is similar but with a larger scale of participants. Moreover, the field of literacy is portrayed as unstable and constantly changing in response to various factors such as technology. Then, she introduces her own study as a distinct one, and compares it to a similar kind of study in the field, arguing how different her study is from this one. In summary, the paragraph indicates that her research will further the discussion with respect to more specific phenomena/areas related to issues in early childhood literacy. In this case, there seems
to be a shift from the beginning of the paragraph. In addition, identifying a problem is a crucial phase in this stage. This second phase identifies a change in literacy practices. This phase responds to the demand for ‘an urgent need for research which examines the out-of-school literacy practices of young children in a rapidly changing landscape of communication’.

As stated above, phase 2 responds to the other concern signposted in the stage, that there is ‘an urgent need for research which….’ [A.1.k]. In this short paragraph, the writer maintains that her research is different and necessary, as in “This study thus differs from the aforementioned studies…..” Thus, she is able to argue that the study is unique and contextually urgent. This is further developed with reference to the potential impact of the study ‘This study thus aims to provide general practical suggestions as to how teachers may be able to strengthen home-school literacy transitions for their students, amidst the current social and technological climate. [A.1.1]’

Stage 3 for Sue’s contribution

Finally, in the last stage of Sue’s introductory chapter, in arguing for the contributions of her research as being of value to the field of literacy education, the text is employed to promote and specify her study. This is typically meant to show the potentially positive contribution the study can make to the relevant field of research (Hood, 2006).

Table 5.8 Stage 3 Phase 2 in the ‘Introductory’ chapter of Sue’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sue’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicative Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Orientation to the Study</strong></td>
<td>Articulating that the study is motivated by Sue’s professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The idea for this study initially grew from a broader interest in children who have differing home and school lives in general, and therefore differing cultural capital to that which schools typically value (Bourdieu,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1986). This interest arose from personal and professional experience with such children during voluntary work in schools and practicums undertaken for my Bachelor degree. As this study is of such a short duration, the focus was narrowed to participants’ home and school literacies, as literacy is an area prominent in early primary curriculum. [A.1.m]

The study was originally designed to focus on a student who was not yet achieving school literacy at grade expectations, when there was no obvious explanation for this other than perhaps differing prior knowledge, learning styles or interests. However, at the direction of the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) at the University of Wollongong (UOW), it was amended to include a child who is progressing at or above their grade expectations for school literacy. This added somewhat to the manageability of the project, as the aim was to provide detailed descriptions of the students’ literacy. Overall, the study was designed to benefit my personal knowledge of how to assist children’s literacy transitions, and to hopefully also benefit teachers of students in similar situations by providing more nuanced understandings of difference. [A.1.n]

**Delimitations of the Study**

It is important to ensure the project is manageable (considering the restricted time frame and resources), whilst catering for the possibility of participant withdrawal. Thus four students will be observed initially, with the intention of presenting two case studies in detail. To prevent children’s diverse literacy competencies going unnoticed, no boundaries will be imposed on the amount or type of data collected until observations have begun. For example, the study will not be limited to exploring reading and writing experiences, in case one participant does few activities involving reading and writing at home. This flexible approach is common in qualitative research. The final delimitations are in regard to the selection criteria for student participants. The students chosen for the case studies will be from similar socio-economic backgrounds, will speak English as their first language, and will not have been diagnosed with conditions such as dyslexia. This is to limit the possibility of other factors, beyond the scope of this study, influencing the children’s home and school literacy experiences and practices. [A.1.p]
In developing the argument in this last stage of the introductory chapter, Sue presents her reasons for conducting her research. The motivation ‘for this study initially grew from a broader interest in children who have differing home and school lives in general…’ [A.1.m]). She also discusses her decisions to shape the study to meet the requirements of the ethics committee, as in ‘However, at the direction of … it was amended to include a child who is …’ [A.1.m]. She then concludes her paragraph by arguing that the contribution of her study ‘…was designed to benefit my personal knowledge of … and … benefit teachers of students …’ [A.1.m]. In the following excerpt [A.1.p], the text moves the argument from Sue’s motivation to the details of her study. Sue cautiously outlines the way she would manage her study by anticipating objections. The writer describes the ways she sets the limits on her study, as in ‘It is important to ensure the project is manageable… [A.1.p]’. Not only the number of the participants – with the possibility of their withdrawal, she also presents her concerns that activities the children perform may go unobserved. She then sets the criteria for the student participants ‘to limit the possibility of other factors, beyond the scope of this study’ [A.1.p], such as in ‘Students must be in Stage 1 of schooling …’ [A.1.r]. The setting of the research is also described briefly, as in ‘The main site for the research will be the classroom…. The students’ homes will also be sites’ [A.1.s]. These efforts indicate that she aims at making the study achievable and rigorous. Sue describes how she will endeavour to ensure as naturalistic a setting to the research as possible. In this way, she demonstrates that she has adopted a suitably rigorous approach, thus establishing herself as a suitably enculturated researcher-in-training.

The following phase (Phase 4 of Stage 3) is employed to briefly outline the theoretical position of the study. This position relates to the Warrant of the argument
structure that bridges the **Data** and the **Claim**. The detail of theories presented suggests that the writer is well informed about the theory underpinning the study. She begins by defining and clarifying the terms and concepts used in the dissertation to contextualise her study. Each concept that may have specific meanings and usage in the dissertation is clearly defined to avoid misunderstanding: for example as “‘literacy experiences” is a term used to refer generally to all the literacy-related activities that a child engages in or observes occurring around them; voluntarily or otherwise’ [A.1.w] and ‘In this study, all artefacts, resources and paraphernalia associated with literacy will be referred to as texts’ [A.1.y].

Sue also understands that a qualitative researcher must also demonstrate how their biases and assumptions will impact on the research. She provides a justification of her theoretical position by acknowledging the assumptions, presumptions, and biases that may influence the objectivity of the research. She admits that her subjectivity may play a great role in the study, as in ‘As with other qualitative research, the findings of this study are acknowledged to be shaped by the **subjectivity of the researcher**, rather than being completely objective’ [A.1.ac]. By acknowledging the bias, she shows her awareness of the research methodology and points to the possible hindrances to conducting a good qualitative study.

Finally, in the last phase (Phase 6), the author foreshadows the discussion in the subsequent chapters. The ‘Thesis Overview’ signposts the structure of the subsequent chapters, and their contribution to the developing argument. Sue clarifies what she presents in the chapters and how these chapters are employed to fulfil each of their roles in the overall construction of the argument.
5.3.2. Contextualising research through the Literature Review

Together with the introductory chapter, the Literature Review (LR) chapter is vital in establishing the background of Sue’s study. Whilst the introductory chapter initiates the contextualisation by concisely introducing the topic ‘the early literacy transitions between home and school’ and rationalising the way the research was conducted, the LR elaborates further on the discussion by positioning it among prior studies in the field. Following a three-move structure (considered as ‘stages’ in this thesis), according to Kwan (2006), the chapter canvasses discussions of a wide range of subjects on the topic of literacy in general as well as on the transition between home and school literacies by young learners. Sue reviews and evaluates previous work in the field whilst adopting different stances toward the topics discussed – aligning with some ideas, challenging others. Table 5.9 below summarises the findings of the textual analysis of this chapter.

Table 5.9 Stages and phases in the Literature Review chapter of Sue’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headings and subheadings in Sue’s Literature Review chapter</th>
<th>Classification based on Generic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td>Genre Two: Contextualising research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction [A.2.a]</td>
<td>Stage 1: Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is Literacy [A.2.b] [A.2.c]</td>
<td>Stage 2.a: Describing what literacy is. (Body 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural Approach to literacy [A.2.d - g]</td>
<td>Phase 1. Establishing general territory of her research (Strategy 1A, B, C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiliteracy [A.2.h – m]</td>
<td>Phase 2. Creating a research niche (Strategy 2 A, B, C, D, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home/community literacies [A.2.n – r]</td>
<td>Stage 2.b: Describing home/community literacies (Body 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School literacies School as socialising tool</td>
<td>Stage 2.c: Describing school literacies (Body 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1. Establishing general territory of her research (Strategy 1B, C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of literacy education</td>
<td>Phase 2. Creating a research niche (Strategy 2 A, C, D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions between home and school literacy</td>
<td>Stage 2.d: Describing transition between home and school literacies (Body 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous research on children early literacy transition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching: Effective Practices and related Issues</td>
<td>Stage 2.e: Body Describing teaching (Body 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovering children’s home literacies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical ideas for assisting transition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Stage 3: Closing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A regular pattern emerged in Sue’s literature review chapter. This regularity is seen in the way the chapter is arranged as three stages: opening, body and closing stages (Kwan, 2006), as shown in table 5.10 above. Such typical organisation of the LR was employed as it easily guides the development of the argument of the chapter. Stage 1, the opening stage of the chapter, sets the scope of the discussion in the chapter. In this short section the author reminds readers of: (1) the theme and topic of the study; and (2) the aim, scope, and structure of the review. Stage 2, the ‘body’ stage explores the broader topics related to literacy in general and literacy transition, more specifically. This ‘body stage’ deals with a number of literacy issues and is then divided into five sub-stages (sub-stage 2.a – 2.e), in which the discussion comprises two phases for each sub-stage. This sub-stage organises the discussion of the subjects to recursively establish each issue as part of the research territory (Phase 1) and create a niche from it for the research (Phase 2). Each of these phases was, in turn, subdivided into several strategies (Strategy 1 A – D and Strategy 2 A – E). In the closing stage, the writer
summarises the overall discussion and announces how her study occupies the niche she has established by announcing the theoretical position in her research. A discussion of the details of Sue’s argument in the dissertation follows.

Stage 1

The opening stage comprises a brief preview of the discussion in the chapter describing the chapter and delimiting the discussion. This section establishes the ‘metadiscourse’ or language choices selected by Sue to signal the field and the ideas of interest in the literature. In a short paragraph [A2.a], this stage introduces the discussion on literacy practices that will be reviewed in the subsequent discussions. As is common in the opening stage of many LRs, Sue’s dissertation initiates a dialogue with readers by opening up the topic of literacy practices and describing how they will be guided through that.

Table 5.10 Stage 1 Phase 1 in the Literature Review chapter of Sue’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sue’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
<th>Stages/Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Communicative Purpose</td>
<td>Stage 1. Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1. Setting the scope of discussion by reminding readers about: (1) the theme and topic of the study; and (2) the aim, scope, and structure of the review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This study was designed to describe the…. The study aimed to focus on the continuities and…. The following review of the literature will begin by considering how…. This survey of the theoretical context recognises Guba and Lincoln’s (1994, p.115) assertion that novice researchers need to (enter) understand the ‘history and structure that serve as the surround for their inquiries’. The review will examine…. Despite a very broad view being taken …, the restrictions placed on the scope of this review resulted in the information being limited to that which was most relevant to the study’s findings. [A2.a]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bridging the reader’s existing knowledge gained in the previous chapter with the new information is a useful textual strategy that is deployed in the paragraph. In each chapter, there are examples of the writer leading the reader from known information to new information. The paragraph opens with the overall construct of the dissertation, that is, what the research is designed for, as in ‘This study was designed to describe ….’ and what its aim is, as in ‘The study aimed to focus on ….’ By restating these topics and objectives of the study, readers are guided through the discussion, from the beginning of the chapter. Then this stage concludes by outlining and limiting the discussion in the subsequent sections, e.g. “The review will examine …” and “Despite a (counter) very broad view …’.

The second stage in the literature review represents the main focus for discussion in the chapter – literacy practices. Issues of literacy, especially those relating to home and school practices, and the effort of transition for young learners are discussed in order to establish a general territory (Phase1) and create a research niche (Phase 2) (Kwan, 2006). The discussion in the five sub-stages of stage 2 encompasses the subjects of ‘what literacy is’, home/community literacies’, ‘school literacies’, ‘transition between home and school literacies’, and ‘the teaching: effective practices and related issues’, each employing relatively similar two-phases staging with some variations in the use of strategies. The sub-stage arguments typically worked as seen in the following excerpt taken from Sub-stage 2.a:

*Table 5.11 Stage 2.a Phase 1 in the Literature Review chapter of Sue’s dissertation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sue’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
<th>Stages/Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is literacy?</strong></td>
<td>Creating a research niche in</td>
<td><strong>Stage 2.a.</strong> Describing what literacy is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The definition of literacy has evolved over time, in parallel with changes in technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
education and economic need (Strategy 1B). These definitions are influenced both by the socio-cultural past and aspirations for a more desirable future (Freebody, 2007). Literacy in Western cultures was initially thought to solely involve developing sets of perceptual and cognitive skills for reading and writing print texts (Healy, 2003). As education is designed to prepare students for participation in social and economic life, this traditionally meant learning the acceptable, conventional way to read and write the national language (New London Group, 2000) (Strategy 1C). This resulted in the people who acquired these skills to a higher degree than others being considered as more literate (Strategy 2E). [A.2.b]

There are many who argue against the view of literacy as a set of skills which can be learned (Strategy 1B). Freebody (1997), for example, compares the view of literacy as a single, measurable competence to traditional views of intelligence. In the last two or three decades, definitions of literacy have continued to evolve. This has been in response to research conducted in various communities (e.g., Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Heath, 1983), as well as wider societal and technological changes (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000) (Strategy 1C). Despite the gradual broadening of what literacy is thought to involve, it is still widely considered to involve the reading and writing of conventional print texts (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Knobel & Lankshear, 2006) (Strategy 2A). Definitions of literacy could seem never-ending, as literacy practices continue to shift with changes in society and technology (Strategy 2C). This leaves us with questions such as: are definitions of literacy beyond school-valued print texts valid? Or are they concerned with different sets of practices? (Strategy 2B) [A.2.c]

| Phase 1. Establishing general territory of her research by examining definitions of literacies |
| Strategy 1B claiming centrality: reason |
| Strategy 1C surveying the research-related phenomena |
| Phase 2. Creating a research niche by: |
| Strategy 2A counter-claiming |
| Strategy 2B gap-indicating |
| Strategy 2C asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed |
| Strategy 2E abstracting or synthesising knowledge claims to establish a theoretical position or a theoretical framework |

The extract in the table above is an important part of the literature review as it establishes a research niche and deals with the complexity of literacy, in particular the trouble with attempting to define it. Thus, the writer’s textual moves, steps, and
strategies are geared towards establishing general territory in literacy and then toward the more specific research in early years’ transition literacy.

In reviewing the subject ‘What is literacy?’ Sue positions her study (Phase 1) and then creates a research gap within the subject in question by utilising Phase 2. Moreover, in establishing general territory (Phase 1) she makes use of Strategy 1.b (claiming centrality), followed by Strategy 1.a (surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims), Strategy 1.c (surveying the research-related phenomena), or a combination of both (strategy 1.a and 1.c). However, in creating the research gap she also anticipates other perspectives by ‘counter claiming’ (Strategy 2A).

The staging pattern describes above is typical of the way in which Sue develops her argument in the literature review. For instance, in the first place she begins the Stage 2 of the LR by examining the definition of literacy (Sub-stage 2.a). Within this subject – ‘What is literacy?’ she divides the stage into three parts, each of which was realised by two phases (establishing the general territory (Phase 1) and creating the niche for her research (Phase 2)). In defining ‘what literacy is’ she began to establish the territory by quoting: ‘The definition of literacy has evolved … economic need’ (Strategy 1B) [A.2.b]. This topic sentence helps to claim the centrality of the topic. She then elaborates the territory further by reviewing some related literature. This is achieved by the use of Strategy 1A (These definitions are influenced … to read and write the national language.), and Strategy 1C (… response to research conducted in various communities). Moreover, she directly couples Phase 1 with Phase 2. This coupling is repeatedly done in other sub-stages.

The ‘Conclusion’ section accomplishes the purpose of the genre of typical LR text. This closing stage of the genre plays a significant role in finalising the argument of
the chapter. The stage is utilised for concluding the discussion by occupying the niche, stating the **Claim**, and previewing the subsequent chapters. In this last stage, Sue summarises the whole discussion in the chapter by synthesising the discussion made in the previous stage (Stage 2). The following text illustrates the conclusion of her LR.

*Table 5.12 Stage 3 in the Literature Review chapter of Sue’s dissertation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sue’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
<th>Stages/Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>Summarising the review she has just done, criticising the reluctance of the school curriculum and assessment to make changes, as there have been changes in literacy, mentioning the similar research done but the focus is on lower SES background, and ending the summary by proposing her own research which is distinctive from the other.</td>
<td>Stage 3: Closing (Strategy 3B): Occupying the niche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The literature review has revealed that, although definitions of literacy continue to evolve, school curriculum and assessments often seem to be based on a more traditional view. The diverse range of literacies that … This study was thus designed to ascertain whether there was a need to bridge the gap between the home and school literacies of two students, who had similar socio-cultural backgrounds, but differing rates of school literacy acquisition. The following chapter will describe how the theory and research examined in this review shaped the design of the current study. [A.2.as]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sue positions her study by identifying the shortcomings in the existing research, ‘The literature review has revealed that, although….’ Thus, the review is used as the **Data** for stating the **Claim** of the chapter. Sue’s authorial strategy aligns with Toulmin’s model of argument, that this final stage is usually where the **Claim** can be found (Hegelund & Kock, 1999). As stated previously, the claim of the chapter is as per the following excerpt:

> This study was thus designed to ascertain whether there was a need to bridge the gap between the home and school literacies of two students, who had similar socio-cultural backgrounds, but differing rates of school literacy acquisition.
The **Claim** argues the need to bridge between students’ home and school literacy in order to ease the troubles of transition. Maintaining an objective but critical tone, the writer criticises the inflexibility of school curriculum and assessment processes despite major changes in literacy concepts and practices. However, the use of indirect question (‘… whether there was a need to …’) indicates that her argument is a measured one. As she works to warrant her study, she draws attention to similar research in communities of learners who are socio-linguistically disadvantaged. Finally, she ends the summary by proposing her own research as a means of addressing the problem identified.

5.3.3. **Sue’s Discussion chapter: Integrating results, theory and other studies**

A discussion chapter is a challenging task for dissertation writers because it demands that writers synthesise the findings of their study and enter into dialogue with theory and literature at an abstract level. Analysis of this chapter reveals that it follows the staging of the meanings suggested by previous studies on genre and text analysis (Holmes, 1997; Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988; Ruiying & Allison, 2003; Samraj, 2005; Swales & Feak, 1994). The following table maps the staging of unfolding meanings in Sue’s chapter.

*Table 5.13 Stages and phases in the Discussion chapter of Sue’s dissertation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macrostructure Sue’s dissertation</th>
<th>Classification based on Generic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td><strong>Stage 1:</strong> Introductory Restatement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section One: Transitions between</td>
<td><strong>Stage 2:</strong> Consolidation of the Present Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phase 1.</strong> Summary of Findings  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Phase 2.</strong> Claims about the literacies of both children: their advantages or disadvantages; and adult influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home and school literacies</td>
<td>Phase 3. Linking the findings to the theories and findings from other research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Two: Implications for teaching practice</td>
<td>Stage 3. Proposing Practical Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Three: Recommendations for Future Research</td>
<td>Stage 4. Proposing Recommendations for Future Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Stage 5. Closing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chapter is developed with three main stages, representing a prototypical model of the discussion chapter in the Western academic context according to a number of studies of academic writing (e.g. Bunton, 1998, 2005; Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988; Ruiying & Allison, 2003; Swales & Feak, 1994). Not only does it provide evidence of Sue’s successful enculturation into academic writing practices, it serves to demonstrate Sue’s achievement in ‘contributing to the knowledge and skills’ leading to ‘improving her skills as a teacher and researcher’ [A.1.l].

In developing the discussion chapter, the writer draws on all three stages to ‘bring home’ her argument. The stages involve Stage 1: Introductory Restatement; Stage 2: Consolidation of the Present Study; Stage 3. Proposing Practical Implications,
**Stage 4.** Proposing Recommendations for Future Research, and **Stage 5.** Closing. She opens the chapter by Stage 1 for quoting a statement of a well-regarded scholar that summarises the findings of her study; and by orienting readers and justifying the presentation of the discussion. The quotation is significant in demarcating the readers’ expectation of the study.

Table 5.14 *Stage 1 and phase 1 in the Discussion chapter of Sue’s dissertation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sue’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
<th>Stages/Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the current climate, with an increasing emphasis on measurable literacy outcomes from the early years, the very practices which are intended to ensure such outcomes can militate against children drawing on their social experiences, producing disconnections even for children whom one would expect to be advantaged (Nichols, 2003, pp.85/6) [A.5.A]</td>
<td>Reminding readers against the possible disadvantages for young learners as a result of practices driven by measurable literacy outcome</td>
<td>Stage 1: Introductory Restatement Phase 1. Reminding readers against the possible disadvantages for young learners as a result of practices driven by measurable literacy outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text above serves to restrict other possible stances with respect to the issue. It identifies the weaknesses of ‘an increasing emphasis on measurable literacy outcomes from the early years’, as it may limit children’s positive early literacy experiences. As the quotation is located in the beginning of this chapter, it becomes the main Theme of the chapter indicating how Sue intends to align her readers with the findings of her study. The quotation resonates with, and foregrounds, the findings of the study, as for instance, in the case of one of her subjects of the study (Jade), who is disadvantaged, despite the fact that ‘Jade also had a large collection of books at home and was both read to, and encouraged to read, regularly’ [A.5.f]. The subtleties of disadvantage go beyond merely the number of books and literate experiences provided.
The second Phase of this stage provides a re-orientation to the overarching argument for the readers and justification for the presentation of the discussion. In doing so, the phase begins by restating the purpose of the study, the underpinning theories, the justification of the presentation of the discussion, and a preview of the contents of the chapter. Consider the following excerpt:

*Table 5.15 Stage 1 and phase 2 in the Discussion chapter of Sue’s dissertation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sue’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
<th>Stages/Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This research investigated and described the diverse literacy experiences of two children across their school and home contexts. It was underpinned by sociocultural approaches and the framework of multi-literacies, and thus took a very broad view of what constituted “literacy”. This chapter brings together the information obtained from relevant literature, the study’s methodology, and the data analysis and research findings. In doing so, it responds to the questions framing the study by detailing the continuities and discontinuities that the case study students experience when transitioning between their home and school literacies. As Stake (1995) asserts may be the case with qualitative case studies, some of the findings of the research were unexpected. In answering the second research question, specific suggestions are proposed for furthering the students’ school literacy learning, in addition to general implications for teaching practice. Finally, recommendations are outlined for future research in this area. [A.5.b]</td>
<td>Reviewing the processes undertaken to get to the answers of the research questions Reassessing what the study is about, and what the chapter’s role is within the whole text</td>
<td>Stage 1: Introductory Restatement Phase 2. Orienting readers and justifying the presentation of the discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text above finalises the opening stage by previewing the chapter. It guides readers as to the contents of the chapter and the reasons for its presentation. In doing so, the argument in the text is developed by summarising what the dissertation has achieved thus far. It begins by restating the concern of the research: ‘This research investigated and described the diverse literacy experiences of ….’ Then, it briefly
reiterates the theoretical underpinnings: ‘It was underpinned by….’ The paragraph also states the main discussion the chapter is about to cover: ‘This chapter brings together the information …’, and the way the purpose of the discussion will be achieved: ‘In doing so, it responds ….’ Finally, the justification for the presentation of the findings, and the follow up of the discussion are also presented to complete the overview of the chapter.

Stage 2 of the Discussion chapter constitutes the peak of the development of the argument in Sue’s dissertation. The stage is utilised to consolidate the components of a convincing macro-argument. This consolidation refers to the way Sue rounds up the argument and relates it to the Claim (as previously mentioned in the previous section) to construct the argument. The Claim of the macro-argument is as follows: ‘Overall, the case studies have highlighted for teachers the importance of not making generalisations and assumptions about students’ literacies’ [A.5.ba]. This stage constitutes the macroNew of the text and is crucial in any discussion chapter or discussion section of academic texts.

In making the Claim, the present stage is constructed through several phases that involve generalisations from the findings about the literacies of both children: their relative disadvantages, and adult influences.

Table 5.16 Stage 2 and phase 1 in the Discussion chapter of Sue’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sue’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
<th>Stages/Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to the narrow focus of each sub-question, as well as the limitations placed on the extent of this discussion, each will not be addressed individually. The findings of the students’ home and school literacies were explicitly described in the previous chapter and</td>
<td>Justifying how the answers are depicted in the diagrams and presented in the sections</td>
<td>Stage 2: Discussing in detail the transition between home and school literacy Phase 1. Rationalising the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
have been summarised in Figures B.5.1 and B.5.2 .... [A.5.d] presentation of the discussion of the finding of both children

The excerpt indicates the way Sue presents the findings of her study and organises them in this second stage. This orientation paragraph is needed as Sue responds in detail to the research question. The paragraph is organised as a complete argument with its claim and supporting evidence. This way of developing paragraphs denotes how the writer approaches each text at all levels (i.e. section, subsection, or paragraph) as a complete argument.

Stage 3 of the Discussion chapter is concerned with how students’ literacy transitions might be assisted by the outcomes of her study. Sue proposes some practical implications as the outcomes of her study. She discusses what to do further to assist students with their school literacy learning. In doing so, she asserts that Neil has benefitted from the continuity in his literacy practices. Yet, the study still offers some meaningful activities to be integrated into the school curriculum for some discontinuities in his literacy practices. On the other hand, she proposes possible ways to support Jade’s acquisition of school literacy practices.

Table 5.17 Stage 3 and phase 1 in the Discussion chapter of Sue’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sue’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
<th>Stages/Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>阶段 3: Discussing what to do for the students be further assisted with their school literacy learning</td>
<td>Asserting that less attention will be given to him. Yet there is a need to integrate his home literacy to school literacy</td>
<td>Phase 1. Asserting that as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
activities, with many of his home literacy experiences occurring for a specific, meaningful reason. Such activities could be integrated into the school curriculum, without affecting the outcomes which are being worked towards. For example, Neil could be asked to write letters or e-mails to his peers or people outside of the classroom or school. He could also be required to create texts that may be displayed around the school, such as posters or expositions arguing a certain point. This is a way in which more text-analyst skills could be integrated into English lessons (Freebody et al., 1995). It may also assist in improving Neil’s presentation of work; an aspect which both Mrs Davies and his mother mentioned. [A.5.ab]

Support for the macro-argument is evident in the excerpt from Stage 3 of the discussion chapter above. Because of the continuities between Neil’s home literacy practices and those of his school, he has benefitted and is considered as having achieved well. However, the excerpt above suggests the Rebuttal of the macro-argument. In other words, despite this success, there are still discontinuities in his literacies between his home and school that lead to on the suggestion that there are ‘implications for teaching have arisen in regard to the discontinuities that are present between his home and school literacies’. On the other hand, as Jade is considered to be disadvantaged by the transition into school, her literacy attainment needs deserve attention.

Table 5.18 Stage 3 and phase 2 in the Discussion chapter of Sue’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sue’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
<th>Stages/Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jade</strong></td>
<td>Presenting other point of view about Jade’s literacies that in spite of often getting distracted and</td>
<td>Stage 3: Discussing what to do to further assist students with their school literacy learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seemed to be the case when students were completing individual tasks. During one observation of a guided reading group activity, Jade was observed to spend over 90% of her time on-task. She was also seen to answer questions and orally read more often in reading group activities, because of both the greater opportunity to participate and an apparent increase in her confidence in these situations. Thus, Jade may be assisted in increasing her on-task behaviours, and the quality of the work she produces, if more scaffolded small-group work occurred. If not possible for Jade to be scaffolded by an adult in a small group situation, Jade’s writing development may alternatively be assisted by providing opportunities for group construction of texts, or by “buddying” Jade with a peer who has a higher level of school literacy acquisition. [A.5.ae]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disengaged, she spent very much more time in a guided reading group activity. She might be assisted by more scaffolded small-group work, or by buddying with a peer with a higher level of school literacy acquisition.</th>
<th>Phase 2. Proposing possible way to help Jade by more scaffolded small-group work, or by buddying with a peer with a higher level of school literacy acquisition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This text presents another Rebuttal for the main argument about Jade’s literacies. Despite her literacies being considered as unsuccessful, there are events where Jade performs well enough. This text indicates the main point Sue intends to share about Jade’s literacy achievements. The text begins with Sue’s analysis of what happens to Jade, which leads to her proposal for what adults can do to help her. In spite of the distractions Jade experiences during the lesson, Sue observes certain activities that may be of interest to Jade as she is engaged in these activities. Thus, the writer proposes activities to improve Jade’s engagement with the literacy lessons. The argument in this excerpt appears to make the macro-argument even stronger ‘… the importance of not making generalisations and assumptions about students’ literacies’.

Recommendations for future research, as proposed in Stage 4, become important in inviting readers to test the macro-argument through further studies.
A vast amount of information was obtained from the observations, interviews and (viewed or collected) artefacts during the two home visits (for each student) in this study. However, it was found that the researcher’s presence seemed to affect the natural behaviours and events which occurred on the first visit to students’ homes. It is thus recommended, for research attempting to observe naturally occurring behaviours and interactions in students’ homes, to involve several home visits. [A.5.as]

Due to rapidly changing technologies and definitions of literacy, there is a need for more up-to-date research which examines and compares the home/community and school literacies of children. It would be advantageous for future studies to capture the experiences of a greater number of children. This study has shown that the literacy experiences of two children, both from mid-high SES households, differed significantly. Thus, it may be beneficial for future studies to include children from various SES backgrounds, as well as including children from a range of geographical areas, age groups, and cultural and language backgrounds. [A.5.at]

Considering possible ‘bias’ in the research is important for making even more accepted by the discourse community. The above excerpts indicate how Sue did this. For example, as she visited Neil’s and Jade’s home only once and was aware that her visit might affect the participants’ behaviour in her study, she recommends that in the future research it is significant to involve several home visits. In the latter, she suggests expanding the backgrounds of the children for portraying more participant variety. In this way, she manages another important point for anticipating counterarguments of
contingencies. Identifying these is often considered an important skill in the neophyte researcher’s text.

The analysis of genre is enriched by exploring the way the stages and phases are further realised by linguistic features. Thus, the following section provides a discussion of how interpersonal meanings contribute to the patterns of meanings identified in the stages and phases of the chapters. The following section reports on the investigation of the writer’s use of evaluative language resources.

5.4 Step 3: Taking a stance to engage with readers

This section reports on the investigation of the way Sue employs evaluative meanings in her dissertation. As a major concern of the study is seeking to detail how Sue engages with readers and other writers in the field, the Engagement system which is connected to the stance the writers take, and the sources of their attitude is a major focus rather than the other systems in the Appraisal framework – Attitude and Graduation. The two systems – the system of Attitude (concerned with the resources employed to realise the writer’s alignment (or otherwise) with respect to the information being negotiated) and the system of Graduation (referring to the linguistic options for grading the evaluative values) are discussed when necessary to support the Engagement system. The following figure shows the position of the Engagement framework among the other frameworks in Appraisal system.
In this section of the chapter, the results of the Appraisal analysis of Sue’s dissertation are discussed, focusing on extracts from three chapters – Introduction, Literature Review, and Discussion chapters. The extracts were chosen because of the salience of interpersonally oriented negotiations; that is, the linguistic analysis revealed that these chapters make most use of evaluative linguistic resources. As we have seen earlier in this chapter, the realisation of stance and negotiations of meanings are important functions of these chapters. The Introduction introduces the macroTheme and the main claim of the dissertation; that is, to study the literacy practices of young learners transitioning from home to school. The Literature Review takes the discussion further by pointing out controversies in the field and the literature. Finally, the Discussion chapter brings together the claim made in Chapter One, the literature, the data analysis and interpretation, and the research questions to persuade the reader to the view that children’s home literacy practices are misunderstood and underutilised by schools. The other two chapters – Methodology and Results/Findings chapters, tend to describe the methodological issues and to report the results of the analysis, without too
much argumentation. In addition, fewer negotiations with other scholars in the field happen in these two chapters compared to the three chapters mentioned above.

5.4.1. Engagement in Sue's Introductory chapter

The Appraisal analysis found that Sue purposefully employs evaluative resources to build convincing arguments. In the introductory chapter, Sue begins by establishing the topic and stating the purpose of the study; then continues to develop a niche for her study; promoting its significance in the field of literacy.

The use of evaluative linguistic resources varies across the stages in the introductory chapter. This variation depends on the phases of development of the argument in the dissertation, as mentioned above. However, an interplay of Monogloss (single voiced choices) and Heterogloss (multi-voiced choices) sentences form a pattern throughout the dissertation to persuade the reader in specific ways. Consider the following excerpt:

Purpose of the Study

This study concerns early literacy transitions between home and school (Monogloss). It aims to describe the relationships between the home and school literacies of two Australian children, who are credited with differing degrees of competency (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Distance and (-) Judgment: Capacity) with school literacy in their third year of schooling. The study has been designed to identify ways in which the students could be further assisted (Heterogloss: Entertain + Graduation) in their school literacy learning. [A.I.a]

The first Monoglossic sentence confidently announces the topic and Sue’s familiarity with the field of the study – ‘school-based literacy’, and the topic – ‘early literacy transitions between home and school’. Like the other sentences in this paragraph, it is declarative in mood with positive polarity. The Monogloss statement allows Sue to authoritatively claim her research space, but she cannot persuade her readers if she does not acknowledge other knowers in the field. Therefore, the following sentences open up to include other voices and knowers. This is a common interpersonal strategy in the
first stage of a text as Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) have pointed out. With the introduction of others into the text, Sue identifies a problem with early literacy experiences – a problem that is to do with equity issues and one that we should all be concerned with – without laying any blame. The use of passive voice, as in ‘who are credited with differing degrees of competency’ and ‘could be further assisted’ indicates that Sue believes that others (i.e. proponents, or government bodies) have labelled the students with a certain degree of competency (or not), in the former; and that she intends to promote her study as a way to further assist the students in question, in the latter. In summary, the Monogloss sentence announces the topic of the study, which is the continuity between students’ home and school literacies in the early years. However, the passive form in the sentences that follow signals that Sue is responding to others in the field who may be have different points of view with regard to the literacy level of early years students and what can be done to assist them. The next sentence is an example of a Heterogloss engagement of entertain choice indicated by ‘could be further assisted’; elements of Graduation and Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain combine to indicate ‘hedging’ (Hyland, 1994, 1996) or a cautious way of putting forward a suggestion. In this case, the writer is planting the idea that this dissertation will contribute to that important work.

The interplay of Monogloss and Heterogloss statements is also evident in the next part of the text. Take for example the research questions. There is a Heterogloss question followed by several Monogloss ones. The research questions direct readers to the focus of the study and frame their expectations in terms of what the study aims to deliver.
This research is guided by the following questions and sub questions (*Monogloss*):

What is the nature of the transition between the home/community literacies and school literacies of two children, who have been identified as having differing levels of school literacy acquisition (*Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Distance and Judgment: Capacity*)?

- What are the children’s home/community literacies?
- What are the children’s school literacies?
- What are the similarities/continuities across these contexts?
- What are the differences/discontinuities across these contexts?
- What are the current home-school connections and lines of communication? [A.1.b]

It could be argued that in setting up this first cluster of research questions, Sue is engaging in a Monogloss interaction with readers. She is not referring to any external voices but is framing her study by deliberately keeping other voices out after the first reference to those ‘who have been identified as having different levels’. To this end, Sue merely presents the questions and there are no attitudinal resources marking the questions. As clarity is important in research questions, this lack of evaluation is not surprising. In this case, the researcher is interested in seeking information that will help her to present her research argument. As discussed earlier, the use of ‘who have been identified as having differing levels of school literacy acquisition’ indicates an acceptance of judgement for the two main research participants (Neil and Jade) whose literacies she is investigating.

However, the goals of the young scholar are to not only investigate and describe the phenomena, but also to recommend a way forward to advance children’s literacy acquisition in the early years of education. This can be seen in the second set of research questions.

How might (*Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain*) the students be further assisted with their school literacy learning?
- How might (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain) the information obtained about students’ literacies be used to enhance their acquisition of school literacy?
- What does the literature (particularly professional advice for teachers) (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge) suggest about assisting students’ literacy transitions? [A.1.c]

Each question in the second cluster of questions contains Heterogloss Engagement. The use of ‘might’ (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain), indicates that Sue is being tentative and is not forcing an authoritative position, and wishes to suggest that there may be other alternatives to studying the literacy advancement necessary for early years students. The questions relate to speculations rather than her own position. It is interesting that there is a difference in the forms of the first, second and third questions. In the third question, the evaluative strategy that is evident is that of Heterogloss: Attribute and Acknowledge. The third question actually refers to other knowers in the field such as other scholars and writers of professional teaching materials. A willingness to engage with others is implicitly present in the phrase, ‘How might’ which also signals that what Sue is seeking is one of many possibilities for advancing students transitions.

So, in framing her questions, Sue goes from using Monogloss resources briefly to using more open, tentative heteroglossic resources. The questions announce that her recommendations will be tentative, suggesting that she is an engaged member of the discourse community interested in early years literacy education, but recognises that her views are not the only acceptable ones.

Part two of the introductory chapter plays a fundamental role in positioning the current study as realised in the section of “Context of the study”. Here the writer shows her awareness of prior/current studies in the field and displays her knowledge and expertise by citing the work of some key scholars and evaluating and synthesising the
different voices in the field. Again, the interplay of Monogloss and Heterogloss statements are evident. Consider the following excerpt:

Literacy is highly controversial (Monogloss, (-) Appreciation, and Force: Intensification: Quality) and, as will be shown in the review of the literature (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge), its evolving definition is regularly contested ((-) Appreciation, and Force: Intensification: Quality). The results of both international and national assessments of literacy, such as Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) (Snyder, 2008) (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge) often generate considerable concern about the rate of students’ literacy acquisition in the early primary school years (Freebody, 2007; Hammond, 2001) (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge). However (Heterogloss: Contract: Disclaim: Counter), Freebody (1997) highlights that there has not actually been a decline (Heterogloss: Contract: Disclaim: Deny and (+) Appreciation) in the results of Australian standardised literacy testing since the mid-1970s. Recent reports additionally indicate (Force: Intensification: Process) and (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain) that nearly 95% of Australian students are achieving the benchmarks for reading and writing (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA), 2006) (Heterogloss: Expansion: Attribute: Acknowledge), which does not seem (Heterogloss: Expansion: Entertain) indicative of serious problems in students’ early literacy acquisition ((-) Judgment). Regardless (Heterogloss: Contraction: Disclaim: Counter), concerns are regularly publicised through the media - and by governments - leading to a public discourse of literacy crisis (Gee, 1990; Freebody, 1997; Street, 1998) (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge). This rhetoric provides governments with increasing leverage to impose greater control over the teaching and assessing of literacy ((-) Judgment and Heterogloss: Contraction: Proclaim: Pronounce). [B.1.e]

Sue begins by stating her hypothesis that literacy in early childhood education is highly controversial. Thus, the excerpt begins by evaluating the field with a Monogloss statement that makes a claim, indicating that evidence from previous studies will be provided to support this claim. The claim is realised by a phrase that generally carries negative attitudinal value (highly controversial). However, it is acknowledged that in the context of research, ‘highly controversial’ may not always have a negative connotation. ‘Highly controversial’ may evoke a positive judgement in terms of Sue’s text, and her evaluation of prior studies in which there is a range of opinions about an issue may be a productive one to explore. This phrase (highly controversial) is both graded and negatively attitudinal ((-) Appreciation, and Force: Intensification:
suggesting that the field of literacy is not a stable one, with different scholars holding different views. With relatively similar attitudinal value, the second clause of this sentence also suggests further negative attitude through ‘regularly contested’ which means that the definition has not been fixed. ‘Literacy is highly controversial and, as will be shown in the review of the literature, its evolving definition is regularly contested’ is followed by a number of Heteroglossic statements that cite various studies relating to her claim. The Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge is evident as she summarises the literature in the field. Each citation can be categorised similarly. It is in a later sentence that she uses Heterogloss disclaim, beginning to present the other side of the argument. According to Hood (2006), writers often switch from a positive Appraisal of previous studies to a position where a negative Appraisal of some studies are made or vice versa. The impact of this shift is a move in the stance and therefore the prosody of the text. For example, Sue’s extract quoted above, moves from a negative evaluation of some of the literature to citing a study that disclaims the work of previous scholars. This represents a shift in her stance and functions to develop the argument in this paragraph ((-) Appreciation, and Force: Intensification: Quality). This strategy is a good one to show the controversy in the field.

She then positions her stance among other voices by introducing and critically reviewing items of previous research in the area of literacy education (as the Phase 3). Negative values, which collide directly against the positive ones, seem to dominate the discussion.

Governments tend (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain) to define literacy in terms of certain skills, mainly related to print texts, which they consider to be measurable ((-) Judgment). According to (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge) the Curriculum Corporation (2000) literacy benchmarks ‘do not attempt to describe the whole of literacy learning, nor the full range of what students are taught’. However (Heterogloss: Contract: Deny) Nixon (2003)
argues (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge) that the skills tested often (Force: Intensification: Process and Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain) reflect those which are valued. Freebody (1997, p.7) points out (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge) that the view of literacy as a ‘unitary construct’ means that the importance of it (and the cost to the country of lacking it) can be asserted more easily. The crisis view ((-) Appreciation) can thus result in school literacy being reduced to the teaching of particular discrete skills associated with reading and writing (Angus, Olney & Ainley, 2007; Luke & Freebody, 1999; Nichols, 2003) (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge). This argument highlights (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain) that the way in which literacy is viewed and assessed in schools can actually contribute to literacy crises (Monogloss and (-) Appreciation). [B.1.f]

The patterns established by the use of Heteroglossic moves which expand the discourse by attributing and acknowledging other voices and possibilities as above play a crucial part in establishing the controversies of the field. The text above constitutes an important part of Sue’s argument about literacy. She argues that government bodies hold a limited view of what literacy means. There are a number of Heterogloss statements in the text above that use a mix of Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain; Attribute and Acknowledge forms of engagement to support her view. There is also an attempt to counter what is being said by using ‘However’ (Heterogloss: Contraction: Disclaim: Counter) to indicate a contradictory view (‘However, Nixon argues …’). In the sentence that follows Freebody is cited to further strengthen the argument that the government bodies hold a reductive view of literacy by relating it to only printed texts.

The excerpt ends with a cluster of authors which further shores up Freebody’s point, and indirectly, the importance of the work that is to be undertaken in the thesis. The last sentence is a Monoglossic statement that presents the author’s support for the contention that the governmental position is reductive and could lead to a ‘literacy crisis’. This position is further developed through reference to other scholars, as is evident in the rationale that is presented.
Rationale/Significance of the Study

Many of the studies conducted on home/community literacies in the last few decades have been concerned with either adults or minority groups (see Barton & Hamilton, 1998, p.14; Freebody, 1997, p.15). Of those which focus on children’s literacy, there has been a tendency to examine the experiences of children with differing cultural and language backgrounds (e.g., Ashton-Warner, 1980; Gonzalez et al., 1993) or from families with a low socio-economic status (SES) (e.g., Freebody, Ludwig & Gunn, 1995; Heath, 1983). This research will provide a different perspective; that of two children from the same cultural background as the dominant culture of the school and from mid-high SES homes, but with differing levels of school literacy. There are more similarities between this research and an Australian study which was conducted on a larger scale (Cairney & Ruge, 1998). However, it is unknown whether the recommendations made by these researchers have influenced educational policy and practice.

Sue employs several Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge to acknowledge other researchers in the field. By using this type of Engagement, Sue portrays herself as aligning herself with these proponents and appraising other researchers. This is important as a novice researcher to align to certain experts as a process of study, as well as to seek acceptance in the academic discourse community. Sue also utilises Heterogloss: Contraction: Disclaim: Counter in some parts of the text to show her ability to distinguish her research from that of others which in turn portrays her as a scholar developing expertise in the field of study. Some values of Judgment and Appreciation are also used to complete her evaluation of certain phenomena under study. Having conducted this evaluation of others’ study, Sue then introduces her own study and makes it clear that her study is distinctive. This is where she employs a statement with Heterogloss: Contraction: Proclaim: Pronounce.

The extract is further evidence of how evaluative language is carefully employed in Sue’s text. In spite of the claim about her study being different, she is modest not to
make any unnecessary claims about her study as well as about others’ research. She also
seems to be very careful in critiquing others, such as in, ‘there has been a tendency to
examine….’ The use of Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain in this sentence suggests a
distancing strategy and a seemingly non-judgemental stance in evaluating previous
research. In addition, the use of ‘Heterogloss: Contraction: Disclaim: Counter
resources such as ‘but’ and ‘however’ indicate that she intends to present her stance or
her opinion about literacy practices after she critiques the previous studies before
claiming that there is a gap in the previous research that she intends to occupy with her
study. Although she uses mostly declarative statements, apparent lack of modality, and
positive polarity, she employs certain type of clauses and chooses certain wordings for
softening her propositions, such as ‘there has been a tendency’. She also frequently
uses others’ voices or backs up her voice by citing others to raise certain issues and
makes use of others’ voices to counter any claim. See for example: ‘There are more
similarities between this research and an Australian study which was conducted on a

Another important part of this stage is how Sue positions of her study
teoretically (see excerpt below). Here again, Sue opens this section with a monoglossic
sentence asserting her position and developing it with a series of Heterogloss
statements.

**Theoretical Location of the Study**

This research is focusing on the literacy transitions which children have
between their home and school experiences (Monogloss). As will be explained
further in the review of the literature, the study is underpinned by a
sociocultural theory of literacy (Fairclough, 2001; Luke & Freebody, 1999)
(Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge). Within this perspective,
literacy is seen as being inextricably linked to specific practical and social
purposes (Heath, 1983; Street, 1998) (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Distance). It is also seen (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Distance) as
evolving with new technologies, as the everyday, meaningful activities it is
utilised for involve the use of a range of modes of communication (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000). This broad view of literacy is thus assumed (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain) to be dynamic and it is expected that it will vary between cultures and over time. Whilst this research partially focuses on the experiences of a child who has a lower rate of school literacy acquisition, it is not (Heterogloss: Contract: Deny) based on a deficit view of children’s home literacy experiences. Instead, children’s home/community literacies are considered to be rich and diverse (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Freebody et al., 1995; Heath, 1983; Street, 1998) (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge). This theoretical underpinning involves the recognition of the concept of emergent literacy (Hall, 1987, cited in Marsh, 2003; Teale & Sulzby, 1986) (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge), through which children’s literacy learning is thought to begin long before they begin formal schooling. [B.1.t]

The pattern that emerges is a combination of Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge with a few statements that Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Distance or Heterogloss: Contract: Disclaim: Deny previous propositions presented by other scholars. As Sue establishes her study within the theoretical framework offered by other scholars; this is appropriate. The use of Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge acknowledges others’ propositions. This is logical, as she has to refer to experts in the field of literacy to develop her theoretical background. This also works for her use of Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Distance; the only difference is that in the latter case, Sue positions herself as not in agreement to the propositions cited. There is also a place where Sue accommodates others’ voices by her use of Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain. The other Engagement value used is Heterogloss: Contract: Deny that refers to the way Sue denies that her study is not based on a deficit view ((-) Judgment) of children’s home literacy experiences. Her statement directly denies that ‘children’s home/community literacies are considered to be rich and diverse’ (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Freebody et al., 1995; Heath, 1983; Street, 1998) (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge and (+) Appreciation). In summary, there is a certain pattern in the way Sue develops her position in relation to the other theories in her field, by
acknowledging some scholars proposition and expressing disagreement with others through the use of Heterogloss Expansion or contraction.

5.4.2. Engagement in Sue's Literature Review chapter

In further developing the argument in the introductory chapter, Sue’s literature review (LR) chapter enacts a significant function to further develop the background to the study. The chapter elaborates on the discussion further by positioning the study among prior studies in the field. There are negotiations with the literature the writer does to contextualise her study. The three-move structure (considered as ‘stages’ in this thesis) (Kwan, 2006) employs different kinds of negotiation as the chapter progresses the discussions of a wide range of subjects on the topic of literacy in general, as well as on the transition between home and school literacies by young learners. In reviewing prior studies, the writer evaluates others’ work in the field by adopting different stances toward the topics discussed – aligning with some ideas, challenging others, etc. Sue utilises a number of engagement values combining both Monogloss and Heterogloss resources. Consider the following excerpt:

Introduction

This study was designed to describe the relationships between the home and school literacies of two children with differing rates of school literacy acquisition (Monogloss). The study aimed to focus on the continuities and discontinuities between the literacy experiences and practices occurring across these contexts (Monogloss). The following review of the literature will begin by considering how the definition of literacy has been re-conceptualised in recent times, before it explores a range of approaches to theorising literacy (Monogloss). This survey of the theoretical context recognises Guba and Lincoln’s (1994, p.115) (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge) assertion that novice researchers need to (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain) understand the ‘history and structure that serve as the surround for their inquiries’. The review will examine some of the literature (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge) surrounding home and school settings; focusing on the differences in children’s literacy acquisition between these contexts. Literature (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge) outlining suggestions for effective teaching practice, and ways to strengthen children’s home-school connections, will then be reviewed (see Figure B.2.1 below). Despite (Heterogloss: Contract: Counter) a very broad view being taken in this
study of what constitutes literacy (including visual and critical literacies), the restrictions placed on the scope of this review resulted in the information being limited to that which was most relevant to the study’s findings. [B.2.A]

The above text – the ‘Introduction’, denotes an important part in the development of the argument in Sue’s LR chapter. The text functions to initiate the discussion in the chapter by combining both Monogloss and Heterogloss statements. The Monogloss statements are used to establish the authority of the student writer (Sue) in her dissertation. They indicate with confidence the nature of the study and how the chapter will unfold – two areas that the writer can be authoritative about. The combination of heteroglossic statements that follow are evidence that Sue knows and acknowledges other voices – authorities in the field of research. The direct quote ‘history and structure that serve as the surround for their inquiries’ indicates that the writer aligns her position with that of Guba, a leading expert in the field. The Heterogloss: Contraction indicated by ‘Despite’ that follows ‘history’ and ‘structure’ serves as the signal and a strategy to limit the scope of the study in this instance to only the ‘history and the structure’. There are several paragraphs that employ similar strategies to indicate a merging of Sue’s Monoglossic voice with that of several scholars in the field. This enhances Sue’s credibility as a writer/scholar who has surveyed the literature competently and has supported her claims with the studies of other scholars.

Negotiations with other writers and experts in the field are evident. The writer employs available resources for engaging with those other authority holders in the field of literacy to seek a position for her study. In doing so, most of the statements are heteroglossic as they evaluate others’ work or represent other voices. However, monoglossic sentences are also in use for similar functions as what those kind of
sentences – heteroglossic, typically function. Consider the combination of these Heterogloss and Monogloss sentences as the writer develops the genre, as the following.

**What is Literacy?**

The definition of literacy has evolved over time (+Appreciation), in parallel with changes in technology, education and economic need (Monogloss). These definitions are influenced both by the socio-cultural past and aspirations for a more desirable future (+Appreciation) (Freebody, 2007) (Heterogloss: Expansion: Attribution: Acknowledgement). Literacy in Western cultures was initially thought to solely involve developing sets of perceptual and cognitive skills for reading and writing print texts (Healy, 2003) (Heterogloss: Expansion: Attribution: Acknowledgement). As education is designed to prepare students for participation in social and economic life, this traditionally meant learning the acceptable, conventional way to read and write the national language (New London Group, 2000) (Heterogloss: Expansion: Attribution: Acknowledgement). This resulted in the people who acquired these skills to a higher degree than others being considered as more literate (Monogloss: +Judgment). [A.2.b]

This opening of the body stage of Sue’s LR denotes a typical pattern of how she develops a paragraph as argumentation. The text develops so as to negotiate ‘the point for the argument’ (realised in the topic sentence) by providing evidence and reiterating the point at the concluding sentence to further boost the effect of the argument. In doing so, the point for the argument is typically her own ‘voice’ that is realised by a Monogloss sentence. In this case, she begins by appreciating the evolution of the definition of literacy. It is a positive value of attitude (has evolved over time (+Appreciation)), in my reading, that the following information implies. This positive value is radiated throughout the paragraph by the use of some evidence from others’ voices, for instance ‘These definitions are influenced both by the socio-cultural past and aspirations for a more desirable future’ (+Appreciation) (Freebody, 2007) (Heterogloss: Expansion: Attribution: Acknowledgement). This positive value at the beginning of the paragraph also leads readers to read the text positively (as explained in Hood, 2006). The concluding sentence, ‘This resulted in the people who acquired these skills to a higher degree than others being considered as more literate (Monogloss;
Further increases the positive value and becomes the **Claim** of the paragraph. Here, the writer relates it to the topic she is developing in her dissertation.

As the ‘body’ move (stage) develops, reviewing others’ work becomes evident in Sue’s LR. In referencing others’ work, evaluation of others is realised through various evaluative language resources. The ‘point for the argument’ can is realised by tactics other than Monogloss sentences, as in the following excerpt.

**Home/Community Literacies**

Many studies of children’s home literacy experiences suggest (Heterogloss: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse) similar findings and opinions; that all children are exposed to, and engage with, a variety of complex literacies. Hunt (2001) states (Heterogloss: Expansion: Attribution: Acknowledgement) that the complexity of literacy becomes apparent as more is learned about it. Several prominent studies have investigated children’s home literacies. In her influential ethnographic research, Heath (1983) documented (Heterogloss: Expansion: Attribution: Acknowledgement) the rich and diverse range of literacies experienced by children in different communities. Home literacy experiences involve combinations of written, spoken, and visual texts (as well as others) and are thus both overlapping and dynamic (Barton, 2001; Barton & Hamilton, 1998) (Heterogloss: Expansion: Attribution: Acknowledgement). Recent research has shown that many of children’s home literacy practices are linked to popular culture, new media and technologies (Marsh, 2003; Marsh & Thompson, 2001; Snyder, 2001) (Heterogloss: Expansion: Attribution: Acknowledgement). Such studies document (Heterogloss: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse) the complex range of literacy practices that children utilise when engaging with digital texts and popular culture. [A.2.n]

The paragraph begins with the writer’s point about how other studies are similar to the topic of her study. This strategy is usually used to affirm that a scholar’s study shares common ground with other research (Kwan, 2006). It is as important to confirm that the study has things in common with other studies as it is to prove it is unique, or it has innovation, or difference, or the problem has not been resolved by other studies, such as ‘… the complexity of literacy becomes apparent as more is learned about it’.

The following sentences review each study as evidence of her point. Each sentence presents one point that becomes one discussion in her study. Finally, she reiterates the
point as the claim of the paragraph and relates to her own study, ‘the complex range of literacy practices that children utilise when engaging with digital texts and popular culture’. This last statement relates to her study that in the home-school literacy transition, children are engaged with popular technology, as she stated in [A.1i].

Finally, in the closing or ‘conclusion’ of the LR chapter, the writer restates her **Claim** for the chapter, that is, ‘…school curriculum and assessments often seem to be based on a more traditional view’. Consider the following excerpt:

**Conclusion**

The literature review has revealed (Heterogloss: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse) that, although (Heterogloss: Contract: Counter) definitions of literacy **continue to evolve** (++) Appreciation, school curriculum and assessments often seem to (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain) be based on a more traditional view. The diverse range of literacies that children experience and learn out-of-school has been richly documented by many studies (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge), several of which have also examined (Heterogloss: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse) the home-school connection. However (Heterogloss: Contract: Disclaim: Counter) some of these studies (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge) have focused exclusively on children who come from lower SES backgrounds, or on a narrower definition than what literacy is thought (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain) to involve in the current day. Multiple sources (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge) have asserted that children’s school literacy will benefit when more is found out about their existing home/community literacies. An argument has thus been developed (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge) throughout about the importance of children having smooth transitions between their home and school literacies. However, (Heterogloss: Contract: Counter) the review of the literature has highlighted (Heterogloss: Contract: Disclaim: Counter) an apparent lack of studies which document a very wide range of literacy practices and experiences, at a time when the social purpose of literacy and evolving technologies are extremely influential factors in wider society. Additionally, although (Heterogloss: Contract: Counter) studies have been conducted (Heterogloss: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse) on the effect of discontinuities between home and school, there appears to (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain) be a dearth of research about children who experience continuity between their home and school literacy practices. This study was thus designed to ascertain (Heterogloss: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse) whether there was a need to (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain) bridge the gap between the home and school literacies of two students, who had similar socio-cultural backgrounds, but (Heterogloss: Contract: Disclaim: Counter) differing rates of school literacy acquisition. The following chapter will describe how the theory and research examined in this review shaped the design of the current study (Monogloss). [B.2.AS]
In the last paragraph of the literature review chapter, *Heterogloss* engagement statements are dominant. To summarise the discussion of the literature, Sue draws on *Heterogloss: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse* (‘The literature review has revealed that…’). However, this is followed by a *Heterogloss: Contract: Counter* statement, which concedes that there are different definitions of literacy that are not static but keep evolving. Other obvious linguistic choices in this excerpt include evaluating prior studies. Engagement of ‘*Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge*’ plays a significant role in positioning Sue’s dissertation among other prior studies in the field. Acknowledging established researchers’ work (… that children experience and learn out-of-school has been richly documented by many studies …) is a typical way for novice researchers to show alignment with them. Furthermore, Sue presents more than one position in constructing arguments throughout this chapter. Engagement of ‘*Heterogloss: Contract: Disclaim: Counter*’ resources (had similar socio-cultural backgrounds, *but* differing rates of school literacy acquisition) is a typical strategy she employs for organising two or more differing voices in the text. Importantly, she identifies the key issues that have arisen as a result of her engagement with the related literature and uses it to further cement the need for research such as hers. Whilst ‘*Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain*’ is also apparent in this chapter, and in other chapters, it is used differently here: This study *was thus designed to ascertain* (*Heterogloss: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse*) whether there *was a need to* (*Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain*) *bridge* the gap between the home and school literacies of two students, who had similar socio-cultural backgrounds. The possibility of open-endedness is directed to her own study rather than others, indicating it too is open to critique. It seems that
while she has presented all possible positions for and against certain opinions, Sue presents her arguments with the humility required of a novice researcher.

**5.4.3. Engagement in Sue’s Discussion chapter**

In this subsection, the Appraisal analysis of the ‘Discussion Chapter’ indicates the ultimate place for constructing the macro-argument in the dissertation. The chapter synthesises previous discussions by consolidating all components: restating the Claim, presenting the evidence (Data), complying with the Warrant and its Backing, and admitting the Rebuttal, to construct a convincing argument (consider the discussion of the macro-argument construction in section 1 of this chapter). However, the analysis in this subsection is done to reveal the construction of meso-argument, as previously stated.

In spite of the complex discussion in the chapter, the interpersonal linguistic resources used indicate a typical pattern of an argument structure. The text in each part within the chapter (in each thematic hierarchy) is organised by monoglossic^heteroglossic^monoglossic sentences. In this case the writer realises the engagement enactment by stating the ‘thesis’/ ‘point’ of the argument – with monoglossic sentences; providing evidence – with heteroglossic sentences; and restating/ summarising the discussion – with monoglossic sentences. This subsection explores those kinds of statements Sue employs that may reveal the way she utilises evaluative linguistic resources to construct the argument of the chapter – to rationalise the significance and the distinctiveness of the research. As with the findings in the genre analysis of her ‘Discussion Chapter’ there are five stages – including the opening and closing stages, the present analysis aims to examine how each stage is variously realised with these kinds of engagement resources. Yet, as the opening and closing stages of this chapter
are fairly typically developed, the discussion in this subsection focuses more on the other stages. They are the stages in which Sue consolidates the argument of her study: (Stage 2) – ‘Section One: Transitions between home and school literacies’; proposes practical implications (Stage 3) – ‘Section Two: Implications for teaching practice’; and proposes recommendations for future research (Stage 4) – ‘Section Three: Recommendations for Future Research’.

In the section ‘Transitions between home and school literacies’, Sue marshals the argument of the study. In doing so, she utilises a number of Engagement resources combining both Monoglossic and Heteroglossic choices. Nevertheless, Heteroglossic statements dominate. Consider the following excerpt, showing the construction of a meso argument in the chapter:

Neil demonstrated a high level of knowledge and skills ((+ Judgment) in relation to all areas of observed literacy (Monogloss and Authorial). It was found, perhaps unsurprisingly (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain), that there was greater continuity between his home and school literacies than Jade; in relation to the literacies which were valued, the experiences provided and the purpose of using literacies (see Figures B.5.1 and B.5.2 above). This seemed to be (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain) principally because his mum, Brenda (a primary school teacher herself and thus in possession of “insider” knowledge ((+ Judgment)), encouraged a variety of school-type literacies at home. For example (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain), documenting everyday events through linguistic and visual modes (eg, required journals) was highly valued in Neil’s home, providing a direct link between his home and school literacy experiences. Another similarity was the volume of books available to Neil and the fact that he was read to and encouraged to read regularly in both settings. In a large-scale study of children’s home and school literacies, Cairney and Ruge (1998, p.57) (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge) similarly found that ‘the students who were most academically successful ((+ Judgment) were those whose family literacy practices reproduced school literacy practices. Those who were less academically successful did not share the home dominance of school literacy’ (Monogloss). Whilst Jade had made dramatic improvements this school year in regards to reading and writing, she was still struggling to meet some school literacy (English) outcomes (NSW Board of Studies, 1998) (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge). However (Heterogloss: Contract: Counter), in contrast to the study’s presupposition about students with school literacy difficulties, Jade also had a large collection of books at home and was both read to, and encouraged to read, regularly (Monogloss). [A.5.f]
The **Claim** is vital in the construction of this meso argument. Realised as the hyperTheme of the paragraph, this topic sentence opens up the discussion on the topic with the writer’s own voice (**Authorial**). In terms of Appraisal, this paragraph begins with the claim that ‘Neil demonstrated a high level of knowledge and skills in relation to all areas of observed literacy’ (**Monogloss**). This Monoglossic statement contains an attitudinal value, ‘**a high level of knowledge and skills**’ (**+** **Judgment**), becomes the topic sentence that is then further developed in the paragraph. The positive value spreads across the paragraph as the literacy competence of participants (Neil and Jade) is discussed. There are a number of attitudinal words that indicate a positive message such as in ‘possession of “**insider**” knowledge (**+** **Judgment**’) and ‘who were **most academically successful** (**+** **Judgment**’) in the paragraph. The choice of the verb ‘demonstrated’ over other possibilities such as display, indicate, validate, or prove, indicates the strength of her claim. This choice represents the **Qualifier** (**Q**) for the claim that in turn represents the confidence of the writer with her argument.

In discussing the ‘Implications for teaching practice’, the interweaving of Monogloss and Heterogloss sentences are evident. Although Heterogloss statements are more in number, two Monogloss statements are strategically used. Sue suggests several practical implications drawing on the data from both subjects of her study.

As Neil is apparently (**Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain**) already **benefiting** (**+** **Judgment**) from the continuity between certain literacy experiences he has at home and school, less attention will be given to his further literacy acquisition in this section (**Authorial**). However (**Heterogloss: Contract: Counter**), implications for teaching have arisen in regards to the **discontinuities that are present between his home and school literacies** (**-** **Judgment**). This is predominantly in relation to the purpose for activities, with many of his home literacy experiences occurring for a specific, meaningful reason (**Monogloss**). Such activities could be (**Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain**) integrated into the school curriculum, without affecting the outcomes which are being worked towards. For example (**Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain**), Neil could be asked to write letters or e-mails to his peers or people outside of the classroom or school. He could (**Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain**) also be required to create texts that
may be displayed around the school, such as posters or expositions arguing a
certain point. This is a way in which more text-analyst skills could be integrated
into English lessons (Freebody et al., 1995) (Heterogloss: Expand: Attribute:
Acknowledge). It may (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain) also assist in
improving Neil’s presentation of work; an aspect which both Mrs Davies and
his mother mentioned. [A.5.AB]

The claim represented in the first sentence is realised as *authorial* statement, but
it represents the fact the writer can’t be sure Neil is, but it is likely that he is, ‘already
benefiting’. On the basis of her study, Sue’s assertion (albeit with some modesty
‘apparently’) that transition involves continuity for Neil is acceptable and provides a
rationale for how she will proceed from here (that is, concentrate on a case study child
for whom transition means discontinuity). The rest of the paragraph presents
suggestions for furthering Neil’s literacy acquisition. From this point onwards, as with
other arguments, she provides supporting evidence that is realised mostly in
*Heteroglossic* statements. Much of the supporting evidences is realised with
*Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain* sentences that proffer ideas for policy and practice.

In the next section of the ‘Implications’ stage, Sue offers a number of
suggestions as to how adults may help the other case study student, Jade. Consider the
engagement choices made by Sue when writing about Jade’s literacy.

Jade *often got distracted* during literacy lessons and spent time looking around
the room or talking to peers (*Monogloss and Authorial*). Tally event sample
observations showed that Jade frequently *spent the largest amount of time
disengaged* during the middle of an activity (*Monogloss*). However
(Heterogloss: Contract: Counter), this only seemed to (Heterogloss: Expand:
Entertain) be the case when students were completing individual tasks. During
one observation of a guided reading group activity, *Jade was observed to
spend over 90% of her time on-task* (*Monogloss and (+) Judgment*). She was
also seen to answer questions and orally read more often in reading group
activities, because of both the greater opportunity to participate and an apparent
increase in her confidence in these situations (*Monogloss and (+) Judgment*).
Thus, Jade may be assisted in increasing her on-task behaviours, and the quality
of the work she produces, if more scaffolded small-group work occurred
(*Monogloss*). If not possible for Jade to be scaffolded by an adult in a small
group situation, Jade’s writing development may alternatively be assisted by
providing opportunities for group construction of texts, or by “buddying” Jade
with a peer who has a higher level of school literacy acquisition (Monogloss).

As with the general findings on Jade’s literacy transition, negative values spread across the paragraph. By using authorial voice, the claim realised through the first sentence obviously displays negative evaluative value by what it says: ‘Jade often got distracted….’ This value seems to be preserved in this paragraph with other negative evaluative resources coming next, as for providing context for the suggestions the study offers. However, compared to Neil’s literacy transition, Jade is considered to be disadvantaged. The Engagement analysis reveals that differences are also evident on the development of the argument of this paragraph. Beside the use of Monoglossic sentences in the claim of the argument, that is, the first sentence, this type of sentence is also utilised in many parts of the paragraph. There is one Heterogloss: Contract: Counter sentence (‘However (Heterogloss: Contract: Counter), this only seemed to (Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain) be the case when students were completing individual tasks’) that is used for countering the negative value found at the beginning of the paragraph by stating a kind of positive value in the second paragraph; yet it does not really change the prosody of the paragraph as the sentence is also realised by the use of Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain (as in the above quotation) perhaps indicating Jade’s uncertainty. This negative prosody together with Monoglossic sentences suggest that the study has been useful in offering to improve Jade’s literacy transitions.

In the final section of ‘Section Three: Recommendations for Future Research’ Sue presents several ideas for future research drawing on Heteroglossic kinds of engagement:

A vast amount of information was obtained from the observations, interviews and (viewed or collected) artefacts during the two home visits (for each student) in this study (Heterogloss: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse). However (Heterogloss: Contract: Counter), it was found that the researcher’s presence
seemed (**Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain**) to affect the **natural** behaviours and events which occurred on the first visit to students’ homes. It is thus recommended (**Heterogloss: Contract: Proclaim: Concur: Concede**), for research attempting to observe **naturally occurring** behaviours and interactions in students’ homes, to involve several home visits. [A.5.as]

Due to **rapidly changing technologies** and definitions of literacy, there is a need for more **up-to-date** research which examines and compares the home/community and school literacies of children. It would be (**Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain**) advantageous for future studies to capture the experiences of a greater number of children. This study has shown (**Heterogloss: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse**) that the literacy experiences of two children, both from mid-high SES households, **differed significantly**. Thus (**Heterogloss: Contract: Proclaim: Concur: Concede**), it may be (**Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain**) **beneficial** for future studies to include children from various SES backgrounds, as well as including children from a range of geographical areas, age groups, and cultural and language backgrounds. [A.5.at]

The recommendations are realised presenting the findings of the study, followed by some exceptional conditions and complete with responses to possible problems that could arise. In realising these meanings, Sue uses **Heterogloss: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse** or **Justify**, followed by **Heterogloss: Contract: Counter**, and **Heterogloss: Contract: Proclaim: Concur: Concede**. There is also the use of **Heterogloss: Expand: Entertain** to accommodate possible other voices that are not in line with her stance.

The graduation and attitude choices made in the extract are indicative of Sue’s growing confidence in her own findings. She indicates that researching in a ‘natural environment’ is of a positive value for further studies in the field of early literacy. She also alludes to the ‘rapidly changing technologies’ that readers would understand as impacting literacy practices. She also suggests that future research in certain areas would be ‘**beneficial**’ to future research.

In summary, purposeful use of evaluative linguistic resources in Sue’s dissertation is evident. In spite of the minimal overt and explicit use of attitudinal language in the context of academic discourse (Hood, 2006, p. 38), Sue employs complex patterns of language choices to negotiate meanings and take up the stance she
performs. This in turn suggests good models for the development of undergraduate dissertations in the Indonesian higher education context.

5.5 Conclusion

The argument in Sue’s dissertation has been constructed carefully and convincingly. The three phases of the analysis reveal that Sue organises meanings in subtle, nuanced ways that serve her argument. The hierarchical layers of meanings at different levels of structure develop as wave-like patterns of information about early literacy transitions between home/community and school. The analysis of these layers enables the ways in which each layer makes links with the higher layers of meanings to be described. It has also allowed the staging of meanings through the structure adopted for each genre to be identified. In addition, genre analysis affords a description of the dissertation as a macro-genre – the genre of the whole text that is developed with each chapter as a distinct genre. Each chapter has been described through stages which organise meanings to achieve their communicative purpose. Finally, the analysis of evaluative language has assisted me to better understand the negotiation of academic stance Sue accomplishes in engaging with readers, literature and other stakeholders in the field of literacy practices. As a summary, the overall analyses are useful for describing the unfolding meanings of Sue’s dissertation. Her dissertation has the potential to inform the development of suitable models of advanced academic writing for international contexts.
Chapter 6  Argument in Sri’s Dissertation

6.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the argumentation presented in Sri’s dissertation. It is primarily concerned with how this student writer – whose second language is English, employs linguistic resources to construct and organise arguments, and to engage with her readers, and with others in the literature. This dissertation exemplifies the longest academic text in English written by an undergraduate language learner in the Indonesian EFL context. This medium size (12,615 words) academic text reports on a research-like project investigating the topic ‘The Points of Assessment Used in an English Competition ‘English News Report Contest ESA Week 2010’’, written in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Sarjana Pendidikan (Bachelor of Education). The text is organised following the ‘traditional-five-chapter type’ dissertation or thesis (Bunton, 1998; Dong, 1998; Paltridge, 2004; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). It comprises five chapters: Introduction, Review of related literature (LR), Method of investigation, Results and discussion, and Conclusions and suggestions chapters.

Employing the same theoretical and methodological bases as those described in Chapter Five, a three-fold analysis of Sri’s dissertation will be presented in the following manner. The first step describes an analysis using the Periodicity framework that reveals the textual organisation of the dissertation through the layers of meanings in the text in order to reveal the construction of its macro-argument. The second step explores
the staging of meanings to achieve social purpose in three selected chapters equivalent to those analysed in Sue’s dissertation. The targeted chapters in this step are the Introduction, Review of related literature, and Conclusion and suggestions chapters. The final step uses the Appraisal framework to further explore the employment of evaluative linguistic resources with particular emphasis on those resources used for engaging with other perspectives and voices. The same coding system used in Chapter Five is employed for presenting the excerpts taken from Sri’s dissertation.

6.2 Step 1: Mapping the macro-argument in Sri’s dissertation

This first step of the analysis, textual analysis, is essential for exploring the textual organisation of Sri’s dissertation. The main purpose of this analysis is to map the thematic development of the dissertation that, in turn, sheds light on the construction of the macro-(overarching) argument of the dissertation. In the first instance, the mapping of the development of Themes across the levels of the dissertation is presented. It is then followed by the exploration of the construction of the argument in the dissertation.

The Themes in Sri’s dissertation are developed in a complex way. At the level of dissertation as a whole text, the organisation of the five chapters follows the typical traditional type of thesis/dissertation, as previously mentioned. However, there is indication that each of the five chapters is developed more independently, compared to those in Sue’s dissertation. There is more heterogeneous distribution of thematic development within each chapter. For instance, the LR chapter distributes the Themes differently in the three sections. As shown in table 6.1, the second section of this second chapter organises the Themes up to three lower levels (sub-subsections) of thematic hierarchy. This is much more delicate than the other two sections. On the
other hand, chapter one, chapter three and chapter five organise the information with only one lower level of hierarchy – the sections.

The argument in Sri’s dissertation indicates a complicated construction. As with the problem in its organisation of the meanings (information), the text does not provide a well-developed argument: events and phenomena tend to be described rather than reasoned about. The macro-argument appears to be developed across the chapters, yet its components are not obviously stated. For example, the point of the argument to be developed – the ‘hypothesis’, is not clearly stated, and is not located within the macro-Theme of the introductory chapter. Chapter one begins with a statement that ‘Assessment has long been part of human’s life’ [B.1.b] that does not state the point of the argument. In fact, this ‘point of the argument’ – the ‘hypothesis’ (as in Andrews, 2005; Hegelund & Kock, 1999; Toulmin, 2003), is typically placed at the beginning of the introductory chapter, as the point of the departure of the dissertation, as was the case with Sue’s dissertation (see section 5.2 in the previous chapter). In addition, in the final chapter, the Claim is not clearly stated and consolidated for developing the complete argument. The last chapter of Sri’s dissertation presents the summary of the study without any strong Claim to argue. There is a statement that appears to be a ‘Claim’: ‘Based on the result of the analysis, it was known that the strengths of the points of assessment used in …’, but this sentence seems to be more a ‘summary’ than a ‘Claim’. There is also no further elaboration for the statement to make the ‘Claim’ more persuasive. This section focuses on the organisation of meanings that is indicative of the development of the macro-argument.
Dissertation Title: The Points of Assessment Used in an English Competition ‘English News Report Contest ESA Week 2010’

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION
• Framing the chapter
• Describing the research, she did in this dissertation

1.1 Background of the Study
- Setting up the background for the research
- Orienting the reader to language assessments in general using an expert’s view

1.2 Reasons for Choosing the Topic

1.3 Statement of the Problem

1.4 Objective of the Study

1.5 Significance of the Study

1.6 Outline of the Report
- Summarising what she will present in each of the chapters
- Indicating the structure of Sri’s dissertation

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE
• Reviewing and describing previous study
• Reviewing theoretical background

2.1 Review of the Previous Studies
- Seeking support from other relevant literature
- Describing previous studies

2.2 Review of the Theoretical Background
2.2.1. General Concept of Language Testing and Assessment
2.2.1.1. A Brief History of Language Testing and Assessment
2.2.1.2. Principles of Language Testing and Assessment
2.2.2. Overview of English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010
2.2.2.1. ESA WEEK 2010
2.2.2.2. English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010
2.2.2.3. Points of Assessment Used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010

2.2.3. Overview of Rating-Scale Design
2.2.3.1. Rating Scale for Testing Speaking Skill
2.2.3.2. Four Approaches to Rating-Scale Design for Testing Speaking Skill

2.3 Framework of the Present Study
- Summarising the discussion in the chapter
- Occupying the research niche by announcing research design/processes

CHAPTER III METHODS OF INVESTIGATION
• Describing the methods used in the study
• Explaining and justifying the methods

3.1 Research Approach
- Explaining and justifying in brief the chosen approach for the research
- There is a sense of argument in this section, but it appears that the argument is not convincing.

3.2 Roles of the Researcher

3.3 Object of the Study

3.4 Source of Data
3.5 Data Collection
3.6 Data Analysis
3.7 Triangulation
- Explaining and justifying triangulation, and how this approach is used in the current study
- There is no summary of what has been discussed in the chapter (about the methods explained).

CHAPTER IV RESULT AND DISCUSSION
• Describing the results of the analysis
• Discussing the topic and relating it to the parameters used

4.1 Results of the Analysis
- Describing the Points of Assessment English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010
- Analysing the points of Assessment with the Four Approaches to Rating – Scale Design

4.1.1 The Points of Assessment English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010
4.1.2 The Points of Assessment and Four Approaches to Rating – Scale Design
4.1.2.1 The FSI (Foreign Service Institute) Family Tradition
4.1.2.2 Data – Based Scale Development
4.1.2.3 Empirically Derived, Binary – Choice, Boundary Definition Scales (EBBs)
4.1.2.4 Scaling Descriptors
4.1.3 The Closest Approach to the Points of Assessment
4.1.4 The Strengths and the Weaknesses of the Points of Assessment

4.2 Discussion
- Summarising the analysis of the points of assessment described in the chapter

CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS
• Briefly summarise the whole discussion in the dissertation
• Concluding the research findings

5.1 Conclusions
- Presenting the summary of the study
- Summarising what she has presented in the chapter

5.2 Suggestions
- Presenting the suggestions from the study
- Stating the implications of the study

Figure 6.1 Hierarchical Layers of Meanings in Sri’s dissertation

In Sri’s dissertation, the development of Themes – the hierarchical layers of meanings, presents as an unequal ‘wave-like’ patterning of the discourse flow. The meanings negotiated are presented in various amounts and depth in each chapter, as aforementioned. As shown in table 6.1, the headings of the chapters imply the typical thesis/dissertation in the academic discourse. These chapters are organised by observing the traditional IMRAD, as indicated above. However, within each chapter,
there is an unequal development of Themes among the lower levels of the hierarchy of meanings. For instance, chapter 2, which is developed with three sections, organises meanings at a different level of layers of meanings among the various sections. This is also the case with chapter 4. Chapter 4 has two sections, which have different levels of hierarchy of thematic development. In addition, the ‘Discussion’ section does not discuss the subject matter as such sections/chapters typically do, by consolidating the components of the argument model (Toulmin, 2003) to develop a convincing argument (see the discussion of chapter 5 of Sue’s dissertation).

Moreover, as we shall see, this inadequate development is also evident in other chapters, as shown in the complete analysis. For instance, in the opening chapter, some parts of the chapter appear to violate what such texts in typical academic writing generally do in the development of the Theme, as well as the argument of the dissertation. The chapter establishes the discussion by introducing the topic: ‘The Points of Assessment Used in an English Competition: English News Report Contest ESA Week 2010’ and describing her research within six sections, each of which is further developed in several paragraphs. The chapter shows more a descriptive text than a persuasive/argumentative one. This confirms what Lee (2006) found in her research about the writing performance of students from East Asian countries. For instance, Sri does not present any problematisation of her research, which is crucial in this kind of text.

In setting up the background for the research, Sri’s introductory chapter orients readers with general information about ‘language assessments’. This information is very broad and general, which does not show a direct connection with the Theme and its development. It is difficult to track the development of the Theme as well as the
argument. For instance, considering its position, the first section, ‘Background of the Study’, should play a role as the MacroTheme – the point of departure of the message – of the chapter as well as of the dissertation (Halliday, 1985b, p. 194). Nevertheless, this section of the dissertation does not obviously state the ‘hypothesis’ of the argument the text is about to develop. There seems to be a mention of the general research area ‘Assessment has long been part of human’s life’ [B.1b], yet the argument does not develop fully. This opening sentence appears to state a vague ‘hypothesis’ (related to the Claim) for the argument to develop, which contains rather general information about the topic being negotiated. This sentence is unfocused, and rather than arguing for a position, it denotes a statement of general knowledge. This topic sentence is then followed by a series of loosely related statements that cannot further elaborate the elusive thesis or hypothesis. For instance, the second sentence ‘It is due to the fact that…’ [B.1.b] appears to provide a reason for the assessment undertaken. However, this information stops at in this sentence without any further evidence or other supporting information for this reasoning. The subsequent sentences present different kinds of information as to why people are assessed, as in ‘The assessments are mostly done to show…’ and the outcomes of assessment: ‘By fulfilling some or all of the criteria, they can be categorized….’ These sentences merely represent a list of points related to the claim but do not really develop the meaning being argued.

The macro-argument does not seem to be developed smoothly. The main point for the argument appears to be that ‘it is important to see what scoring criteria [sic] used in ‘English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010’ [B.1.1]. The ‘hypothesis’ of the macro-argument of the dissertation is not explicitly stated and appropriately positioned in the right place. However, readers can still infer it from one part of certain parts of the
introductory chapter, because, in many cases, it is not restricted to a single sentence or passage (Hegelund & Kock, 1999). The following excerpt indicates the most possible ‘hypothesis’ – ‘problem statement that anticipates the Claim’ (Hegelund & Kock, 1999), of the macro-argument, in which it seems merely to respond a voice of an expert (McNamara). In this case, Sri acts in response to his opinion in regard to the importance of language assessment for its significance to people’s lives [B.1.i]. Thus, it is obvious that Sri’s stance leans very much to him by responding his view, as shown by the way she presents the hypothesis in the following excerpt.

Therefore, it is important to see what scoring criteria [sic] used in ‘English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010’. Besides, it is also important to see what strengths and weaknesses of the scoring criteria in assessing the speaking performances performed by the participants'. [B.1.i]

The choice of the expression – ‘is important to’, suggests that the writer evaluates the topic – ‘scoring criteria used in ‘English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010’’, to seek a gap for her research (as the ‘hypothesis’ or point for the argument). However, the gap does not seem to be problematised adequately. The conjunctive ‘Therefore’ at the beginning of the sentence suggests this statement of ‘hypothesis’ follows certain text(s) such as preceding evidence/data that leads to conclusive statements. These data are likely those the writer presented in the ‘Reasons for choosing the topic’ (McNamara’s statement), as Sri’s statement is positioned in the closing position of the section.

As the macroNew of the chapter, the last section of chapter 1 – ‘Outline of the Report’, denotes another important section in the introductory chapter. It functions to predict the subsequent chapters – how they will develop their argument as well as how each functions in the construction of the macro-argument. Consider the following excerpt:
1.6. Outline of the Report

The research report of this study consists of five chapters. Each chapter in this report contains several sub-chapters. The outline for each chapter of the report is explained as follows: [A1.t]

Chapter I is the introduction. It presents the background of the study, some reasons for choosing the topic, the statement of the problem, the objective of the study, the significance of the study, and the outline of the report. [A1.u]

Chapter II deals with the review of the related literature. It includes some information about the previous studies, the review of the theoretical background for this study, and the framework of the present study. [B.1.v]

The section ‘Outline of the Report’ is evident in most introductory sections/chapters of academic texts. In Swales’ (1990) CARS model, this section is a compulsory step for an introductory section/chapter. However, in spite of detailing the content of the chapter, this section in Sri’s introductory chapter is descriptive; there is little sense of argumentation. The text summarises the chapter (‘…the introduction. It presents the background of the study, some reasons for choosing the topic, the statement …’); and describes each chapter in the dissertation (as in ‘Chapter II deals with the review of the related literature. It includes some information about the previous studies…’). Compared to what is found in Sue’s dissertation in which she ‘indicates the structure of the dissertation and provides mini-synopses (previews) of each subsequent chapter, this section in Sri’s dissertation does not lead the reader as directly to the development of the subsection chapters. It lacks the argumentative construction of, for instance, the reason for the development of each chapter.

The analysis of Sri’s ‘Review of related Literature’ (LR) chapter sheds light on how the writer employs specific theoretical Data led by the ‘hypothesis’ to support the Claim of the macro-argument. The analysis considers how Sri’s study is contextualised with respect to prior research, that is, how she makes use of prior studies to position her own study. The analysis reveals that Sri’s LR merely pursues supports for her research
from prior studies and theories in the field. The text opens up with an orientation – ‘This chapter brings out some related literature for the study’, which is likely to be the macroTheme of the chapter. This short paragraph also initiates the discussion and outlines the chapter: ‘It is distinguished in three subchapters’, by presenting the main discussion in the text – ‘They are: review of the previous studies, review of the theoretical background, and framework of the present study’. This short paragraph is focused on textual meanings, or how the dissertation is organised, rather than ideational meanings that would bring the argumentation to the fore. There is no clear point to argue for the development of the chapter as well as the dissertation as a whole.

The first section, ‘Review of the Previous Studies’, is developed without any obvious argument. This section reviews and describes previous studies in the field with little connection to Sri’s research. It is further developed with several paragraphs, each of their hyperThemes summarising a study. The section begins by establishing the general territory of her research, as shown in the following excerpt.

As one of four aspects in language skills, speaking has become a concern for the language researchers to study, especially on how this skill is elicited and assessed. Following the issue, a number of researches have been held. Some parts of the research and discussion then come to the area of rating scales used in the assessment of the speaking ability. [B.2.b]

This paragraph of the section opens up with a statement of the general territory related to Sri’s research. The writer restates the focus of her study; that is, ‘speaking’ rather than the ‘four aspects in language skills’. This statement is further specified in its territory by saying ‘especially on how this skill is elicited and assessed’. This sentence denotes her effort to approach her study from its extended context. The subsequent sentences orient the discussion by presenting what will be discussed in the section.
However, the rest of the paragraphs present no persuasive argument. Each of the paragraphs summarises and describes a study that supports Sri’s study, as in ‘One example research is done by Kim (2006) about….’ Each also indicates a point that supports her study, as in ‘The research leads to a conclusion that in order to….’ There is a lack of systematic reasoning explaining what leads to such a point. Only in the last summary of the study ‘… the analysis of the scoring indicators of speaking assessment conducted by Anggarani (2010)’ Sri seems to present adequate information that leads to the point she presents (see appendix 2 paragraph [B.2.e]). This study is very similar in its subject matter and context to ‘the Analysis of the Scoring Indicators of Panel Evaluation Used in Speech Contest English Students Association (ESA) Week 2009 in UNNES Given by the Judges’. Sri even draws on the study to conduct her study: ‘The result of Anggarani’s study is highly considered in this study since….’ [B.2.f]. However, she does not reflect on how this study may lead to better research in the field.

The other sections do little to contribute to her argument for a closer investigation of the speaking assessment. The discussions in this part of the chapter are too general for the topic Sri pursues. For example, the second section, ‘2.2 The Review of the Theoretical Background’, is divided into three lower levels of macroThemes. The first subsection, ‘2.2.1. General Concept of Language Testing and Assessment’, which is expanded into two lower level macroThemes, opens the discussion with a general statement about assessment, ‘Since a long time ago, assessment has become one part of human’s [sic] life’ [B.2.g]. Even in its lower level, ‘2.2.1.1. A Brief History of Language Testing and Assessment’, it begins with a general statement that is far from the topic of the study, by saying that ‘As we have already known, there are four aspects of language skills that should be elicited from the students in the process of language
learning’ [B.2.j]. Such layering reveals the complexity of the field of the study Sri presents (detailed analysis can be found in Appendix 2). However, it also shows that she does not strategically develop the Theme in the chapter. In addition, the last section, ‘Framework of the Present Study’, ends the discussion in the chapter by clarifying the research focus and verifying the use of the four chosen approaches in the current research. This short section summarises the study and verifies the use of the four chosen approaches in Sri’s study, as in ‘As the framework of this study, the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 is analysed using four approaches of rating-scale design by …’ [B.2.bm]. However, there is no sound argument negotiated in this last section of the chapter. It only gives a reason for the decision: ‘Four approaches of rating-scale design are used in this study since it can make…’ [B.2.bn]

As with previous chapters, argumentation constitutes a challenge for this student writer in the methodology chapter. The chapter is developed with a lack of sound argument. It opens with a paragraph outlining the boundaries of the chapter:

This chapter discusses about the methods of investigation used in this study. It covers the investigation approach, the roles of the researcher, the object of the study, the source of data, the data collection, the data analysis, and the triangulation. [A3.a]

Similar to earlier chapter openings, the brief paragraph describes the main discussion of the chapter (‘… discusses about the methods of investigation …’). It then reproduces the headings of the sections to show the structure of the chapter. The following text (3.1 Research Approach) recounts the study approach. There is a sense of better argumentation; yet the way she presents the point seems to need more improvement. Consider the following excerpt:
3.1 Research Approach

The study used a qualitative approach in its process of investigation. The approach was chosen since the purpose of the study was to analyse the points of assessment used in ‘English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010’ and to decide the strengths and the weaknesses of the points of assessment by comparing it to another scoring criteria used to assess speaking skill. This process of investigation could not be done in statistical procedures since it needed some descriptions instead of numbers to confirm the research findings. Thus, the qualitative approach was considered to be the most appropriate approach in this study. [B.3.b]

The above excerpt describes the process of investigation. The argument has been developed but the ‘point to argue’ is not positioned in the right place. There is a sense of reasoning (as in ‘… was chosen since the purpose of the study was …’ and ‘This process of investigation could not be done in statistical procedures since it needed some …’). Also, the last sentence in the excerpt indicates a ‘conclusive’ statement about the point she is talking about after the reasoning was provided. Following (Halliday, 1985b, p. 194), this text would be a better argument if the point was stated at the beginning of the text and reiterated at the ending. It appears to be common for Indonesian students to state the Claim at the end of a text as a summarised point of the argument. Thus, the first sentence ‘The study used a qualitative approach in its process of investigation’ could be better phrased if it states, ‘the point for the argument’ as ‘A qualitative approach was assumed to be the most suitable design for the study in its process of investigation’.

The above pattern of paragraph/text development is also evident in the rest of the sections of this methodology chapter. Within the seven sections in this chapter, the paragraphs are developed with each hyperTheme (paragraph) discussing the theme as per its heading (see Table 6.1). These paragraphs are still more descriptive then the previous (analysed) one. For instance, in section ‘3.3 Object of the Study’, the object of the study is posited as ‘The object of the study was the points of assessment used in….’
There was evidence of reasoning, as in ‘This object was chosen since it was considered to be important for…’ which makes the paragraph sounds argumentative; yet there is no point stated at the hyperTheme position. Thus, the other sections are also expanded in the same way as the first paragraph. While there is an effort to develop argumentation, there is a problem with its organisation.

There is a sense of argumentation in the ‘Results and Discussion’ chapter. In this chapter, Sri describes the analysis and its results in her research. In structuring the chapter in two macroThemes in the level of sections – ‘Results of the Analysis’ and ‘Discussion’, Sri divides the former into four lower macroThemes, which are further subdivided into several lower macroThemes before coming to the hyperThemes. ‘The results of the analysis’ displays the analysis; that is, the writer responds to the research questions and presents her findings; whilst, in the ‘discussion’ section, the results are summarised. Emphasis throughout is on the results of the analysis without examining a particular point. Consider the following excerpt from the ‘Result of the analysis’ section:

… were rather different in their orientation. The FSI family scales were both assessor- and user-oriented. Meanwhile, the points of assessment were identified as only be assessor-oriented. Therefore, the points of assessment could only be used to guide the judges in giving scores toward the participants’ performances. [B.4.l]

In the paragraph from where this excerpt is taken, there is no further analysis of their difference. The writer may assume that readers share the information provided. As discussed in the previous chapter, in discussing ‘Findings’, Sue provides detailed information on what she is arguing. For instance, when she describes the ‘available texts’ at school, she detailed the information on ‘why the texts are provided’; ‘what the texts consist of’; ‘how they are accessed by students’ etc. These details provide readers with information to understand her ‘point behind her argument’ in the paragraph. Thus
the excerpt above would be complete had Sri provided those kinds of information in relation to her own point for her argument. Moreover, the ‘Discussion’ section does not really explore the topic to construct the macro-argument of the dissertation. This section consists of a very brief summary of the results/findings with little explanation and analysis of the results. As further explained in the next paragraphs, the chapter does not function as anticipated by the descriptions of most successful theses or dissertations (Bunton, 1998, 2005; Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988).

As with the previous chapters, ‘Results and Discussion’ chapter begins with a paragraph outlining briefly the boundaries of the chapter. Sri writes that:

There are two main information presented in this chapter: the result of the analysis of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 and the discussion of the result of the analysis. [B.4.a]

The orientation, ‘There are two main information presented in this chapter’, merely explains the contents and organisation of the chapter. Thus, once again, the focus is on textual organisation rather than advancing an argument for the importance of examining spoken language assessment. This is different from the text by the Australian writer who presents reasons for what she describes. Thus, what is missing in this orientation is discussion of Sri’s reasoning as to why the two sections are combined; what is presented in each section and why, etc.

The following paragraphs in the chapter seem to have been developed in a similar way. In the subsection ‘The Points of Assessment English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010’, the writer foreshadows what is discussed in the section. The paragraph is descriptive, but without giving reasons for such description as we see in Sue’s opening paragraph (as shown in [A.4.a]). Sri’s text is more concerned with
ideational meaning and lacks substantiated argumentation, as shown in the excerpt below:

First analysis was done to look further on the points of assessment used in ‘English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010’. As it was seen from the form of the points of assessment in Appendix 1, there were five points of assessment included. They were performance, elaboration, pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy. [B.4.b]

This opening paragraph does not indicate the writer’s take on the research topic. Rather it describes the aspects of speaking assessed in the competition. As with other opening paragraphs, there is no stated point for argument. This point may be found in the body of the text, as in the following paragraph in the same subsection: ‘Each point of assessment consisted of one or several components or criteria that should be assessed from the participants’ [B.4.c]. The use of modality (should) indicates Sri’s position with the meanings being negotiated.

The ‘Discussion’ section indicates a different kind of text than is actually presented. It does not present the discussion of the topic of the study. Moreover, there is a lack of argumentation that is typically reflected in the moves of such a chapter/section (Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988, p. 118). The section opens by summarising the data presented in the previous section:

‘From the result of the …, it was known that the points of assessment covered five categories….’ which offers merely a description of what she did in the analysis but offers no point to argue. ‘Those five points of assessment… were analysed using some categories of… design proposed by Fulcher’ (2003).’ [B.4.al-bm]

The only point she argues is to do with the strength and weaknesses of the point of assessment: ‘by comparing to … it was found out that there are some strengths and weaknesses of the points of assessment….’ [B.4.an]. It is clear that there is no argument and argumentation presented in this section.
Similarly, the final chapter of Sri’s dissertation, – ‘Conclusion and suggestions’, does not contribute to the dissertation’s macro-argument. It does not restate the claim or provide the necessary evidence to support the claim. For example, the conclusion suggests that:

This study worked on the analysis of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010. It identified what points of assessment used to assess participants’ performance in the competition. It figured out that the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 included performance, elaboration, pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy. [B.5.b]

The excerpt points out that ‘performance, elaboration, pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy’ are the main criteria for assessing the News Report. Although Sri identifies the criteria for assessing oral presentation of news reports, we do not see her reasoning for reaching such conclusions. She seems to skip some steps before arriving at this response to the research question. It may be that Sri does not know how to convincingly argue for her position in English. The text is limited to presenting the claim, while other elements such as evidence and judgment are missing. Of particular interest is the absence of generalisations arising from the analysis; as a result, Sri’s dissertation loses its coherence.

This is illustrated the following excerpt from her dissertation:

Based on the result of the analysis, it was known that the strengths of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 covered the use of the scale that focused on the specific task – news reporting task; the larger features of assessment included in the scale; and its appearance. Meanwhile, the weaknesses of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 included the scores that could not be generalized to be an assumption of participant’s overall proficiency in speaking; and the inability of the scale to provide deeper information about the participant’s abilities in doing the task given. [B.5.c]

The explanation about the strength and weakness of the assessment criteria is not clear. The reference to previous sections in the research study ‘Based on the result of the analysis,’ is too general. The reader needs to be shown the emerging insights arising from the interpretation and analysis of the data (in dialogue with the literature).
Beyond the macro-argument of Sri’s dissertation, the chapter does attempt to address the importance of the argument with respect to other stakeholders. The ‘Suggestions’ section foreshadows which others might benefit from Sri’s dissertation but does not recommend other possible studies. Consider the following excerpt.

For the judges of the competition

It is suggested for the judges of the competition to enrich their information about the rating scale they are going to use in assessing participants’ performances in the competition, especially the points of assessment included in the rating scale. Therefore, fair judgments about the participants’ performances can be achieved. [B.5.e]

The excerpt indicates the outcome of the research for the judges of the competition. However, there is no clear explanation of how the study may benefit other researchers.

The textual analysis of Sri’s dissertation also shows an unclear construction of the macro-argument. It is not easy to trace the macro-argument across the chapters. One possible reason is that each chapter does not contribute to the construction of the macro-argument as expected in typical academic texts. Considering Hegelund and Kock’s (1999) argument about the close relationship between the beginning of the text and the Claim (that is located at the end of the text) and what Halliday (1985b, p. 194) argues about the importance of the beginning (and of ending) of a text, the ‘Introductory’ and ‘Conclusion’ chapters in Sri’s dissertation do not contain the peaks of the argument. In fact, the introductory chapter merely describes the research without a clear statement of the ‘theses of the argument’. There is a claim presented but the position is not stated in the manner of typical academic texts. Further, the ‘conclusion’ chapter does not sufficiently consolidate the ideas emerging from the analysis and literature review to construct a compelling argument. Rather, the chapter dutifully summarises the research and provides suggestions for several parties: the judges of the
competition, the committees of the competition, English Department students, and English teachers.

In summary, the analysis of the thematic development of Sri’s dissertation indicates that there is no convincing argument such as that represented in Toulmin’s model (see Figure 5.2).

![Figure 6.2 The Toulmin’s model of Argument (in Andrew, 2005, p. 115)](image)

Generally, an argument is structured based on a ‘hypothesis’ (as in Andrews, 2005; Hegelund & Kock, 1999; Toulmin, 2003) that lies in the beginning of the dissertation and it is reiterated at the end of texts – the conclusion (the Claim). However, finding the components of argument in Sri’s dissertation is challenging because the Claim, Data, Warrant, Rebuttal, Backing, and Qualifier of the argument that usually spread across the text are not obviously indicated. For example, locating the ‘hypothesis’ (about the importance of exploring the scoring criteria used in ‘English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010’) requires an analysis of the whole introductory chapter as it is not located in ‘one single passage’ (Hegelund & Kock, 1999). The following table maps the macro-argument in Sri’s dissertation.

*Table 6.1 Macro-Argument in Sri’s dissertation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of argument</th>
<th>Text extracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claim (Hypothesis)</strong></td>
<td>Therefore, it is important to see what scoring criteria used in ‘English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010’. Besides, it is also important to see what strengths and weaknesses of the scoring criteria in assessing the speaking performances performed by the participants’ [B.1.1] (There is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
no obvious restatement of this ‘hypothesis’ in the conclusion chapter, nor any Claim)

**Qualifier**

Therefore…

**Data**

*Theoretical data*

[B.2.q] *In order to* know whether a test and/or an assessment is effective for its test-takers or not, Brown (2004:19 – 30) identifies five principles of language testing and assessment. These principles will help the test-developer to measure the effectiveness of the test in eliciting test-takers’ abilities. Below is Brown’s (2004:19 – 30) *description* about the principles: practicality, reliability, validity, authenticity, and washback.

a) **Practicality**

[B.2.r] Practicality means that a test: (1) is *not excessively* expensive, (2) stays within appropriate time constraints, (3) is relatively easy to administer, (4) has a scoring/evaluation procedure that is specific and time-efficient.

b) **Reliability**

[B.2.s] Reliability means the consistency and dependability of a test. *If* the test is given to a group of students today, *the result will not be very* different with the test result two days ago. The reliability of a test is its consistency: tape measure that stays the same length all the time as opposed to a piece of elastic. Same results *should be obtained* wherever the tape measure is used (Power).

**Specific data drawn from studies by others**

3. [B.2.c] One example research is *done by Kim* (2006) about “Issues of Rating Scales in Speaking Performance Assessment”. The research *leads to* a conclusion that *in order to* ensure validity and reliability of a speaking performance test, attention *needs to be paid to* the quality of the speaking performance ….  

4. [B.2.d] Another study *conducted by* Nakatsuhara (2007) is written in the article entitled “Developing a Rating Scale to Assess English Speaking Skills of Japanese Upper-secondary Students”. The research *concludes* that the developed rating scale *can be a proper* indicator of students’ speaking achievement with *high* reliability and the scale *should serve as a good working* model.

**Specific data drawn from Sri’s own study**

[B.4.g] As it had been discussed in chapter II, there were several uses of rating scales in speaking tests. They were: (1) user-oriented scales; (2) assessor-oriented scales; and (3) constructor-oriented scales. Besides that, it had also been explained about the types of rating scales in terms of their scoring systems. There were holistic rating scales and analytic rating scales. The holistic assessment could then be broken down into three: (1) holistic scoring; (2) primary-trait scoring; and (3) multiple-trait scoring.

**Warrant**

McNamara (2000:4) explains “language tests play a powerful role in many people’s lives, acting as gateways at important transitional moments in education, in employment, and in moving from one country to another”.

**Backing**

Not obviously available

**Rebuttal**

Not obviously available

There is little sense of developing a compelling argument in Sri’s dissertation. When we closely examine the contents of each component of the argument based on Toulmin’s (2003) model presented in the table above, some do not seem to contribute very much to the discussion on the topic (e.g. the specific data drawn from studies by
others do not really relate to the specific discussion of the topic of the study, and the lack of a clear Backing and Rebuttal makes the argument less convincing. Nor do they seem to link to each other. This is also evident that between chapters, for instance, chapter three (‘Methods of Investigation’) does not present a sense of Warrant for the research besides explaining what Sri did in her study. There is justification, but it seems to work locally, providing reasons for some methodological choices, without considering the more general sense of developing the macro-argument, as in ‘The approach was chosen since the purpose of the study was to…’. The lack of discussion of other possible kinds of research that can be used in the methodology chapter suggests that the writer does not negotiate other possibilities. This lack of argumentation indicates that there is lack of ‘general, hypothetical statements, which can act as bridges, and authorise the sort of step to which [her] particular argument commits [her]’ (Toulmin, 2003, p. 91). This in turn weakens the soundness of the argument presented.

Similarly, the final chapter – ‘Conclusion and suggestions’, summarises the discussion and presents some suggestions for future pedagogy; rather than consolidating all components of the argument to develop a convincing argument and present recommendations for future research, as we have seen in Sue’s dissertation. This chapter seems to be a part of the complete discussion chapter in a typical academic text, such as in Sue’s dissertation. The conclusion section is not different from the ‘discussion’ section in chapter 4. There is even one same point presented in the two texts, that of ‘…the strengths and the weaknesses of the points of assessment…’ [B.5.c]. In the suggestions section, Sri makes no recommendation for future research that links her research and future research in the field. In this sense, she does not argue some points for future research. The last section recommends ‘… some suggestions that can
be given to the readers related to the use of this study…’ [B.5.d]. These all indicate how different the Indonesian student’s dissertation is from the one written by the Australian student.

The following section examines in greater detail the language choices made by Sri as she negotiated those chapters where argumentation is most ‘at risk’.

6.3 Step 2: Staging meanings in the meso-level argument

Describing the genres of chapters considered crucial for developing a stance is significant for an understanding of the way argumentation is developed across text. The analysis aims to draw out comparative findings from both analysed dissertations to enable a better understanding of challenges confronting second language writers such as Sri. As with the corresponding chapters in Sue’s dissertation, chapters in Sri’s thesis were examined to see how each is developed and how each contributes to the construction of the overarching thesis argument. In this case, the analysis includes the ‘Introduction’, ‘Review of related literature’, and ‘Conclusion and suggestions’ chapters.

The analysis in this section follows the one that is presented in the previous chapter (see section 5.3) and utilises Martin’s (e.g. Martin, 1993, 2009; Martin & Rose, 2008; Rose & Martin, 2012) genre theory as the theoretical underpinning. This analysis is undertaken to examine a range of linguistic resources Sri employed to construct the argument through the organisation of information in stages/steps and moves. In addition, the analysis is also informed by a number of scholars who have investigated different aspects of dissertations/thesis/journal articles.

Genre analysis of Sri’s selected chapters reveals a significant deviation from the conventional dissertation genres of these chapters in English speaking contexts. Despite
the findings of previous textual analysis that the highest macroThemes in the chapter level of Sri’s dissertation are organised observing the IMRD type of academic text (as mentioned previously), genre analysis revealed the way the argument in Sri’s dissertation is signposted, established and maintained.

### 6.3.1. Sri’s introductory chapter

Examining the introductory chapter of Sri’s dissertation is crucial in the present research as it offers insights into the way Sri struggles to create a research space (Swales, 1990). In general, the chapter is employed to introduce the topic and builds up the background to warrant the research. As with the analysis of Sue’s dissertation, the complete analysis of this chapter was conducted observing the organisation of the moves and steps of Bunton (1998, 2002), Paltridge and Starfield (2007), Hood (2006) and Swales (Swales, 1990; Swales & Feak, 2012). The three kinds of moves represented in the CARS model, each of which is developed in steps, are utilised to analyse the schematic structure of the introductory chapter. As we have seen, this chapter is commonly employed for arguing for the object of the study, a need for new knowledge, and the author’s contribution. Thus, in the present research, Sri’s introductory chapter was analysed with reference to the CARS model. In general, the text seems to follow this typical pattern, as shown in table 6.3 below.

**Table 6.2 Stages and phases in the introductory chapter of Sri’s dissertation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual structure of Sri’s dissertation</th>
<th>Classification based on Generic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>Stage 1: Establishing Warrant for the Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Opening) [B.1.a]</td>
<td>Phase 1: Briefly outlining the content of the chapter by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 The excerpt coded accordingly to facilitate easy referencing, as aforementioned. For instance, an excerpt coded [B.1.a] means that it is taken from Sri’s Dissertation/B/, Chapter I (One) /1/, and paragraph /a/ that refers to the numbering of the paragraph.
The table above indicates that Sri’s introductory chapter is developed through a sequence of moves and steps as compared to the CARS model. As with the stages offered by Hood (2006) (as in subsection 5.3.1 in this thesis), Sri’s text deviates from employing the three stages: ‘arguing for the object of the study’, ’arguing for the need for new knowledge’, and ‘arguing for the significance of the author’s contribution’ (see Hood, 2006; Swales, 1990). However, while Sue’s introductory chapter develops the argument through detailed explanations of the moves and steps (see subsection 5.3.1), Sri’s text lacks argument and merely describes the study leading the chapter to the next direction.
The introductory chapter briefly develops the topic of the study, ‘The Points of Assessment Used in an English Competition’, setting up the background by reviewing the development of language assessment and the changes in ‘English speech contests’; explaining the reasons for the study; and guiding readers to the focus of the study to frame their expectations towards what and how to read her research. As has been discussed, this chapter is descriptive rather than argumentative. There is some orientation to the topic of assessment, but no well-developed argument is presented for the choice of the object of the study.

*Argumentation in stage 1 of Sri’s introductory chapter*

In initiating the discussion in the chapter, as well as the dissertation as a whole, arguing for the object of the study, as the first stage, plays a central role. This first stage is typically employed to begin the engagement with readers about the research being reported. The genre analysis of this stage suggests that the stage is employed to describe ‘Assessment’ as the object of the study. Sri describes the topic of the study. In doing so, four connected phases were identified in this stage of Sri’s introductory chapter, as shown in the above table.

The first phase opens the discussion by outlining the contents of the chapter, as shown in the excerpt in the following table.

*Table 6.3 Stage 1 phase 1 in the introductory chapter of Sri’s dissertation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sri’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[B.1.a] This chapter presents the background of the study, the reasons for choosing the topic, the statement of the problem, the objective of the study, the significance of the study, and the outline of the report.</td>
<td>Framing the discussion in the chapter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Stage 1 Describing the object of the study*

*Phase 1: Briefly outlining the content of the chapter by reproducing the headings of the sections*
This beginning provides the textual orientation used to frame the discussion in the chapter: ‘This chapter presents the background of the study, the reasons….’ However, the orientation is merely provided by reproducing the headings of the subsections without any further discussion or explanation about those headings, the chapter or the dissertation in general. There is little sense of ideational signposting, of foreshadowing of what the argument is going to be; nor is there an indication of whether the writer considers the presence of other people (the readers) in her development of the dissertation. More detailed analysis on this ‘engagement’ and the challenges it establishes for English language learners is presented in the last section in this chapter.

The following two phases in the table below are linked to each other in providing the background to the study, reviewing the development of language assessment and the changes in ‘English speech contests’.

Table 6.4 Stage 1 phase 2 and 3 in the introductory chapter of Sri’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sri’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Background of the Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.1.b] Assessment has long been part of human’s life. It is due to the fact that people are assessed in many aspects during their lives. The assessments are mostly done to show their performance in a category. The others are to put them into an appropriate level of a category. McNamara (2000:3) states that throughout history, people have been put to the test to prove their capabilities or to establish their credentials. In order to do that, people have to fulfil some criteria of the test or assessment. By fulfilling some or all of the criteria, they can be categorized into a group of which the assessment is done.</td>
<td>Setting up the background for the research by reviewing the development of language assessment and the changes in ‘English speech contests’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language assessment was first developed based on some principles. But the principles have much changed during this time. In the 1950s, the testing focused on specific language elements such as the phonological, grammatical, and lexical contrasts between two languages. Today, test designers are still challenged in their quest for more authentic, valid instruments that simulate real-world interaction (Brown 2004:8).

| Phase 3. Providing background information about assessment in language | Recounting the early development of language assessment and comparing it to the current time | B.1.d Language assessment was first developed based on some principles. But the principles have much changed during this time. In the 1950s, the testing focused on specific language elements such as the phonological, grammatical, and lexical contrasts between two languages. Today, test designers are still challenged in their quest for more authentic, valid instruments that simulate real-world interaction (Brown 2004:8). |

Phase 2 provides background information that indicates the importance of the role of assessment in education. This phase begins by explaining the research area – ‘Assessment as important, central, and interesting (‘Assessment has long been part of human’s [sic] life’). The following sentence; ‘It is due to the fact that …’ suggests some reasoning for the previous ‘grand claim’, but the information is not further elaborated. In the next sentence, the writer presents the purpose of such assessment: ‘The assessments are mostly done to show …’ Sri then provides historical recount, as in ‘McNamara (2000:3) states that throughout history, people have been put….’ In summary, there is no obvious argument for the dissertation work in this part of the text.

Argument is also largely absent in the following paragraph (Table 6.2b Phase 3). In Phase 3 of the analysis, Sri provides a historical overview of previous research in the area of language assessment. In the sentence: ‘In the 1950s, the testing focused on specific language elements…’, Sri recounts what the history of assessment looks like, perhaps in order to develop a position about the present one – the ESA. However, she has not yet introduced the ESA assessment, the focus of her study. This lack of clarity has significant ramifications for her writing. This strategy is typical for a dissertation in the English department where the study was conducted, that the first stage of the
introductory chapter describes the object of the study. There is often no argument realised by a ‘background to the study’ section.

In phase 4 of this first stage, Sri’s own study is finally introduced as is shown in the following excerpt.

**Table 6.5 Stage 1 phase 4 in the introductory chapter of Sri’s dissertation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sri’s dissertation</th>
<th><strong>Genre analysis</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[B.1.f] One form of the alternative assessment in language learning is done in language competition. Here, in the competition, language learners as participants are encouraged to perform their capabilities in mastering the language. They have to compete each other to show their best performances. There will be some experts of the language as judges to assess the performances and they will choose one participant to be the best of the others.</td>
<td>Introducing language competition as an alternative assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.1.g] In the context of this study, the competition is “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”. It is an English competition with the participants comes from senior and junior high schools around Central Java province. In the competition, they have to show their abilities in developing some news points into well-constructed news and reporting it as if they were the real live-news reporters.</td>
<td>Introducing the subject matter of the current research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In spite of the importance of reviewing previous research in the area, the writer does not refer to this body of knowledge in the introductory chapter. Instead, language competitions generally are introduced. However, reviewing studies done previously is important in establishing an argument from the introductory chapter. The lack of this information suggests that the writer may not really know how to begin to develop a convincing argument or that she is not aware of the persuasive purpose of the dissertation – that is, of the importance of establishing a problem, making a space, and
developing a position from the outset of the dissertation. Such insights into the challenges faced by student writers are offered by genre analysis.

*Argumentation in stage 2 of Sri’s introductory chapter*

The second stage of Sri’s introductory chapter argues the need for new understandings in the area of spoken language assessment. The writer offers reasons to conduct the study; that is, that she (and readers) need to understand language assessment, in this case the assessment in ESA week competition as ‘new’ knowledge. However, one vital phase of the stage of most successful English dissertations (as suggested in e.g. Swales, 1990) is missing. It is an obligatory step of articulating the research gap. Consider the extract in following table.

*Table 6.6 Stage 2 phase 1 in the introductory chapter of Sri’s dissertation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicative Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Reasons for Choosing the Topic [A1.i] There are some reasons for people to understand about language assessment due to its significance towards their lives. McNamara (2000:4) explains the reasons as follows. First, language tests play a powerful role in many people’s lives …. Secondly, you may be working with language tests in your professional life as a teacher or …. Finally, if you are conducting research in language study you may need to have measures of the language proficiency of your subjects. [A1.j] Based on the reasons, it then seems to be very interesting to find out more about language assessment and its applications in the real-life conditions.</td>
<td>Role of language assessments Motivation for further research Obligatory Phase of finding the research gap is missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This stage is employed to argue a need to understand language assessment (as the ‘new’ knowledge). Typically, it is done by seeking the research gap that the study intends to occupy and offering a solution; however, as has been pointed out, Sri does
not do so. Instead, she begins by listing several motivations for doing the study. She argues from three perspectives: the social (the place of language assessment in ‘gateway’ moments in individual lives); the professional (language assessment approaches as teaching tools); and the academic (understanding measurement procedures).

*Argumentation in stage 3 of Sri’s dissertation*

The third stage of the introductory chapter in successful English language dissertations such as Sue’s typically argues for the contribution the research will offer to the field of study. However, there are two phases of the CARS model missing in Sri’s introductory chapter. The following discussion unpacks these sections of Sri’s dissertation in detail.

**Table 6.7 Stage 3 phase 1 in the introductory chapter of Sri’s dissertation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicative Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Stating the problem: ESA marking criteria and its strengths and weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[A1.m] Based on the illustration above, there are two questions arise. The questions which are then constructed to focus the study are:</td>
<td>Phase 1: Stating the research questions and outlining purpose of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) What are the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) What are the strengths and weaknesses of the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Objective of the Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.1.n] From the research questions constructed, it is known that there are two main purposes to be achieved in this study. The purposes are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) to identify the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) to find out what strengths and weaknesses of the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This first phase represents one of the obligatory phases of this last stage. The CARS model describes this phase as for ‘outlining purposes/aims or stating the nature of the present research or research questions/hypotheses” (Bunton, 1998, 2002; Swales, 1990). The text begins by stating the research questions and outlining purpose of the study. However, the writer fails to state the problem addressed by the research – why is this area worthy of study? Without such information the reader is left wondering what the purpose is for studying assessment of a speaking competition. Moreover, the transition from the research questions to the objective of the study is performed by simply changing the questions into statements of the same ideational status. Compare the following quotes, ‘The questions which are then constructed to focus the study are: What are the points of assessment used in ‘English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010?’ with: ‘The purposes are: (a) to identify the points of assessment used in ‘English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010’’. Such ‘sleight of hand’ is a missed opportunity to convince the reader of the worth of the study and to seed the eventual position taken by the writer.

The second phase is employed for stating the significance of Sri’s dissertation; that is, ‘stating value of the research’ (as in, Bunton, 1998, 2002; Swales, 1990). Realised by ‘Significance of the Study’, this optional phase is meant to predict the positive values the study may offer, especially in the related field of the study. Consider the following extract:
Table 6.8 Stage 3 phase 2 in the introductory chapter of Sri’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Significance of the Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.1.o] By conducting the research in this study, it is hoped that there will be some advantages achieved. Those advantages are expected to have some contributions toward different parties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.1.p] It deals with the significance of the study that can be classified into three parts. They are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) For the judges and the committees</td>
<td>Outlining the significance of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.1.q] The study will let the judges and the committees of the competition know the quality of the scoring criteria they used to assess the participants’ performances.</td>
<td>Phase 2: Stating the significance of Sri’s dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) For science development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.1.r] The study will let people know what scoring criteria can be used to assess the performance in speaking skill, especially the performance in reporting news.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) For the researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.1.s] This study will improve the researcher’s knowledge, as a teacher candidate, about language assessment since it is an important aspect in language learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phase announces the significance of the study for three parties, that is, for ‘the judges and committee’ (of the ‘English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010’), ‘the science development’ and ‘the researcher’. For instance, for the judges and the committees, she promises, ‘The study will let the judges and the committees of the competition know the quality of the scoring criteria they used to assess the participants’ performances’. The significance for the development of pedagogy is also indicated by saying, ‘The study will let people know what scoring criteria can be used to assess the
performance in speaking skill, especially the performance in reporting news’. The significance for the researcher is, she asserts, that ‘This study will improve the researcher’s knowledge, as a teacher candidate, about language assessment since it is an important aspect in language learning.’

Despite arguing for the significance of the study, the end of the chapter arrives with no obvious indication of the outcomes of the investigation.

Table 6.9 Stage 3 phase 3 in the introductory chapter of Sri’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sri’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[B.1.t] The research report of this study consists of five chapters. Each chapter in this report contains several sub-chapters. The outline for each chapter of the report is explained as follows:</td>
<td>Preview of the dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.1.u] Chapter I is the introduction. It presents the background of the study, some reasons for choosing the topic, the statement of the problem, the objective of the study, the significance of the study, and the outline of the report.</td>
<td>Phase 3: by indicating the structure of the dissertation and providing mini-synopses (previews) of each subsequent chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.1.v] Chapter II deals with the review of the related literature. It includes some information about the previous studies, the review of the theoretical background for this study, and the framework of the present study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This last section of the chapter (Table 6.10 above) represents an obligatory phase (step); that is, ‘indicating the structure of the thesis and providing mini-synopses (previews) of each subsequent chapter’ (Bunton, 1998, 2002; Swales, 1990). The section entitled ‘Outline of the Report’ indicates the content and organisation of the subsequent chapters, and the development of their argument.
6.3.2. Literature review chapter

Both the introductory and literature review chapters play important roles in staging meanings to develop the argument of the dissertation. The Introductory chapter discussed above contextualises Sri’s study; whilst the LR contextualises the discussion further by placing Sri’s study among prior research in the field. These chapters present unique challenges to student writers (Kwan, 2006; Swales & Feak, 2000), especially in the EFL context, as in Indonesia. Students often experience difficulty in identifying the gap in knowledge addressed by the study and in justifying its worth. The analysis of the LR in this research utilises the three moves or stages offered by Kwan (2006): (opening, body and closing). The table below indicates the stages in Sri’s dissertation. Limitation of space makes it difficult to include the whole text.

Table 6.10 Stages and phases in the Review of Related Literature chapter of Sri’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual structure of Sri’s dissertation</th>
<th>Classification based on Generic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</td>
<td>Genre Two: Contextualising research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Introduction) [B.2.a]</td>
<td>Stage 1: Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the Previous Studies</td>
<td>Stage 2: Sub-stage 2.a:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph [B.2.f]</td>
<td>Reviewing previous studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the Theoretical Background</td>
<td>Sub-stage 2b: Reviewing theoretical background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1.</strong> Establishing one part of the territory of one’s own research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 1B:</strong> claiming centrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 1C:</strong> Surveying research related literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2.</strong> Creating a research niche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 2D:</strong> asserting the relevancy of the surveyed claims to one’s own research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1.</strong> Establishing general territory of her research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 1B:</strong> claiming centrality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - A Brief History of Language Testing and Assessment  
- Principles of Language Testing and Assessment | **Strategy 1A:** surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims  
**Phase 2:** Creating a research niche by:  
**Strategy 2A:** counter-claiming  
**Strategy 2B:** gap-indicating  
**Strategy 2C:** asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed |
| --- | --- |
| Overview of English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010  
- ESA WEEK 2010  
- English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010  
- Points of Assessment Used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 | **Sub-stage 2c:** Reviewing ESA WEEK 2010  
**Phase 1:** Establishing general territory of her research  
**Strategy 1B:** claiming centrality  
**Strategy 1A:** surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims  
**Phase 2:** Creating a research niche by:  
**Strategy 2C:** asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed |
| Overview of Rating-Scale Design  
- Rating Scale for Testing Speaking Skill  
- Four Approaches to Rating-Scale Design for Testing Speaking Skill | **Sub-stage 2d:** Reviewing Rating-Scale Design  
**Phase 1:** Establishing general territory of her research  
**Strategy 1B:** claiming centrality  
**Strategy 1A:** surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims  
**Phase 2:** Creating a research niche by:  
**Strategy 2D:** asserting the relevancy of the surveyed claims to one’s own research  
**Strategy 2E:** abstracting or synthesizing knowledge claims to establish a theoretical position or a theoretical framework |
| **Framework of the Present Study** | **Stage 3:** Conclusion  
**Phase 1:** Occupying the research niche by announcing research design/processes |

Sri’s textual organisation does not completely correspond to Kwan’s model, but there is considerable resemblance. The general territory for her research is established, but the more specific discussion that corresponds to phases and strategies such as
finding the gap in the research, or a niche is not evident. Kwan (2006) argues that there are three moves/stages adopted by writers to organise their literature reviews: establishing their territory; creating a research niche and occupying this research niche.

In this part of the text, Sri begins by briefly reviewing previous studies and the theoretical background to the field of assessment. However, there are some indications that the discussion is done mainly to seek support for her study. The review is completed by describing the three studies related to Sri’s study. She does not engage with the literature critically. This LR could be better if she evaluates each study, relates it to her work, and states how and why her study is different or the same. This evaluation was done often in Sue’s LR, either positively (that is, when the study relates and supports hers), or negatively (when it contradicts hers, or her study is claimed to be better).

Stage 1

In stage 1, the discussion begins by briefly overviewing the chapter, delineating the scope and structure of the chapter. Once again however, the emphasis is on the textual rather than argumentative signposting in this opening stage. Consider the following extract.

Table 6.11 Stage 1 in the Literature Review chapter of Sri’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sri’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[B.2.a] This chapter brings out some related literature for the study. It is distinguished in three subchapters. They are: review of the previous studies, review of the theoretical background, and framework of the present study.</td>
<td>Communicative Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opening the chapter by outlining briefly its contents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This stage opens by establishing the range of the discussion in the chapter. As with the typical opening stage of LRs (Kwan, 2006), Sri’s dissertation previews the discussion of the chapter (‘This chapter brings out some related literature for the study’). In addition, it also reminds readers of the way the chapter organises the discussion: ‘They are: review of the previous studies, review of the theoretical background, and framework of the present study’. However, this ‘metatext’ does not take the opportunity to advance the writer’s ‘angle’. Doing so would enable the writer to justify her choices in what is necessarily a selective exercise – no single scholar can read all the literature around a particular topic.

Stage 2

The second stage may be considered the core of the LR chapter. This stage, which is divided into four sub-stages (stage 2.a – d), presents the main discussion of the chapter. Each sub-stage is oriented to a different topic. Sub-stage one relates to prior studies, sub-stage 2 to the theoretical background, sub stage 3 to the ESA week and sub-stage 4 to the marking criteria. This ‘body’ stage (Kwan, 2006) reviews the previous studies on assessment and theoretical background of language testing and assessment as well as the English News Report Contest. However, studies in the field are only briefly discussed in the list and the remaining sub stages are dedicated to explicating the theoretical framework. As a result, it is difficult for Sri to position her study among those of other scholars in the field in the way in which Sue does (see Sub-section 5.3.2).

The first sub-stage reviews three studies in the field. In this sub-stage, the writer briefly describes and summarises the studies, without evaluating them. Consider the following extract:
2.1 Review of the Previous Studies
As one of four aspects in language skills, speaking has become a concern for the language researchers to study, especially on how this skill is elicited and assessed (Strategy 1B). Following the issue…, [B.2.b]

One example research is done by Kim (2006) about “Issues of Rating Scales in Speaking Performance Assessment”. The research leads to a conclusion that in order to ensure validity and reliability of a speaking performance test, attention needs to be paid to the quality of the speaking performance along with scoring that is based on criteria specific to that particular testing context (Strategy 1C). [B.2.c]

Another study conducted by Nakatsu (2007) is written in the article entitled “Developing a Rating Scale to Assess English Speaking Skills of Japanese Upper-secondary Students”. The research concludes that the developed rating scale can be a proper indicator of students’ speaking achievement with high reliability and the scale should serve as a good working model (Strategy 1C). [B.2.d]

The latest learned study on the issue of rating scale to assess speaking ability is about the analysis of the scoring indicators of speaking assessment conducted by Anggari (2010). She works on “the Analysis of the Scoring Indicators of Panel Evaluation Used in Speech Contest English Students Association (ESA) Week 2009 in UNNES Given by the Judges”…. [B.2.e] (Strategy 1C).

The result of Anggari’s study is highly considered in this study since the present study tries to make a similar analysis but in different perception and deals with different object of study. [B.2.f]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sri’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicative Purpose</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stages/Phases</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing the literature review section.</td>
<td>Sub-stage 2a. Reviewing previous studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of one study</td>
<td>Phase 1. Establishing general territory of her research on speaking assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary/description of another study</td>
<td>Strategy 1B: claiming centrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of another study</td>
<td>Strategy 1C: Surveying research related literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of the other</td>
<td>Phase 2. Creating a research niche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 2D:</strong> asserting the relevancy of the surveyed claims to one’s own research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite the relatively limited nature of the literature review in this sub-stage, Sri begins to develop her argument at this stage of the chapter. The argument begins by establishing the general territory of speaking skills, pedagogy and assessment (as Phase 1). The writer elaborates on the area in two strategies: Strategy 1B: claiming centrality, ‘… speaking has become a concern for the language researchers to study…’ and Strategy 1C: Surveying research related literature, ‘that is based on criteria specific to that particular testing context’. However, the argument does not seem to be developed completely. Only one study that is evaluated in this part relates very much to Sri’s study.

Phase 2 of this stage represents an important point of the chapter. It identifies the gap that the research intends to occupy:

The result of Anggarani’s study is highly considered in this study since the present study tries to make a similar analysis but in different perception and deals with different object of study. [B.2.f]

This excerpt indicates that Sri’s study makes use of Anggarani’s study as a basis for assessing the criteria of speaking assessment used in ESA week completion to help her answer her research question. This only study, out of three that Sri describes, that is used as the ‘comparing research’ does not give adequate information needed for the gap Sri is developing. However, a more convincing case for her study could be made if she was in dialogue with a greater number of scholars through their ‘work’.

Sub-stages 2 to 4 review theories in relation to the speaking assessment and describe the subject of the study (ESA WEEK 2010). The arguments at each level of hierarchy of meaning are developed in the same way as the one in the first sub-stage. The development of the argument is not complete, as shown in the following excerpt:
In language learning, people need to know how far learners have achieved the lessons or what level of language proficiency they should be put into. Therefore, it is also important to take an assessment as one part of language learning. [B.2.h]

The above text is taken from a complete short paragraph from section ‘Review of Theoretical Background’. The first sentence has a good point for the argument for the paragraph. The use of ‘need to know’ indicates Sri’s evaluation of the phenomena she discusses. However, there is neither evidence nor further information to bolster the conclusion in the last sentence, ‘Therefore, it is also important to take…..’

Stage 3

The last stage in Sri’s LR chapter (as the table below shows) is utilised for concluding the discussion in the chapter and for occupying the niche.

Table 6.13 Stage 3 phase 1 in the Literature Review chapter of Sri’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sri’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framework of the Present Study</td>
<td>Stages/Phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.2.bl] The study works on the analysis of points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010. It attempts to find out what points of assessment used in the competition and also its strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>Discussion of the work informing the rating scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.2.bm] As the framework of this study, the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 is analyzed using four approaches of rating-scale design by Glenn Fulcher (2003).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.2.bn] Four approaches of rating-scale design are used in this study since it can make the process of analysis more objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this stage, as shown in the table above, a summary of, and the discussion in, the chapter are presented. The summary begins by briefly restating the aim of Sri’s study
and positioning the study (‘the analysis of points of assessment used in English News Report Contest’) through the strengths and weaknesses of the assessment of the ESA competition. These sentences [B.2.bm-bn] refer to the methodology of the study. The logical conjunctions in these sentences (‘as’ and ‘since’) suggest argumentation is in play. Thus, the chapter conclusion summarises and points forward to the next chapter, the methodology. However, the reasoning is local, confined to the methodology of the study rather than to executing a hypothesis or position for the rest of the dissertation.

6.3.3. Coming to conclusions and suggestions

As previously mentioned, Sri’s dissertation deviates somewhat from the typical genre of thesis/dissertation (as in Bunton, 1998; Dong, 1998; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). This is particularly so in the absence of a single Discussion chapter which draws together the findings and their implications as exemplified in Sue’s dissertation. In contrast, Sri’s discussion is a section in the fourth chapter, the Results and Discussion chapter while the conclusion is presented in the final Conclusion and suggestion chapter.

The Discussion section

As discussed in the previous section, the discussion section appears not to serve its function. This genre analysis also shows how the section is different from such texts as the dissertation previously analysed (Sue’s discussion chapter). The discussion section in Sri’s dissertation summarises the results of the analysis of the research. Fulcher is cited as a scholar whose contribution of ‘four approaches to rating scale design’ is useful, however there is no reason given for why the model is useful.

Despite its subheading, this short text (136 words) of the discussion section does not indicate a ‘discussion’ according to those described by Brett (1994), Posteguillo
(1999), Ruiying and Allison (2003); and Paltridge and Starfield (2007, p. 135). The typical discussion chapter/section involves the summary of the findings/results of the analysis, findings of previous studies, theoretical underpinning for the study, and the writer’s comments/synthesis of the information, as found in Sue’s discussion chapter. Of the most importance to a discussion section/chapter is how it consolidates all the discussions previously undertaken, and states the main point of the research, which is missing in Sri’s dissertation. There is also an absence of reference to other studies reflecting the writer’s limited use of literature and reliance on a single source for methodological design.

*The Conclusion and suggestions chapter*

Sri’s closing chapter – the ‘Conclusion and suggestions’ chapter, is different from a typical closing chapter in academic writing (as in Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). Compared to Sue’s closing chapter, this chapter of Sri’s dissertation appears to be a part of or a section in her ‘discussion’ chapter where she provides summaries of the findings/results of the analysis along with the implication of the study. This is a very short chapter (676 words) consisting of only three sections. Consider the generic analysis shown in the table below.

*Table 6.14 Stages and phases in the ‘Conclusion and suggestions’ chapter of Sri’s dissertation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual structure of Sri’s dissertation</th>
<th>Classification based on Generic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Five: Conclusion and Suggestions</td>
<td>Genre Five: Summarising the findings and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Stage 1: Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Stage 2. Presenting the summary of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1. Briefly outlining the two main discussion of the chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1. Summarising what she has presented in the chapter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The opening of the chapter, as with other previous chapters in Sri’s dissertation once more focuses on how the chapter is organised textually. This opening paragraph of the chapter details what is presented in the following sections of the chapter.

Consider the following excerpt below:

Table 6.15 Stage 1 phase 1 in the ‘Conclusion and suggestions’ chapter of Sri’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sri’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
<th>Stages/Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.5.a] Chapter five presents some points that are classified into two subchapters. First, conclusions will discuss the summary of this study and the research findings. Meanwhile, the next subchapter will present some suggestions for the readers related to the use of this study.</td>
<td>Outlining briefly the boundaries of the chapter</td>
<td>Stage 1. Opening Phase 1. Briefly outlining the two main discussion of the chapter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With its brief text overall, this opening paragraph appears to be long. There is no obvious argument negotiated; yet the meanings have been broad with a strong ideational orientation.

There seems to be a sign of argument in the conclusion section. The point to argue is evident but the organisation does not really follow what it should be. Consider the excerpt below.
Table 6.16 Stage 2 phase 1 in the ‘Conclusion and suggestions’ chapter of Sri’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sri’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
<th>Stages/Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicative Purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1 Conclusions</strong></td>
<td>Summarising the discussions previously done</td>
<td>Stage 2. Presenting the summary of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.5.b] This study worked on the analysis of the points of assessment used in <em>English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010</em>. It identified what points of assessment used to assess participants’ performance in the competition. It figured out that the points of assessment used in <em>English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010</em> included performance, elaboration, pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy.</td>
<td>Phase 1. Summarising what she has presented in the chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table above, findings are summarised in this brief chapter but there is no attempt to make a Claim (such as in the opening of the ‘Conclusion’ section, as is illustrated in the sentence: ‘This study worked on the analysis of the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010*’). This is in line with what (P. Thompson, 2005, pp. 317-318) identifies as the typical sections of the final chapter in dissertations or theses:

- an introductory restatement of aims and research questions;
- consolidation of presented research (e.g. findings, limitations);
- practical applications/implications; recommendations for further research.

The cited opening sentence (‘This study worked on the analysis of….’) appears to function as a restatement of the research aims. The following sentences provide the consolidation of the data from the research that supports the point stated. There are attempts at restating the aim of research in Sri’s conclusion: ‘Those points of assessment were then compared to four approaches to rating-scale design proposed by Glenn Fulcher (2003)’. One closest approach to the points of assessment was elicited. It was found out
that the data-based scale development was the closest approach to the points of assessment used in ‘English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010.’

There is a discussion of suggestions which attempt to bring together practical implications of the research. The suggestions are listed around four parties that may get benefit from the research comprising ‘For the judges of the competition’, ‘For the committees of the competition’, ‘For English Department students’, and ‘For English teachers’. The following excerpt provides an example of these suggestions.

Table 6.17 Stage 3 phase 1 in the ‘Conclusion and suggestions’ chapter of Sri’s dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from Sri’s dissertation</th>
<th>Genre analysis</th>
<th>Stages/Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2 Suggestions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) ‘For the judges of the competition [B.5. e]’ It is suggested for the judges of the competition to enrich their information about the rating scale they are going to use in assessing participants’ performances in the competition, especially the points of assessment included in the rating scale’</td>
<td>Bringing together practical implication of the research</td>
<td>Stage 3. Presenting the suggestions from the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phase 1.</strong> Stating the implications of the study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This ‘Suggestion’ section denotes Sri’s reflection on the results of her study. She provides recommendations for stakeholders for a better understanding of the topic discussed and further follow-up. However, there is no direction for further research which may suggest Sri’s lack of strong awareness of a discourse community and the social purpose of the dissertation. She has not seen the task as one to conduct research that contributes to the body of literature or research.

6.4 Step 3: Taking a stance to engage with readers

This section discusses the findings of the Appraisal analysis of the three chapters focused on in the previous section. There we examined how the writer managed the
generic patterns of chapters most critical to negotiation with the discourse community. This section considers the challenges of arguing through language choices at the levels of discourse semantics and lexicogrammar. As Martin and White (2005, p. 92) suggest, engagement is the category that indicates one’s stance in respect to alternative positions. Thus, the resources of engagement value become the main focus of the analysis. However, instances from the other two resources of attitude and graduation are discussed when they are most relevant to the engagement choices. The figure below shows the three domains in the Appraisal system, in which engagement – as one of the domains, is the main focus of this thesis.

![Figure 6.3 The system of Appraisal (Martin & White, 2005, p. 38)](https://example.com/appraisal_system)

Analysing corresponding chapters in Sri’s dissertation to those of Sue’s is imperative to provide comparative data for the research (that is, further comparison of both will be conducted in the Discussion chapter). The Appraisal analysis is conducted by deconstructing the selected chapters – Introduction, Review of Related Literature, and Conclusion and Suggestions chapters, so that the linguistic resources that convey
argument in these chapters in Sri’s and Sue’s dissertations may be compared. To do so, extracts from Sri’s dissertation are analysed from the above-mentioned chapters. The analysis of Sri’s use of English-language linguistic resources to engage with the discourse community (other scholars and readers) suggests that they are challenging resources to deploy. As we have seen, the basic choice for engagement (see section 4.5.3 in methodology chapter) is between monoglossic (single voiced) and heteroglossic (multi-voiced) utterances. In general, the analysis indicates that the selected chapters employ a combination of monoglossic and heteroglossic statements. There are a number of uses of subjective and inter-subjective meanings, which seems to portray the writer’s engagement with others involved in the literature, and the readers in her dissertation; for example, ‘Puppin (2007) states (Heteroglossic: Expansion: Attribution: Acknowledgement) that teachers, administrators, and students became dissatisfied (negative Affect)…. ’ and ‘As we have already known (Heteroglossic: Expansion: Entertain), there are four aspects of language skills that should be elicited (Heteroglossic: Expansion: Entertain)….’ [B.2.j]. However, the combinations sometimes appear not to be carefully selected resulting in inaccurate deployment of evaluative linguistic resources in inappropriate places. The discussion of the findings is presented in the following subsections.

6.4.1. Engagement in Sri’s Introductory chapter

The chapter begins with a Monoglossic sentence that gives a preview or outline of the chapter:

This chapter presents the background of the study, the reasons for choosing the topic, the statement of the problem, the objective of the study, the significance of the study, and the outline of the report (Monogloss). [B1.a]
This long single-sentence orientation lists the contents of the chapter, reproducing the headings of the sections in the chapter. This, it can be argued, is perhaps acceptable, as there is no need for any dialogue with other voices. However, it is hardly a convincing beginning to a well-argued dissertation on an important educational subject.

Nevertheless, Sri begins the discussion with the statement, a bare assertion, that is, ‘intersubjectively neutral’ (Martin & White, 2005, p. 99). In the absence of a clear thesis statement at this opening point, the chapter announces the text organisation for the current chapter.

The employment of such Monoglossic sentences happens not only in the opening paragraph (as the ‘thesis’ of the argument), but they also dominate the introductory chapter. Consider the following excerpt:

Assessment has long been part of human’s life (Monoglossic). It is due to the fact that people are assessed in many aspects during their lives (Monoglossic). The assessments are mostly done to show their performance in a category (Monoglossic). The others are to put them into an appropriate level of a category (Monoglossic). McNamara (2000:3) states (Heteroglossic: Expansion: Attribution: Acknowledgement) that throughout history, people have been put to the test to prove their capabilities or to establish their credentials. In order to do that (justify), people have to fulfil some criteria of the test or assessment. By fulfilling some or all of the criteria, they can be (Heteroglossic: Expansion: Entertain) categorized into a group of which the assessment is done. [A1.b]

In the excerpt above, there are four Monoglossic statements and only two Heteroglossic statements. The topic of assessment is introduced as part of ‘human life’. Monoglossic sentences can have a ‘spotlight’ effect, according to Martin and White (2005, p. 136). As this excerpt is located at the opening part of the chapter, by virtue of its position it plays an important part in the text. For this function, it is reasonable to use a Monoglossic statement to project authorial voice; it is the writer who shares the utterance and who is also the one responsible for the proposition. However, the use of these Monoglossic statements continues over several sentences (see previous excerpt) to
indicate the centrality of Sri’s topic; that is, assessment. The Heteroglossic statements that follow provide supporting evidence for the topic. There is engagement with prior research through the reference to McNamara to introduce the concept of criteria. Thus, through the voice of an expert in the field, Sri channels the main topic in her dissertation which concerns spoken assessment criteria.

In spite of the dominance of Monoglossic statements, the Heteroglossic statements used do not act in the way evidence typically does. Consider the following excerpt and the discussion below:

**Reasons for Choosing the Topic**

There are some reasons for people to understand about language assessment due to its significance towards their lives (Monoglossic). McNamara (2000:4) explains (Heteroglossic: Expansion: Attribution: Acknowledgement) the reasons as follows.

First, language tests play a powerful role in many people’s lives, acting as gateways at important transitional moments in education, in employment, and in moving from one country to another. Secondly, you may be working with language tests in your professional life as a teacher or administrator, teaching to a test, administering tests, or relying on information from tests to make decisions on the placement of students on particular courses. Finally, if you are conducting research in language study you may need to have measures of the language proficiency of your subjects. [A1.i]

Based on the reasons, it then seems (Heteroglossic: Expansion: Entertain) to be very interesting to find out more about language assessment and its applications in the real-life conditions. [A1.j]

The excerpt above represents the typical way the argument is constructed in Sri’s introductory chapter. There are one Monoglossic statement and two Heteroglossic ones. The ‘Reasons for Choosing the Topic’ are introduced at the beginning of the text by the use of the word ‘some’. This indicates that the text will develop several points. The first sentence which contains a Monoglossic statement (‘There are some reasons for people to….’) could be a claim in an argument, but it is too general. The argument is not developed appropriately. The presentation of McNamara’s statements in this text
suggests that the writer relies on McNamara to carry her argument. The cited text in the second paragraph (underlined) are McNamara’s statements that the writer copies to support her argument. Although there are various instances of Heteroglossic Engagement resources in this paragraph, they belong to McNamara (these are not considered in the analysis). By quoting the whole paragraph, it indicates that the writer depends very much on what this author says. Thus, the writer merely uses one voice that of McNamara’s in her evidence. The only Monoglossic statements are made by the writer (Sri) in the opening sentence of the text (e.g. ‘There are some reasons for people to understand about language assessment’). This shows a point she is developing in the text; but the development does not represent a good argument. Then, she ends the paragraph by reiterating the statement about her interest in studying ‘language assessment and its applications in the real-life conditions’. She posits this like the Claim of the text, but as we have seen, it is not developed convincingly as an argument because of the limited sources of evidence, and her dependence on one expert only. In addition, this also represents a difficult task at this early stage of the dissertation. The *Heteroglossic: Expansion: Entertain* in the phrase ‘it then seems’ is an example of hedging that does not seem appropriate in this position because there is only one writer who is cited, and the evidence therefore does not persuade the reader. It may, however, be a marker of low confidence in her abilities as a writer or excessive modesty.

### 6.4.2. Engagement in Review of related literature chapter

Analysing the instantiations of Engagement choices in Sri’s literature review (LR) chapter shows further evidence of the challenges posed by building argument through interpersonal meaning choices. In this chapter, Sri contextualises her study by seeking support from the literature, as discussed earlier. Combinations of Heteroglossic and
Monoglossic statements are evident throughout the chapter. However, as with the analysis in the introductory chapter, these sentences do not really perform what these kinds of sentences should do. For instance, the point is sometimes not stated clearly, and thus does not really argue that point:

‘As one of four aspects in language skills, speaking has become a concern for the language researchers to study, especially on how this skill is elicited and assessed’. [B.2.b]

‘Since a long time ago, assessment has become one part of human’s life’). [B.2.g]

These two examples are openings of paragraphs; but the ‘point to argue’ in each is not explicit. Both statements are descriptive that there is no sense of arguing any point. The writer merely states the sentences without any obvious engaging language she uses that readers may not react or pay attention to what she has said.

Structurally, Sri’s LR chapter seems to be developed as those of the typical LRs. However, when the text is analysed and compared to the typical argument structure, there appears to be some inappropriate use of language in realising it. One obvious example is the statement of the point of the argument, which is usually presented in the first sentence of a paragraph. Consider the following excerpt, especially the first sentence where the point for the argument is commonly positioned.

As one of four aspects in language skills, speaking has become a concern for the language researchers to study (Heteroglossic: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse), especially on how this skill is elicited and assessed. Following the issue, a number of researches (Heteroglossic: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse) have been held. Some parts of the research and discussion then come to the area of rating scales used in the assessment of the speaking ability (Heteroglossic: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse). [B.2.b]

The paragraph does not seem to develop appropriately. The topic sentence which commonly states the writer’s point for the argument does not play this role
properly. Sri begins by claiming that speaking has become an area of concern for many. It is not a strong point for her argument in this opening paragraph. She suggests that, ‘it is a concern for the language researchers to study’. The Heteroglossic: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse statement validates her claim using the voices of other researchers. This appears to be an elaboration of a point she should have presented in a preceding sentence. A better statement of point for the argument can be seen in an opening sentence from Sue’s LR chapter, ‘A broader perspective encompasses literacy as social practice’ [A.2.d]. Moreover, there is an indication that the paragraph above is not developed coherently. What follows is a series of sentences all of which are Heteroglossic and are inadequately linked. These sentences cite what researchers have been studying in relation to assessment of speaking performance.

The second paragraph shares a similar problem to the paragraph above. In this second one, the case is even far from the typical argument (paragraph). The paragraph consists only of two sentences without a clear point for the argument. Consider the following excerpt:

One example research is done by Kim (2006) (Heteroglossic: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge) about “Issues of Rating Scales in Speaking Performance Assessment”. The research leads to (Heteroglossic: Expand: Entertain) a conclusion that in order to ensure validity and reliability of a speaking performance test, attention needs to be paid to (Heteroglossic: Expand: Entertain) the quality of the speaking performance along with scoring that is based on criteria specific to that particular testing context. [B.2.c]

The first sentence only describes and introduces the research done by Kim and its topic. It does not present any opinion, judgment or appreciation of the research and why it is cited: the benefit of this research to Sri’s. It might be better if she appreciates Kim’s research and states how it benefits her. In addition, there is also a leap of
One of the paragraphs from the LR chapter (extracted below) is an illustration of how interpersonal linguistic choices work together to enact argumentation. The paragraph begins with a positive evaluation of a study by Anggarani (‘latest learned’) through choices of ATTITUDINAL resources (inscribed, positive appreciation) that appraise the study. The study is seen as relevant by Sri and therefore, positively evaluated and this is followed by other Heteroglossic sentences that position Sri as being in dialogue with the discourse community.

The latest learned (Appreciation: Valuation: Positive) study on the issue of rating scale to assess speaking ability is about the analysis of the scoring indicators of speaking assessment conducted by Anggarani (2010) (Heteroglossic: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge). She (Heteroglossic: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge) works on ‘the Analysis of the Scoring Indicators of Panel Evaluation Used in Speech Contest English Students Association (ESA) Week 2009 in UNNES Given by the Judges’. Her study explores (Heteroglossic: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse) what scoring indicators used in ESA WEEK Speech Contest 2009, the strengths, and the weaknesses of the scoring indicators comparing to the FSI rating scale. The result of the analysis shows (Heteroglossic: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse) that the scoring indicators cover the area of content, language, organization, performance, appearance, and time. [B.2.e]

However, Sri has also used a number of Monoglossic statements, for example:

These scoring criteria have some strengths and weaknesses (Monoglossic and Appreciation). The strengths (+Appreciation) include the simplicity of the scoring indicators and the absence of ‘accent’ category which makes the participants do not have to face the difficulties upon the category as in the FSI rating scale (Monoglossic). Besides that, there are also some weaknesses (-Appreciation) in the scoring indicators (Monoglossic). First, the scoring indicators’ appearance is less in detail than the FSI rating scale (Monoglossic).’ Finally, the participants will face a difficulty (-Appreciation) in considering the ‘time’ category since every unpunctuality will be considered as the score reduction (Monoglossic).
These Monoglossic sentences assess the strengths and weaknesses of Anggarani’s research. Monoglossic statements are appropriate here because they are evidence of Sri’s capacity to critique the research of others – an important part of developing authorial voice. There is evidence of confidence in the authorial voice signalled by the Monoglossic statement.

In the closing paragraph of the LR chapter, Sri refers to the criteria of assessment for the ESA competition. She summarises the discussion in the chapter by restating the topic and identifies Fulcher’s rating scale as a criterion for the ESA speech competition. There is likely a negotiation about why the four approaches to rating-scale design are used in her study. She also predicts what and how information about her point about assessment will be gained by the employment of the four approaches.

**Framework of the Present Study** (closing)

The study works on the analysis of points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 (*Monoglossic*). It attempts to find out what points of assessment used in the competition and also its strengths and weaknesses (*Monoglossic*). [B.2.bl]

As the framework of this study, the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 is analyzed using four approaches of rating-scale design by Glenn Fulcher (2003) (*Heteroglossic: Expand: Attribute: Acknowledge*). From the four approaches, one closest approach to the points of assessment design is elicited. Since each of four approaches has its own rating-scale examples, one rating-scale example of the closest approach to the points of assessment is compared with the points of assessment (*Monoglossic*). It aims to find out the strengths and the weaknesses of the points of assessment used in the competition (*Monoglossic*). [A2.bm]

Four approaches of rating-scale design are used in this study since it can make (*Heteroglossic: Expand: Entertain*) the process of analysis more objective. More and deeper information about the points of assessment will be gained, if it is seen from many different sides (*Heteroglossic: Expand: Entertain*). Therefore, the four approaches of rating-scale design are used in this study (*Monoglossic*). [A2.bn]
As a closing paragraph in the LR chapter, there is more obvious negotiation in the text. In general, the combination of Heteroglossic and Monoglossic statements is appropriate in the summary paragraph of a LR chapter. At the ending part of this concluding paragraph, the writer states the point for the argument of the paragraph. By employing *Heteroglossic: Expand: Entertain*, she speculates on how her analysis becomes better. She believes that the four approaches will be of benefit to her study. It is obvious that the writer considers that the rating scale used would be ‘more objective’ as the writer claims in the sentence: ‘Four approaches of rating-scale design are used in this study since it can make the process of analysis more objective’. Evidence from other studies realised in Heteroglossic options would strengthen Sri’s argument for her choice of Fulcher’s framework as a methodological approach.

6.4.3. Engagement in the final stages of Sri’s dissertation

As we have seen, Sri’s final argument moves sprawl across chapters four and five. The discussion section of chapter four, however, falls short of expectations. Consider the following excerpt.

Discussion

From the result of the analysis of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010, it was known that the points of assessment covered five categories to assess the participants’ performances in news reporting (*Monoglossic*). They were performance, elaboration, pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy (*Monoglossic*).

Those five points of assessment, which were arranged into one scale, were analyzed using some categories of framework for describing rating scales from four approaches to rating-scale design proposed by Fulcher (2003) (*Heteroglossic: Expansion: Attribution: Acknowledgement*) and the result showed that the data-based scale development approach as the closest approach to the points of assessment (*Monoglossic*).

Next, by comparing to the example scale of data-based scale development, it was found out that there are some strengths and weaknesses of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 (*Monoglossic*).
This discussion section does not show a complete discussion section/chapter of developed academic text. This section describes and summarises the explanation of the result of the analysis. It presents the answers of the research questions as presented in chapter 1, that is ‘(a) What are the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”? ’ and ‘(b) What are the strengths and weaknesses of the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”? ’ The answers seem to be (a) ‘it was known that the points of assessment covered five categories to assess the participants’ performances in news reporting’, and (b) ‘… that there are some strengths and weaknesses of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010.’ However, these answers do not accurately address the question. There is also no explanation for these answers, which may also indicate that there is no consolidation of the components of the argument to develop a convincing Claim for the macro-argument.

The second closing move, the conclusion in the next and final chapter, similarly does not present a convincing overarching argument. Rather, Sri takes it that the job of concluding is one of summarising the details of her research processes. She orchestrates dialogic moves which both open up and close down negotiation. To do so, she employs a combination of Monoglossic and Heteroglossic sentences. As is shown in the following excerpt, monoglossic statements dominate in Sri’s writing.

Conclusions
This study worked on the analysis of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 (Monoglossic). It identified (Heteroglossic: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse) what points of assessment used to assess participants’ performance in the competition. It figured out (Heteroglossic: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse) that the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 included performance, elaboration, pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy. [B.5.b]
[t]hose points of assessment were then compared to four approaches to rating-scale design proposed by Glenn Fulcher (2003) (*Heteroglossic: Expansion: Attribution: Acknowledgement*). One closest approach to the points of assessment was elicited (*Monoglossic*). It was found out that the data-based scale development (*Heteroglossic: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse*) was the closest approach to the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010. The rating-scale example of the data-based scale development approach was compared to the points of assessment to see the strengths and the weaknesses of the points of assessment (*Monoglossic*). Based on the result of the analysis, it was known that the strengths of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 covered the use of the scale that focused on the specific task – news reporting task; the larger features of assessment included in the scale; and its appearance (*Monoglossic*). Meanwhile, the weaknesses of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 included the scores that could not be generalized to be an assumption of participant’s overall proficiency in speaking; and the inability of the scale to provide deeper information about the participant’s abilities in doing the task given (*Monoglossic*). [B.5.c]

The excerpt begins with a bare assertion that provides information about the topic ‘the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010’. The following two sentences, ‘It identified….’ and ‘It figured out….’ further provide information within these projections. The projections serve to associate the propositions with the writer’s position, as Martin and White explain – that through such choices the writer ‘shares responsibility for it with the cited source’ (2005, pp. 126-127). In other words, the two sentences detail what the study (‘it’) has achieved and the writer employs an external voice to share the responsibility of the proposition. The second paragraph (B.5c) elaborates the previous paragraph. It details the procedures through heteroglossic choices frequently instantiated through passive voice with an implicit agent (e.g. ‘those points of assessment were then compared to ...’). These choices indicate the writer’s difficulty in avoiding personal pronouns and remind us of the importance of explicitly teaching students how to manage intersubjectivity in academic texts.
As the closing part of the last chapter, the ‘Suggestions’ section argues the positive value of Sri’s research. The text is developed by employing Heteroglossic statements, either expanding or contracting the space for negotiation.

Suggestions

**Learning from the whole process of this study** (+ Appreciation: Valuation (flag)), there are some suggestions that can be (Heteroglossic: Expand: Entertain) given to the readers related to the use of this study as follows (Authorial):

For the judges of the competition

It is suggested (Heteroglossic: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse) for the judges of the competition to enrich their information about the rating scale they are going to use in assessing participants’ performances in the competition, especially the points of assessment included in the rating scale. Therefore (Heteroglossic: Contract: Concur: Affirm), fair judgments about the participants’ performances can be achieved.

For the committees of the competition

[B.5.f] It is suggested (Heteroglossic: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse) that in the process of developing a rating scale for the competition, the committees should (Heteroglossic: Expand: Entertain) consider the appropriate points of assessment used to assess the participants’ performances. It is important (+Appreciation: Valuation) since it will help them to minimize the possibility of misinterpretation about the objective of the task and what is scored from the participant’s performance. In other words (Heteroglossic: Contract: Proclaim: Pronounce), the committees are supposed (Heteroglossic: Expand: Entertain) to know why particular points of assessment are chosen to assess the performances.

Sri draws on her study to propose recommendations for different stakeholders using a patterning of Heteroglossic contract: Proclaim: Endorse and Heteroglossic: Expand: Entertain. Once again, the patterning of passive voice with an implicit agent is evident, in this case acting as a sort of collective advice for different stakeholders for example…

‘It is suggested (Heteroglossic: Contract: Proclaim: Endorse) for the judges of the competition to enrich their information about the rating scale…’
The other main form of engagement is Heteroglossic: Expand: Entertain. These statements include words like the committee ‘should’, ‘are supposed to’ and indicate high modality. In a way, Sri argues for action.

With respect to evaluative meanings, the writer positively evaluates the study and its benefits to others. There are four examples of Positive Appreciation/Valuation of the impact of her research. ‘Learning from the whole process of the study’ provokes a positive appreciation. A major value of research is that it contributes to practice. Similarly, she refers to ‘fair judgments about the participants’ performances’ and ‘appropriate points of assessments’ which inscribes the positive impact that research can have.

6.5 Conclusion

In summary, analysis of Sri’s dissertation offers insights into the challenges for English language learner in writing extended texts in an academic context. The analysis reveals a lack of clarity about the purposes of such texts. It is not clear whether the purpose is to argue a case or whether it is to report on an investigation. The three steps of the analysis indicate that Sri is unknowingly developing the text which is the latter. The Periodicity analysis reveals that at the highest level of MacroTheme the chapters are organised in a way close to the typical academic dissertation genre. However, the way meanings at different levels of structure are organised does not represent a smooth development of claim and evidence patterns. In the second step, genre analysis affords a description of the key argument chapters of the dissertation, which varies from what is typically expected of a dissertation in English speaking contexts. Each selected chapter appears to follow the typical stages which organises meanings to achieve its communicative purpose but does not contain the complete elements required for the argumentation of the stage
(such as ‘the point for argument’, evidence and ‘the Claim’ (reiteration of the point for the argument). Finally, the Appraisal analysis uncovers the way Sri realises her negotiation with her readers, the literature and other stakeholders in the field to discuss the language assessment in her dissertation. The challenges at the micro-level contribute to those at the levels of text – evaluative language is critical to the construction of arguments beyond the clause and into the staging of whole texts. The analysis confirms the importance of considering student texts at the macro, micro, and meso levels in order to see how patterns of meaning combine to achieve the text’s purpose.
Chapter 7  Discussion and Conclusion

7.1 Introduction

The analyses of the student writers’ dissertations undertaken in this thesis have provided insights into the nature of these lengthy texts and the challenges they pose to novice writers. Such insights have implications for the field of academic literacy in general, and English language teaching in particular. The analyses have shed light on the strategies employed by the two neophyte writers in organising and staging meanings in their dissertations to achieve their communicative purposes. A further outcome of the thesis is a better picture of the language resources used by writers as they negotiate their positions in an academic discourse community.

Previous chapters have outlined the background and aims of the research, the methodological approach and the findings. The analyses focussed on three chapters key to negotiating the academic community: the introduction, the literature review, and the discussion/conclusion chapters. Drawing on the Periodicity framework, genre pedagogy theory, and Appraisal theory, the study employs a functional model of language at the level of discourse semantics to interpret these academic writing practices. While the thesis has endeavoured to avoid making deficit judgements about either dissertation, the study has shed light on some of the challenges faced by English language learners in a globalised academic environment in which English is the dominant language.

This chapter will draw together the argument and evidence presented in preceding chapters and discuss the contributions of this thesis to a better understanding
of academic literacy practices and pedagogy in English as a foreign language context, such as in Indonesia. In section 7.2, I summarise the major findings of the research in terms of the features of these lengthy texts and the importance of mastering the evaluative resources of the English language. In section 7.3, I outline the contributions of the thesis to the practice of English language teaching and academic writing; while in section 7.4, I propose some contributions of my research to the theory. In section 7.5, I conclude the chapter with a discussion of future potential directions that arise from the research findings.

7.2 Research Findings

This section summarises the major findings of the present research to contribute to a better understanding of the construction of quality arguments in undergraduate dissertations written by students coming from two different linguistic backgrounds and academic contexts. I begin by reiterating the major concern of the thesis and the research methodology that is employed to address this concern.

The concern, which is the major research question, has been formulated as the following: How do undergraduate student writers in different contexts build up interpersonally oriented arguments in their dissertations? This question has required a detailed qualitative exploration of how meanings unfold through the construction of the argument in the analysed texts. The examinations of the quality of the argument have also been pursued through appropriate tools within the perspective of Systemic Functional Linguistics. The theories of Periodicity, Genre and Appraisal (Halliday, 1973b, 1978a, 1985b; Martin, 1992, 2000a, 2009; Martin & Rose, 2007, 2008; Martin & White, 2005) are drawn on in the analyses in order to understand how arguments were constructed, and how the quality of the arguments was anticipated. These three
theories enable the examination of the dissertation in the way messages are
hierarchically organised in terms of thematic development; the way the dissertations
represent a recurrent configuration of meanings and reflect the conventions of staging in
the contexts in which they were written to achieve their communicative purpose; and
the way academic negotiations are enacted through evaluative linguistic resources.

From an SFL perspective, an argument is constructed as it simultaneously construes
ideational meaning; enacts interpersonal meaning and organises textual meaning.
However, the present research focuses on interpersonal and textual meanings,
desccribing the quality argument in terms of the organisation of meanings and the
deployment of interpersonal language in the analysed dissertations.

The method of text analysis has been accomplished in three steps that
correspond to the three analytic perspectives employed, as well as to the scope of the
realisations of argument in each dissertation. The unit of analysis in this study is a
‘text’ at the various levels of its instantiations. The three steps of the analysis provide
insight into the quality of the argument. The major findings and emerging issues from
each step are discussed in turn in the following subsections.

7.2.1. The role of text organisation in argument construction

The first part of the analysis is essential to detailing the way the two dissertations
organise meanings to construct arguments. The driving force for the analysis is that the
ability to construct an argument is considered as a vital aspect of successful writing by
most academics across the discipline (Lea & Street, 1998). The most effective
dissertations are characterised by high levels of attention and planning (Martin, 1992, p.
444). Attention and planning are reflected in the way student writers organise meanings
in the dissertations; that is how they organise the messages and the hierarchy and staging of meanings to achieve communicative purposes.

The concern with the organisations of the quality of the argument in the dissertations addresses the first research sub-question: “How are the two undergraduate dissertations organised and staged in terms of their thematic development and genres?” Analysis focuses on organisation of macro- and meso-arguments in the two dissertations; firstly, exploring the way the student writers provide assistance for readers to predict the thematic development of the whole texts; and secondly, examining the way they stage meanings across three selected chapters. Both levels of organisation are crucial for argument construction. The three chapters were chosen as they emerged as those chapters that represented the greatest degree of the writers’ negotiation with readers through the use of the evaluative meanings which influenced the quality of the argument in the dissertation. The following discussion summarises both analyses.

7.2.1. Periodicity analysis

Periodicity analysis is key to the present research as the objects of the present research are such lengthy academic texts. Periodicity focuses on the way that student writers organise meanings hierarchically to represent the information flow. The framework of Periodicity offers insight into the ‘texture’ (Halliday, 1973b, 1978a, 1985b; Martin, 1992) of the texts, that is, the way the dissertations organise information into a coherent whole. This first step of the analysis culminates in a map of the negotiated meanings in terms of thematic development – the way meanings are packaged to make the information easier for readers to understand (Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 197). The map predicts the development of the Themes at different levels of meaning hierarchy, which in turn suggests the way arguments are constructed in each dissertation. The analysis of
the development of the Themes of each complete text is also essential as ‘this development is particularly sensitive to the staging of the genre’ (Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 198), which helps the next step of the analysis – genre analysis. In addition, having analysed each dissertation as one whole text, each is then compared to the typical models of thesis/dissertation (Bunton, 1998; Dong, 1998; Paltridge, 2004; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007) and with the model of argument by Toulmin (as in Andrews, 2005; Hegelund & Kock, 1999; Toulmin, 1958, 2003). This is done to examine whether or not each dissertation is in line with these models in terms of the organisation of its meanings. The following discussion summarises the findings in this analysis.

In the first instance, Sue’s Honours dissertation represents a comprehensive development of themes across the text. Hierarchically, meanings are organised in a way that enables readers to easily predict the development of themes in any level of hierarchy. This development in turn also suggests a complete construction of macro-argument – as shown in the analysis in section 5.2 and summarised in Table 5.1. Compared to the typical models mentioned above, Sue’s dissertation shows a consistency with the argument structure of a thesis/dissertation (e.g. Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). The five chapters in Sue’s dissertation play essential roles in the construction of the macro-argument. The components of argument spread across these chapters (higher level macroThemes), sections (lower level macroTheme) and paragraph (hyperThemes), as shown in Table 5.3. It was concluded that Sue’s dissertation demonstrated her understanding of the type of writing an undergraduate student is expected to produce (Christie, 1997; Mei, 2006). This, in turn, suggests that Sue can be considered a successful academic writer (as suggested by, e.g. Lea & Street, 1998)
Hegelund and Kock (1999) and Toulmin (1958, 2003) remind us of the importance of the beginning and ending of a text. The ‘Introductory’ chapter in Sue’s dissertation is vital in the construction of the macro argument. This is where she provides the ‘(hypo)-thesis’ for the macro argument, which becomes the ‘main point’ the argument will develop. Within the SFL perspective, this refers to the macroTheme of the text, where the ‘point of departure’ (Halliday, 1985b, p. 194) of the dissertation is located. Sue’s introductory chapter announces the overarching or macro argument in the dissertation and presents the point of departure of the dissertation – the ‘(hypo)-thesis’. It argues for the research gap the study is to address (Purpose of the study) as the excerpt [A.1.a] shows in section 5.2, on page 121. It is specifically about mapping the field and identifying the gap that Sue’s study wants to fill. This first role relates to the ‘(hypo)-thesis’ of the macro argument that ‘home and school literacy transition for young children is worthy of investigation’.

The final chapter in Sue’s dissertation – the ‘Discussion’, is also significant in the development of the macro argument of the dissertation. It was found that in this chapter, Sue finalises the construction of its macro argument by consolidating all the lines of the argument from previous chapters and states her ‘claim’ that becomes the main point of the macro argument. The last chapter synthesised the ideas presented throughout the thesis and generalised from the findings as it responds to the research questions to construct a convincing overarching argument. The chapter went beyond the thesis argument by presenting the implications and the suggestions for further research.

In contrast, the analysis of the Indonesian student, Sri’s, dissertation reveals her struggle in accomplishing the overarching argument. Sri is not likely to know about the
structural organisation of arguments in any metalinguistic sense because it may not have been taught to her in her writing class series. Besides her difficulty in constructing an argument for the whole dissertation, Sri struggles to control the micro argument. In this case, the argument Sri attempts to develop does not represent a proposition which is supported by evidence (grounds and warrants) (Wingate, 2012). Analysis of the textual structure of Sri’s dissertation indicates a problematic way of organising the arguments. The themes of the text (in any level of hierarchy) are often difficult to identify as they are rarely positioned at the beginning of the text – as the point of the discussion in the text. From my experience as a staff member in the English department where the study was conducted, this strategy is typical of dissertations completed by many students. In the case of Sri’s dissertation, the first stage of the introductory chapter describes the object of the study with little persuasive intent revealed in the ‘background to the study’ section.

In addition, in the text level, Sri develops the macro argument in her dissertation in a complicated way that lacks coherence. As we have seen, the chapters at the higher level of macroThemes are developed more independently and heterogeneously with little obvious connection among them. For instance, chapter three describes the methods used without a clear link to the overall construction of the macro argument. In addition, in chapter two – ‘Review of related literature’, the three sections are not developed equally and are uneven in length. Moreover, the hypothesis that is vital in the construction of the macro argument is not obviously stated at the beginning of the text, and the claim is absent from the conclusion chapter. These anomalies or incongruities make the macro-argument difficult to discern and therefore difficult to read.
As with the position of ‘hypothesis’ and ‘claim’ of the macro argument, both components of argument are difficult to identify in Sri’s dissertation. These components relate to the main point that the argument is presenting. Here, what we can consider as the ‘hypothesis’ is located in the middle of the introductory chapter. Her statement ‘Therefore, it is important to see what scoring criteria used in ‘English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010’” appears to be the most probable statement of hypothesis. However, its positioning in the chapter, and the proposition itself, do not represent a strong point to argue. The conclusion chapter does not restate the claim of the argument nor consolidate the components of the argument from the previous chapters. Instead, the chapter summarises what has been discussed in the previous chapter without making a claim. There are statements about the significance of the study; but no suggestions for further research are presented.

The present research reveals differences in the way arguments are organised in academic writing practices between L1 and L2 student writers. Previous similar studies found no significant difference on the way argument is structured in L1 and L2 academic writing. Lee’s (2006, 2014) studies on the argumentative/persuasive essays by L1 and L2 student writers found that there is no significant difference in their way of developing the global schematic structure (that is, ‘in terms of the argument structure’ (2006, p. v)). However, as the research reported here examined much longer texts, it reveals that there are considerable differences in the general overall structures of the dissertations and even more differences are found when more delicate realisations of the argument in Sri’s dissertation are examined.

At the general level of structure, both Sue’s and Sri’s dissertations appear to observe the typical model of thesis/dissertation structure (Bunton, 1998; Dong, 1998;
Paltridge, 2004; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). The five chapters from each dissertation are organised following the IMRAD type. However, despite the similarity of their headings, parallel chapters from each dissertation discuss different things. Whilst Sue’s sections in her LR discuss subject matter to develop the argument constructed, in which accounts and evaluation of others’ research are placed throughout the chapter to build the arguments, Sri’s sections often describe them without any obvious arguments being developed. For instance, Sri’s LR has a section called ‘Review of the previous study’, where she describes previous studies without any obvious argument built (see excerpt [B.2.b] in section 6.2 on page 189). Another obvious example is the difference between the methods/methodology chapters in the two dissertations. In Sue’s methodology chapter, besides providing justifications for the research paradigm and approaches used, links between her study and other previous studies are constantly made, especially when describing and defining certain terms and negotiating certain practices. Negotiations about certain phenomena are presented to show how one idea is more preferred than others. In Sri’s ‘Methods of Investigation’ chapter, reasons for the methods used are provided and definitions of terms are also supplied by referring to some experts in the field. However, the presentation of experts’ voices is only used to support what she believes to work in her study. In other words, Sri tends to allow the voice of the cited authors to establish her claim. For instance, in describing the ‘Roles of the researcher’, she quotes an expert’s voice to present the point of the discussion in the section. The use of another’s voice to present the ‘hypothesis’ of the section suggests that the writer merely relies on others’ descriptions, without any original comment or critique. This may be indicative of Sri’s positioning as a novice and marginal position-holder in the academic community; a position for which some degree of humility is necessary in
many settings. In contrast, Sue adopts a more collegial approach to the reader, with whom she shares particular interests. These differences in the way both writers organise their meanings are more obvious in the following genre and Appraisal analyses.

### 7.2.1.2. Genre analysis

The second analytic step is concerned with the way the texts stage meanings to achieve their social purposes. Analysis focuses on three chapters – the ‘Introduction’, ‘Literature review’, and ‘Discussion/Conclusion’ chapters, in the way they represent recurrent configuration of meanings that enact the social practices of a given culture (Martin & Rose, 2008, p. 6) – in this case, the academic culture. As discussed above, three chapters are selected: they are the chapters that are prominent in terms of the macro argument development and represent that part of the dissertation where negotiation with others (readers) takes place through the use of evaluative meanings. Following a Periodicity analysis of the two dissertations, a genre analysis was undertaken. The analysis of chapters from Sue’s and Sri’s dissertation is presented in the following discussions.

Analysing the Introductory chapters from both dissertations was essential in the present research. As we have seen, the analysis reveals the way each text presents its macroTheme – the point of the departure of the dissertation, where the student writers identify their research goals. The analysis of both texts revealed that there was little significant difference in the way the writers employed the main moves/stages in both texts. Both texts employed the three typical points of persuasion: arguing for the object of the study, arguing for the need for new knowledge, and arguing for the significance of the author’s contribution (as suggested by, Hood, 2006; Swales, 1990). However, differences emerge when we analyse each stage and phase in detail. The presentation of
argument is more obvious in Sue’s dissertation than in Sri’s, which describes the topic without argumentation. Analysis of how each text completes the suggested moves/stages and steps/phases with a more delicate realisation shows that Sue’s text provides a more complete explication of each stage and phase following the beginning of the chapter. On the other hand, Sri’s text offers labels for the compulsory phases of each stage without fully developing them. In other words, moves/stages are often obvious but important phases comprising these stages in successful academic writing are often missing. For example, one obligatory phase of ‘Finding the research gap’ is missing from stage two ‘arguing for the need for new knowledge’. This seems to be a typical practice of academic writing by L2 writers, in that identifying a research gap may not be an expectation in some contexts (Hirano, 2009; Taylor & Chen, 1991). In the last stage, a phase previewing organisation of thesis is found in both texts; however, the way the arguments are presented is somewhat different. While Sue clarifies what she presents in the chapters, and how these chapters are employed to fulfil each of their roles in the overall construction of the argument, Sri’s ‘Outline of the Report’ indicates the content and organisation of the subsequent chapters, but without signalling their contribution to the development of the argument.

This research also analysed the literature review chapter. The analysis focused on the way meanings were organised in the LR chapter to contextualise the student dissertations by their referral to previous studies. Both LR texts are compared to each other and to a model offered by Kwan (2006). Analysis culminates in tables listing stages and phases employed by both student writers, as shown in table 5.10 and table 6.11. In the general staging, both texts follow the model, but differences emerge again from the detailed analyses of the phases and in the way these phases are realised
linguistically. In the first case, Sue’s LR shows patterns of regularity as the three main stages follows the model (Kwan, 2006). In keeping with the function of the LR chapter, Sue’s LR discusses controversies in the field and further justifies the research gap indicated in the introductory chapter. The topics are presented in arguments about which she takes particular stances on certain ideas, sometimes against other disputed stances on those ideas. Similarly, Sri’s LR follows the generic structure of the typical LR as offered by the model. However, each stage does not develop through the sub-stages in the body; for instance, in ‘Review of the Previous Studies’, the text merely recounts and describes those studies without conducting further analysis of each study that is reviewed. In addition, while the general territory for the study is established, there is little space devoted to those phases and strategies such as finding the gap in the research. There is a general lack of argument and the purpose of the discussion appears to be to justify the study.

Finally, the analysis of the ‘Discussion’ or ‘Conclusion’ chapter reveals a number of differences between the two dissertations. This closing chapter of the dissertation typically represents the high point of the macro argument, where justifiable conclusions can be drawn out (Hegelund & Kock, 1999; Toulmin, 2003) by stating the Claim, providing data as evidence, and synthesising all the elements of the argument. These activities are evident in Sue’s ‘Discussion’ chapter, but not in Sri’s dissertation. Sue’s discussion chapter is developed with five main stages, representing a prototypical model of the discussion chapter in the Western academic context, according to a number of studies of academic writing (e.g. Bunton, 1998, 2005; Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988; Ruifying & Allison, 2003; Swales & Feak, 1994). The stages include Stage 1: Introductory Restatement; Stage 2: Consolidation of the Present Study; Stage 3.
Proposing Practical Implications, Stage 4. Proposing Recommendations for Future Research, and Stage 5. Closing. Not only does the chapter provide evidence of Sue’s successful enculturation into academic writing practices, it also serves to demonstrate her achievement in ‘contributing to the knowledge and skills leading to ‘improving her skills as a teacher and researcher’ [A.1.1]. On the other hand, Sri’s ‘Conclusion’ chapter differs from expectations of conclusions in most English academic writing. Compared to Sue’s closing chapter, this chapter of Sri’s dissertation appears to be a part of or a section in her ‘Discussion’ chapter where she provides summaries of the findings/results of the analysis along with the implications of the study. There is little evidence that Sri observes the five stages as in Sue’s ‘Discussion’ chapter. In fact, the ‘Discussion’ is only a section from the previous chapter ‘Result and Discussion’ which serves to summarise the description of the findings of her study. The differences are consistent with what Peacock (2002) found in his study, that ‘NS/NNS differences were found in the type and number of moves and move cycles (in the discussion section)’.

7.2.2. Interpersonal linguistic resources in academic Engagement

The third and final step of the analysis examines student writers’ engagement with readers and other writers in the field. The main concern of this step is to understand the way student writers employ interpersonal language to position themselves with respect to both the subject matter they present in their dissertations and those (other writers and readers) with whom they negotiate the meanings. The research sub-question for this study is: “How do the interpersonal linguistic resources drawn on by the student writers to argue a position or point of view vary across the dissertations?” The analysis of the evaluative resources draws on Appraisal theory which is concerned with how writers/speakers construe for themselves particular authorial identities or personae, how
they align or dis-align themselves with actual or potential respondents, and how they construct for their texts an intended or ideal audience (Martin & White, 2005). Because of the study’s concerns with writers’ negotiations with others, the engagement system which is connected to the stance the writers take is the major focus rather than other systems in Appraisal framework – attitude and graduation. Thus, this research focuses on the language at the discourse semantic level. The findings and issues emerging from the analysis of the two dissertations are outlined below.

In the first instance, Sue’s dissertation represents a purposeful employment of evaluative/interpersonal linguistic resources to build convincing arguments. Across the three analysed chapters from Sue’s dissertation, the employment of the resources represents an interplay of Monogloss (single voiced choices) and Heterogloss (multi-voiced choices) sentences through certain patterns to persuade the reader in specific ways. In the introductory chapter, Sue begins by establishing the topic and stating the purpose of the study; then continues to develop a niche for her study, promoting its significance in the field of literacy. The use of evaluative linguistic resources varies across the stages in the introductory chapter depending on the phases of development of the argument. For instance, the first Monoglossic sentence ‘This study concerns early literacy transitions between home and school (Monogloss)’ confidently announces the topic and Sue’s familiarity with the field of the study – ‘school-based literacy’, and the topic – ‘early literacy transitions between home and school’. This is where she authoritatively claims space for her research. However, she cannot persuade her readers if she does not acknowledge other knowers in the field. This is where she employs Heteroglossic sentences in the evidence of her claim. Another instance, Sue points out one negative value about literacy (‘Literacy is highly controversial’ (Monogloss, -)
Appreciation, and Force: Intensification: Quality)). This negative value is maintained as the prosody of the paragraph. This is in line with Hood’s (2006) argument that the prosody of negative values is reinforced and amplified by the use of some instances of heteroglossic sentences that are in line with this value.

Sue’s LR chapter further elaborates the background of the study. In elaborating the discussion, it positions the study among prior studies in the field. Negotiations with others in the literature are evident as the writer contextualises her study. The three-move structure (considered as ‘stages’ in this thesis) (Kwan, 2006) employs different kinds of negotiation as the chapter progresses the discussions of a wide range of subjects on the topic of literacy in general, as well as on the transition between home and school literacies by young learners, specific to the topic of her study. In reviewing prior studies, the writer evaluates others’ work in the field by adopting different stances toward the topics discussed; for example, aligning with some ideas and challenging others. As we have seen, Sue achieves this by utilising a number of engagement values combining both Monogloss and Heterogloss resources.

Finally, in the Discussion chapter, the writer’s engagement with others is also evident. This chapter indicates the ultimate place for constructing the macro argument in the dissertation. In doing so, it synthesises previous discussions by consolidating all components of the argument to construct a convincing argument. The engagement in this chapter shows a regular pattern organised by the use of monoglossic^ heteroglossic^monoglossic sentences. The first monoglossic sentence – usually authorially voiced, is employed to state the ‘thesis’/ ‘point’ of the argument; the heteroglossic ones are used to provide evidence; and the last monoglossic sentence(s) is/are utilised to restate or summarise the discussion. Several variations are also evident.
in the use of heteroglossic sentence at the beginning of a text; however, it still provides an authorial statement.

In contrast, the analysis of Sri’s selected chapters suggests that she doesn’t yet control the English language resources for enacting interpersonal meanings. There are combinations of Monoglossic and Heteroglossic sentences; however, the combinations sometimes appear not to be carefully selected, resulting in inaccurate deployment of evaluative linguistic resources in inappropriate places. In general, the dissertation appears to describe what the study did, rather than to present an argument for a research problem or the reasons for the choice of the literature reviewed or certain other phenomena. Sri’s introductory chapter – one that typically functions to argue for the object of the study, for the need for new knowledge and for the significance of the author’s contribution (see Hood, 2006; Swales, 1990) - does not achieve this satisfactorily. A bare assertion, that is ‘inter-subjectively neutral’ (Martin & White, 2005, p. 99) opens the chapter, which hardly denotes a convincing beginning to a well-argued dissertation on an important educational subject. As with Sue’s dissertation, the combination of monoglossic and heteroglossic sentences are evident, however their presence does not represent appropriate engagement. On the one hand, the Monoglossic sentences not only occur at the opening of a paragraph (as the ‘thesis’ of the argument), but they also dominate the introductory chapter. On the other hand, the Heteroglossic sentences used do not indicate awareness of the function of such sentences in English. In addition, the absence of a clear thesis statement at this opening point contributes to the complexity of the argument organisation.

Similarly, the LR and Conclusion chapters posed challenges for Sri. In the LR chapter, claims are often made without engaging with others in the discourse
community. As we have seen, many citations are used without the writer’s evaluation nor without her making a claim. Citing other authors seems merely to shift Sri’s responsibility of her stance to the cited author. The final chapter does not achieve the communicative goals of a typical conclusion, summarising the details of the research processes rather than consolidating the components of the argument from other chapters into a convincing claim.

In summary, the analysis revealed considerable differences between the two student writers’ capacity to present a convincing dissertation. One writer has an ‘assured’ voice, controlling the stages and phases of the dissertation, prosecuting an argument across the unfolding text and negotiating a position for herself as a new voice within the academic discourse community. In contrast, the other writer produces a ‘dutiful’ text, reproducing major stages as much EFL instruction recommends, but remains challenged by the patterning of language to flesh out those stages and to ‘sound like’ a member of the new community. In a context dominated by Western academic traditions, this writer struggles as cultural, linguistic and pedagogic factors conspire against her success.

7.3 Theoretical and pedagogical significance of the findings

This thesis denotes an overlay between two contributing fields: linguistics and education. Within the linguistics domain, it was found that developing quality arguments requires complex organisation of meanings that not only construe the research being reported but also enact the negotiations between the writers and others in the discourse community. In doing so, the analyses of the quality argument have been conducted in the level of discourse semantics and considered in relation to the Periodicity framework (Halliday, 1985b; Martin & Rose, 2007), Appraisal system
(Martin, 2000a; Martin & White, 2005) and genre theory (Martin, 1992; Martin & Rose, 2008), of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and the construct of ‘text as argument’ (e.g. in Andrews, 1997, 2005, 2009; Hegelund & Kock, 1999; Lee, 2006, 2014). In this sense, the findings of the research have contributed to the method/model of academic written discourse, in the way a convincing argument could be developed linguistically in lengthy texts. The following subsection summarises the key significance of the research to understand the organisation of argument and the role of the organisations of meanings (in the present research, textual and interpersonal meanings) in the construction of quality argument.

7.3.1. A social semiotic interpretation of argument construction

This research provides a significant contribution to the methods for analysing lengthy academic written discourse. The three steps of the analyses denote a detailed investigation of ways in which quality arguments in lengthy texts are constructed. The steps seek to investigate the realisation of arguments from the most general organisation of information in a complete text to the more specific realisations of argument, where interpersonal meanings are organised to instantitate the writers’ engagement linguistically. To this point, SFL offers tools for a principled interpretation of argument construction linguistically. Some of these tools can be combined to examine argumentation from various research foci. In the case of the present research, the tools have been utilised to explore the scope of the argument – from the macro to meso and micro level argument.

At the macro level of the text, the analysis provides a general understanding of how to interpret the structure/construction of macro arguments. Aspects of argument structure have been examined from different perspectives (as discussed in, Andrews,
1997, 2005, 2009; Coffin, 2009; Coffin et al., 2012; Hegelund & Kock, 1999; Lee, 2014; Ross & Rossen-Knill, 2016; Rusfandi, 2015; Simon, 2008). While those aspects of the structure of argument are crucial, the ways in which those aspects are instantiated linguistically and staged in texts remain central and under-researched. In this study, this structure refers to the textual organisation of information where meanings are hierarchically arranged across a whole text. In this case, the text is understood as one complete macro argument that organises the information. This relates to the examination of the construct of argument in any level of the text, from whole thesis to chapter, to sections, and so on to phrase and word levels of text. For instance, the importance of the beginning and ending of an argument (as in Hegelund & Kock, 1999) has a close relation to the importance of position of Theme and New (Rheme) in a text within the SFL perspective.

In the present research, the use of the three tools of linguistic analysis in conjunction with the scope of the argument (either macro, meso, or micro level of argument) have contributed to a better understanding of how quality of the argument in academic context has been constructed in lengthy texts.

7.3.2. The dialogic role of interpersonal/evaluative language

One main concern of the present research has been to better understand how student writers employ interpersonal/evaluative language to realise their engagement with others in the literature and with their target readers. There have been limited studies in the field of academic writing, especially in ESL/EFL context, that address the use of interpersonal language for improving the quality argument that show the writers’ engagement with others (with the exception of Lee, 2006; Nakamura, 2009), and none has been conducted in Indonesia (or with respect to Indonesian students’ needs). This
research has pointed out the importance of evaluative language in stance taking in undergraduate dissertations. Thus, this thesis has provided an account of language patterning in dissertations produced in two very different contexts in order to shed light on how evaluative language works with text organisation to achieve the dissertations’ purposes.

7.4 Pedagogical implications of research findings

This present research enhances our understanding of the practices of academic writing in undergraduate degrees in two different academic contexts. At the broadest description, it provides detailed exploration of how the quality of the argument has been comprehended and constructed by two student writers as they write their dissertations. The two dissertations analysed in this study demonstrate the student writers’ accomplishment in constructing quality arguments. The texts had been developed observing the conventions and expectations of the academic community: that is, how such texts are valued by, and used for, achieving their communicative purposes. This research has focused on how meanings are organised and negotiated in the practices of the construction of argument in the dissertations. Specifically, as with the textual and the interpersonal zones in the development of argument, this thesis offers a number of significant contributions to the teaching of advanced academic writing especially in the EFL context as in Indonesian. These two zones have particular contribution in the understanding of the construct of argument in the academic texts, and the need for explicit teaching of advanced academic writing in the Indonesian EFL context, as discussed in the following subsections.
7.4.1. A linguistic interpretation of argument for teaching EAP

The research findings are significant as they offer a linguistic interpretation of ‘argument’. Theoretically speaking, these findings contribute a more nuanced understanding of the construct of argument, its components, and its potential linguistic realisations. As the thesis adopts Andrews’ (2005) concept of argument as a mode of thinking and composition by which student writers create and organise meanings of the dissertations, the construct is considered in relation to the proposal from Hegelund and Kock (1999), that is, to ‘adapt the Toulmin model (of argument) to explain the genre requirements of the academic paper’ – in this case undergraduate dissertations. Moreover, as with the focus of the research—the textual and the interpersonal zones of the argument, the construct has also been interpreted through the three variables of argument (i.e. Periodicity, genre and Engagement (Appraisal)) to model the construction convincing arguments that embody the organisation of the text as a unified whole, the staging of meanings to achieve communicative purposes, and their engagement with others in the literature where they take up their positions in the discourse community. Thus, having examined the analysed dissertations, this thesis offers interpretations of argument as the way student writers construct each argument as a ‘text’ that is organised as unified whole (through Periodicity framework), as meanings that are staged to achieve communicative purpose (through genre theory), and as the writer’s negotiations (through Appraisal framework) through the linguistic resources utilised.

This linguistic interpretation of argument, in turn, has important implications for the teaching and learning of EAP, especially in EFL context. In this case, by positively integrating two fields – the study of argument (as modelled by Toulmin) and SFL, it is
evident that the three variables of argument (i.e. Periodicity, genre and Engagement (Appraisal)), will enrich the exploration of argument in academic discourse, especially in this case at the undergraduate level. Each variable provides comprehensive linguistic explanations on the way to construct an effective argument. The three variables simultaneously offer ways to build up convincing argument that embody the organisation of the text as a unified whole, the staging of meanings to achieve communicative purposes, and their engagement with others in the literature where they take up their positions in the discourse community. Thus, the thesis is significant especially for student writers in assisting them improve their ability to construct a quality argument, which is considered as one vital aspect of successful writing in most academic discourse communities (Lea & Street, 1998; Wingate, 2012).

In addition, the results of the three-step analysis are significant in advocating possible materials and methods for the teaching and learning of academic writing especially in the EFL context. The analyses uncover utilisations of linguistic resources together with certain patterns that are potentially beneficial for student writers in writing their dissertation. The findings from the Indonesian dissertation suggest that these resources are not significant suggesting that they have not so far been taught adequately in the Indonesian education context. The following subsection discusses how the teaching may be improved.

7.4.2. Explicit teaching of linguistically-oriented argument

Linguistic interpretation of argument has important implications for the teaching of linguistically-oriented argument construction. This interpretation provides insights into how argument is organised and how the linguistic resources for realising these, once visible, are available to be taught explicitly. The employment of some SFL perspectives
for framing these realisations has proved to be useful in the present research, yet other perspectives/frameworks may afford more delicate realisations.

Undergraduate dissertations can be enhanced by developing the quality of its argument. The findings of this research offer insights into how linguistics resources can be used to improve the quality of academic texts (the dissertations). In the Indonesian EFL context, the concept of argument is not explicitly taught (Basthomi, 2009; Cahyono, 2000; Emilia, 2005; Emilia & Hamied, 2015). In addition, SFL theory has just begun to be accepted as a theory of language description and teaching. The model of argument by Toulmin (1958, 2003) used here identifies several ways in which a convincing argument can be constructed in lengthy texts. The present research has built on this by identifying key chapters in the dissertation that have been described and their function in the overall argument has been explicated thoroughly. Thus, if Indonesian students are explicitly taught these components and use them in developing academic text, their dissertations are likely to improve. Further, the SFL interpretation of argument construction as operating on different levels of meaning and across different ideational, textual and interpersonal choices sheds light on appropriate linguistic resources available to construct quality argument in the teaching and learning of EAP. In doing so, teachers may use the model of argument and insights from SFL to develop pedagogies which support students to construct dissertation arguments more convincingly. In addition, interpretation of the realisations of each component of argument linguistically will contribute to the development of useful resources for the teaching of argument or argumentative genre especially in the Indonesian EFL context.

The teaching of academic argument using the two perspectives above can be done in a top-down manner. Following Hegelund and Kock (1999), the teaching can be
conducted by introducing the construct of argument: purpose, components, and functions, to the student writers to use them as guidance for developing their academic papers/dissertations. Having understood the construct of argument, students can then be trained to realise them linguistically. For instance, in developing a hypothesis for the Claim and the Claim itself, students are trained with the concept of Theme-Rheme and evaluative linguistic resources. These kinds of linguistic resources provide students with materials for developing a strong hypothesis for the Claim and fostering the Claim in the argument. However, in practice, the teaching of both constructs – model of argument and SFL theories used, should be presented carefully as students may oversimplify the connection of both. That is, students may assume particular realisations for certain components of argumentation.

7.5 Directions for future research

The present research has established a number of grounds for directions of future research. Most importantly, it has shown a need to better our understanding of how arguments are constructed through negotiation of meanings in written academic texts. The detailed linguistic analysis of both dissertations has uncovered the maps of hierarchical layers of meanings. Each map outlines the ways in which meanings are arranged hierarchically to portray the development of Themes of the analysed texts. This thematic development provides perspective on making a lengthy text easier to understand (as discussed in section 7.2.1). It also offers ways to predict the staging of meanings to reveal the genre(s) in play in the analysed texts. However, these two analyses still need to be coupled with an analysis of the way in which engagement is instantiated through the analysis interpersonal/evaluative linguistic resources. These three analyses provide effective ways of assessing the quality of the argument in lengthy
academic texts. One possible improvement for the present set-of-analyses can be affected by involving the other frameworks from Appraisal theory to sharpen and complete the portrayal of quality of the argument sought.

Other participants and new contexts, such as L2 learners learning English in Anglophone based universities, may reveal additional unique challenges these students face in constructing arguments in their dissertations. In the present research, the two dissertations are quite different, as student writers experienced different challenges, supports and requirements for their writing tasks. Research on student writers from different contexts may reveal additional findings in which the quality of the arguments is possibly understood and constructed in between the present contrasting texts. Additional studies may well result in refining and improving the quality of the argument of the students’ dissertation by conducting classroom action research that can be based on the results of the present research. This type of research will contribute to enhancing the outcomes for students from linguistic and culturally diverse backgrounds studying in a globalised higher education market.
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# Sue’s dissertation

## Chapter One: Introduction

**Genre one: Establishing warrant for Sue’s research**

### Purpose of the Study

[A.1.a] This study concerns early literacy transitions between home and school. It aims to describe the relationships between the home and school literacies of two Australian children, **who are credited with differing degrees of competency** [-judge] with school literacy in their third year of schooling. The study has been designed to identify ways in which the students **could be further assisted** in their school literacy learning.

### Research Questions

[A.1.b] This research is guided by the following questions and subquestions:

- What is the nature of the transition between the home/community literacies and school literacies of two children, who have been identified as having differing levels of school literacy acquisition?
  - What are the children’s home/community literacies?
  - What are the children’s school literacies?
  - What are the similarities/continuities across these contexts?
  - What are the differences/discontinuities across these contexts?
  - What are the current home-school connections and lines of communication?

[A.1.c] How might the students be further assisted with their school literacy learning?

- How might the information obtained about students’ literacies be used to enhance their acquisition of school literacy?
- What does the literature (particularly professional advice for teachers) suggest about assisting students’ literacy transitions?

### Context of the Study

[A.1.d] **Although** we often think of literacy as a set of all-purpose skills and strategies to be learned, it is **more complex, more local, more personal, and more social** than that (Johnston & Costello, 2005, p.256).

[A.1.e] Literacy is **highly controversial** and, as will be shown in the review of the literature, its evolving definition is **regularly contested**. The results of both

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Communicative Purpose</th>
<th>Stages/ phases</th>
<th>Appraisal analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1:</strong> Arguing for the object of the study that home and school literacy transition is worthy of investigation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>ATTITUDE</strong>&lt;br&gt;- monoglossic&lt;br&gt;- could be further assisted <strong>ENGAGE</strong>&lt;br&gt;- monoglossic&lt;br&gt;- could be further assisted <strong>GRADUATION</strong>&lt;br&gt;- monoglossic&lt;br&gt;- could be further assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1:</strong> Outlines the purposes/aims, and research questions of Sue’s study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>ATTITUDE</strong>&lt;br&gt;- monoglossic&lt;br&gt;- could be further assisted <strong>ENGAGE</strong>&lt;br&gt;- monoglossic&lt;br&gt;- could be further assisted <strong>GRADUATION</strong>&lt;br&gt;- monoglossic&lt;br&gt;- could be further assisted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
international and national assessments of literacy, such as Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) (Snyder, 2008) often generate considerable concern about the rate of students’ literacy acquisition in the early primary school years (Freebody, 2007; Hammond, 2001). However, Freebody (1997) highlights that there has not actually been a decline in the results of Australian standardised literacy testing since the mid 1970s. Recent reports additionally indicate that nearly 95% of Australian students are achieving the benchmarks for reading and writing (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA), 2006), which does not seem indicative of serious problems in students’ early literacy acquisition. Regardless, concerns are regularly publicised through the media - and by governments - leading to a public discourse of literacy crisis (Gee, 1990; Freebody, 1997; Street, 1998). This rhetoric provides governments with increasing leverage to impose greater control over the teaching and assessing of literacy.

| [A.1.f] Governments tend to define literacy in terms of certain skills, mainly related to print texts, which they consider to be measurable. According to the Curriculum Corporation (2000) literacy benchmarks “do not attempt to describe the whole of literacy learning, nor the full range of what students are taught”. However Nixon (2003) argues that the skills tested often reflect those which are valued. Freebody (1997, p.7) points out that the view of literacy as a ‘unitary construct’ means that the importance of it (and the cost to the country of lacking it) can be asserted more easily. The crisis view can thus result in school literacy being reduced to the teaching of particular discrete skills associated with reading and writing (Angus, Olney & Ainley, 2007; Luke & Freebody, 1999; Nichols, 2003). This argument highlights that the way in which literacy is viewed and assessed in schools can actually contribute to literacy crises. |
| [A.1.g] This is especially pertinent to Australia in the current political climate, with focus being placed on basic skills, teacher accountability and a national curriculum (Australian Labor, 2007). Such concerns are not new however. Christie and Macken-Horark (2007) argue that similar debates about the teaching of English have occurred since state-supported schooling was first established. The current national literacy policy and NSW English curriculum were developed in response to similar concerns in the 1990s (Snyder, 2008). Thus, much of the literacy curriculum support materials used in New South Wales (NSW) Department of Education and Training (DET) schools are aimed at addressing concerns about students’ literacy acquisition. Such documents advocate a balanced approach to teaching literacy, which accounts for various theoretical perspectives (eg. Commonwealth of Australia, 2005; NSW

| [Phase 3. Providing background information about how controversial the field of literacy is and how its definition is regularly contested] |
| Phase 4. Introducing and critically reviewing items of previous research in the area of literacy education in Australia (especially in NSW) |
| [current Australian educational context] |
| - Its evolving definition is regularly contested. |
| - … often generate considerable concern…. (negative value). |
| - … there has not actually been a decline… (positive values). |
| - literacy crisis. |
| - … to impose greater control over …. (1-judg) |
| - The use of others’ voices (references) |
| - However, … |
| - Regardless |
| - Freebody (1997) highlights |
| - indicate that |
| - which does not seem indicative |
| - Considerable (intens) |
| - Additionally |
| - Actually |
| - Regularly quant |
| - Serious |
| - Greater quant |

| - Phase 4. Introducing and critically reviewing items of previous research in the area of literacy education in Australia (especially in NSW) |
| - certain skills, mainly related to print texts, which they consider to be measurable (-app). |
| - The crisis view |
| - Literacy crisis |
| - Government tends to … (enter) |
| - However, Nixon argues…. |
| - Freebody points out …. This argument highlights…. |
| - mainly related |
| - often reflect those |
| - more easily. |
| - particular discrete skills |
| - actually contribute to |
| - similar debates…. |
| - …however…. |
| - …argue…. |
| - Thus,….. |
| - …especially… |
| - …such concerns… |
| - …similar…. |
| - …much of the…. |
| - Such documents…. |
| - …various theoretical |
| - …various types…. |
Department of School Education, 1997). This is evident in modelled, guided and independent pedagogical approaches, instruction in various text types, and the inclusion of levedled readers. The latter are texts categorised according to difficulty and are said to be matched to students’ current level of reading as assessed by the teacher.

[A.1.h] Despite the aim of a balanced approach, which caters for the needs of different learners, the increasing focus on assessing literacy can have detrimental outcomes. Alongside the increased emphasis placed on literacy test scores, is the responsibility placed on teachers to ensure all students reach acceptable levels of mainstream literacy (Curriculum Corporation, 2000; Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR), 2000; Freebody, 2007). This expectation does not seem to allow for the diverse backgrounds and literacy experiences children have out-of-school. Many current initiatives recognise the importance of parental involvement and programs have been developed with the aim of increasing the home-school connection (Australian Parents Council, 2008; Cairney, 2003). However, despite the national literacy policy asserting that literacy is a social and cultural practice, and advocating the usefulness of Luke’s & Freebody’s (1999) framework, a main emphasis of the policy is on the national testing of basic literacy skills (Commonwealth of Australia, 1998). Because many researchers and teachers believe school literacy to be more valuable than other literacies (Cairney & Ruge, 1998), learning activities are thus more often designed around these basic skills than children’s prior knowledge and social experiences (Angus et al., 2007; Freebody, 2007; Luke & Freebody, 1999; Nichols, 2003). The imposed controls on teaching and learning can deter teachers from spending time discovering information about their students’ lives and literacies (Knobel, 2001; Nichols, 2003).

[A.1.1] In addition to the emphasis on assessing students and the increasing pressure to create uniform curriculum and pedagogy (regardless of student diversity), there is also a lack of attention given to new technologies. Continuing advancements in digital technologies have a direct effect on many modes of communication involved in broad views of literacy: linguistic, oral, visual, audio, digital and multi-modal. It has been suggested that the perception of literacy - as it is valued in national Australian assessments - is actually a narrow part of the practices and resources necessary to effectively engage with a variety of texts in the current day (Bull & Anstey, 2007; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000). More recent research, which is inclusive of popular culture and new technologies (eg, Marsh, 2003; Snyder, Angus & Sutherland-Smith, 2002) has not yet prompted the development of an amended national literacy policy, which addresses the role these play in everyday life and learning. There

-... detrimental outcomes....
-... The imposed controls on teaching and learning can deter teachers....
-... acceptable levels of mainstream literacy.
-... the importance of parental involvement and....
-... be more valuable than....
-... children’s prior knowledge and social experiences...

- Increasing pressure....
-... student diversity.
-... a lack of attention....
-... in broad views of literacy.
-... a narrow part of....
-... necessary to....
-... political emphasis

- Despite....
-... does not seem to allow....
-... However....
-... thus....
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- Increasing....
-... all....
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-... many researchers....
-... more valuable....
-... more often....
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-... effectively engage....
-... a variety of texts....
-... in the current day....
- More recent research....
-... an increasing....
### Rationale/Significance of the Study

[1.1] Many of the studies conducted on home/community literacies in the last few decades have been concerned with either adults or minority groups (see Barton & Hamilton, 1998, p.14; Freebody, 1997, p.15). Of those which focus on children’s literacy, there has been a tendency to examine the experiences of children with differing cultural and language backgrounds (e.g., Ashton-Warner, 1980; Gonzalez et al., 1993) or from families with a low socio-economic status (SES) (e.g., Freebody, Ludwig & Gunn, 1995; Heath, 1983). This research will provide a different perspective: that of two children from the same cultural background as the dominant culture of the school and from mid-high SES homes, but with differing levels of school literacy. There are more similarities between this research and an Australian study which was conducted on a larger scale (Cairney & Ruge, 1998). However, it is unknown whether the recommendations made by these researchers have influenced educational policy and practice.

[1.1.1] Further, social and technological changes have occurred since the studies mentioned above. Marsh (2003, p.380) states that there is an urgent need for research which examines the out-of-school literacy practices of young children in a rapidly changing landscape of communication (Kress, 1997, p.160) in which multimodal forms of meaning-making are prevalent and shaped in part by technological innovations. This study thus differs from the aforementioned studies, including Cairney and Ruge’s (1998), in that it focuses on the literacies occurring in the current day.

### Stage 2: Argues a need for new knowledge Sue’s study

**Phase 1:** Indicating why the research on literacy transition is important in the changing context of the use of technology; multiliteracy and its implication for school literacy

- ... minority...
- ... of children with differing cultural and language backgrounds
- ...or from families with a low socio-economic status (SES)
- ... provide a different perspective with differing levels of

**Phase 2:** by identifying the need of the study to strengthen home-school literacy transitions for their students, amidst the current social and technological climate.

- ... grandiose claims
- ... a novice researcher
- ... be influential...
- ... contributing to
- ... improving her skills
- ... strengthen...

- ... there has been a tendency....
- ... but....
- However, ....
- Many of the....
- ... the last few....
- ... with differing levels of
- ... more similarities...
- ... on a larger scale....

---

[A.1.l] In acknowledgement of Silverman’s (2000, p.825) warning, that it is not advisable to make ‘grandiose claims about originality, scope, or applicability to social problems’, this study will not attempt to. As this study is being undertaken by a novice researcher, in partial fulfilment of an Honours year, the nature of the project (including its scope and duration) will not enable it to be influential in changing current practice on a large scale. However, the findings will contribute a more recent example to previous literature on this topic. The research may also influence the teaching practice at the school which is the site for research, as well as contributing to the knowledge and skills of the researcher, which will lead to improving her skills as a teacher and researcher. This study thus aims to provide general practical suggestions as to how teachers may be able to strengthen home-school literacy transitions for their students, amidst the current social and technological climate.
Personal Orientation to the Study

The idea for this study initially grew from a broader interest in children who have differing home and school lives in general, and therefore differing cultural capital to that which schools typically value (Bourdieu, 1986). This interest arose from personal and professional experience with such children during voluntary work in schools and practicums undertaken for my Bachelor degree. As this study is of such a short duration, the focus was narrowed to participants’ home and school literacies, as literacy is an area prominent in early primary curriculum.

Limitations of the Study

The study was originally designed to focus on a student who was not yet achieving school literacy at grade expectations, when there was no obvious explanation for this other than perhaps differing prior knowledge, learning styles or interests. However, at the direction of the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) at the University of Wollongong (UOW), it was amended to include a child who is progressing at or above their grade expectations for school literacy. This added somewhat to the manageability of the project, as the aim was to provide detailed descriptions of the students’ literacy. Overall, the study was designed to benefit my personal knowledge of how to assist children’s literacy transitions, and to hopefully also benefit teachers of students in similar situations by providing more nuanced understandings of difference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The links made with cultural capital may be construed as an assertion that the student with school literacy difficulties has an inadequate home life.</td>
<td>A deficit view does not underlie this. During data collection, I will consider kinds of literacies (Kalantzis &amp; Cope, 2000) and will value and respect the cultural understandings of students and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents may be uneasy or suspicious about home visits and observations. Adult participants may also feel they are being judged, or that the research is intruding on their time and space.</td>
<td>I will present myself as a competent professional, eager to learn and work in partnership with both teachers and families (Gonzalez et al., 1993). A good rapport be built with all participants and data will be conducted fairly informally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Limitations and Subsequent Responses

Stage 3: Arguing for the contributions of Sue’s research to the field of literacy

Phase 2: Announce principal findings/stating value of research

- (A deficit view) ...
- (uneasy or suspicious) ...
- (feel they are being judged) ...
- (intruding on their time and space) ...
- (competent new professional, eager to learn and work in partnership) ...
- (a good rapport) ...
- (informally) ...
- (deeply entrenched for their generosity of time and participation) ...
- It was acknowledged that ...
- (may be) ...
- (does not underlie) ...
- (may be) ...
- (participants may also) ...
- (might change) ...
- (due to being) ...
- (unlikely that) ...
- (due to being) ...
- (may affect) ...
- (the data may) ...
- (due to typical) ...
- (rather than desired) ...

- (was not yet achieving school literacy) ...
- (differing prior knowledge) ...
- (progressing at or above their grade expectations for school literacy) ...
- (also benefit) ...
- (more nuanced understandings of difference) ...
- (than perhaps) ...
- (However, ...) ...
- (It was amended to) ...
- (to hopefully) ...
- (was originally) ...
- (was no obvious) ...
- (provide detailed) ...
- (Overall, ...) ...
- (also benefit) ...
- (several identified limitations) ...
- (may also) ...
- (all) ...
- (fairly) ...
- (much due to) ...
- (may also be) ...
- (As many) ...
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Participants might change their typical behaviour due to being observed. It is unlikely that ‘deeply entrenched practices and routines’ will alter much being observed (Burns, 2000, p.463). The time restraints of participants may affect the completeness of the data. The data may also be incomplete due to typical behaviour being observed, rather than desired behaviour requested. As many observations will take place participants are comfortable with, and be thanked for their generosity of time and participation (Patton, 2002). Triangulation will be used to ascertain whether the information gained from one method of data collection seems credible in light of other data (Yin, 2003).

Delimitations of the Study
[A.1.p] It is important to ensure the project is manageable (considering the restricted time frame and resources), whilst catering for the possibility of participant withdrawal. Thus four students will be observed initially, with the intention of presenting two case studies in detail. To prevent children’s diverse literacy competencies going unnoticed, no boundaries will be imposed on the amount or type of data collected until observations have begun. For example, the study will not be limited to exploring reading and writing experiences, in case one participant does few activities involving reading and writing at home. This flexible approach is common in qualitative research. The final delimitations are in regards to the selection criteria for student participants. The students chosen for the case studies will be from similar socio-economic backgrounds, will speak English as their first language, and will not have been diagnosed with conditions such as dyslexia. This is to limit the possibility of other factors, beyond the scope of this study, influencing the children’s home and school literacy experiences and practices.

Locus of the Study
[A.1.q] In this section, the participants targeted and the setting of the research are briefly described:

| Participants must be in Stage 1 of schooling, to ensure they have had at least a year of formal schooling and that their teachers have had an opportunity to develop an opinion about their school literacy acquisition. The case studies will be compiled on a student who is identified by their teacher as having difficulties with acquiring school literacies and another who is considered to be achieving grade expectations or beyond. | Phase 2. Explaining the subjects of the study | Students must be... | ...are briefly described... |
| - It is important to... | - who is identified by their teacher as having difficulties with acquiring school literacies | - who is considered to be achieving grade expectations or beyond | - had at least a year |
| - This flexible approach... | - ...no boundaries... | - ...the study will not be in case one | |
| - ...will not have been diagnosed with conditions... | - ...for example,.... | -...whilst... | |
| - ...Thus four.... | -...initially.... | -...two case studies in detail | |
| - ...does few.... | -...from similar.... | -...beyond the scope | |
The main site for the research will be the classroom attended by the students in a local school. Observations will be conducted here twice weekly over a period of two months. The students' homes will also be sites where research takes place, although not as regularly. These visits may vary in number and frequency, as the researcher will rely on participants' generosity and will need to be flexible around their schedules.

Theoretical Location of the Study

This research is focusing on the literacy transitions which children have between their home and school experiences. As will be explained further in the review of the literature, the study is underpinned by a sociocultural theory of literacy (Fairclough, 2001; Luke & Freebody, 1999). Within this perspective, literacy is seen as being inextricably linked to specific practical and social purposes (Heath, 1983; Street, 1998). It is also seen as evolving with new technologies, as the everyday, meaningful activities it is utilised for involve the use of a range of modes of communication (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000). This broad view of literacy is thus assumed to be dynamic and it is expected that it will vary between cultures and over time.

Whilst this research partially focuses on the experiences of a child who has a lower rate of school literacy acquisition, it is not based on a deficit view of children's home literacy experiences. Instead, children's home/community literacies are considered to be rich and diverse (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Freebody et al., 1995; Heath, 1983; Street, 1998). This theoretical underpinning involves the recognition of the concept of emergent literacy (Hall, 1987, cited in Marsh, 2003; Teale & Sulzby, 1986), through which children's literacy learning is thought to begin long before formal schooling.

Definition of Terms

There are multiple terms and concepts which are used regularly throughout the thesis and these are defined and explained below.

- Phase 3: Explaining the adoption of sociocultural theories
  - Who has a lower rate of school literacy acquisition?
    - As seen as a deficit view of literacy is not based on this assumption.
    - Instead, children's home/community literacies are considered to be rich and diverse (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Freebody et al., 1995; Heath, 1983; Street, 1998). This theoretical underpinning involves the recognition of the concept of emergent literacy (Hall, 1987, cited in Marsh, 2003; Teale & Sulzby, 1986), through which children's literacy learning is thought to begin long before formal schooling.

- Phase 4: Defining terms related to literacy such as 'multiliteracies'
  - "As an occasion..."
  - "The main site..."
  - "At risk and diverse..."
  - "Indeed..."
  - "Use of..."
  - "Theoretical..."
  - "Involves..."
  - "Theoretical..."
expressing and interpreting meaning and includes reading, writing, talking, listening, using digital technologies, drawing, viewing, gesture and critical literacies (Kalantzis & Cope, 2000; Marsh, 2003; Snyder et al., 2002).

**Literacy Experiences:**

[A.1.w] Literacy experiences is a term used to refer generally to all the literacy-related activities that a child engages in or observes occurring around them; voluntarily or otherwise. In some previous studies these are referred to as literacy events (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Heath, 1983; Marsh, 2003). Examples of this occurring are: writing a postcard; playing a computer game; or watching a parent read the newspaper.

**Literacy Practices:**

[A.1.x] In this study, the term literacy practices is used to refer to the specific strategies or skills that a child employs to achieve a desired purpose during a literacy experience. As described by Barton and Hamilton (1998, p.6), literacy practices are the 'general cultural ways of utilising written language which people draw upon in their lives'. Due to the broad definition of literacy that underpins this study, literacy practices will also be related to oral language, visual images and digital technologies. Examples of such practices include: decoding words when reading; or navigating through the Internet.

**Texts:**

[A.1.y] In this study, all artefacts, resources and paraphernalia associated with literacy will be referred to as texts. For example, the term will be used to include: print-texts, such as comics; digital-texts, such as movies; and environmental print, such as signs.

**School Literacies:**

[A.1.z] School literacies can be defined as the literacy practices and experiences which are valued and prioritised at school. Examples include: writing particular text types; reading books and worksheets; and speaking appropriately in different situations.

**Home/Community Literacies:**

[A.1.aa] Home/community literacies are the literacy practices and experiences undertaken and observed outside of the school context. Some of these may be similar to (or the same as) school literacies, whilst others may be more specific to the home/community context, such as playing video games or writing a shopping list (Freebody et al., 1995).

**Transitions:**

[A.1. ab] The word transition is used, in the context of this study, to refer to the way a child moves (mentally and emotionally) between their home and school lives. This study focuses on the way continuities or discontinuities
between a child’s home and school literacies can affect the ease of these transitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presumptions Surrounding the Study</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.1.ac] <em>As with</em> other qualitative research, the findings of this study are acknowledged to be shaped by the <strong>subjectivity of the researcher</strong>, rather than being <strong>completely objective</strong>. This is because personal assumptions and biases <em>can</em> influence the data collection, data analysis and reporting of the findings. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), effort needs <em>to</em> be made to identify assumptions and biases <em>both</em> prior to, and during, the study. A <strong>major</strong> assumption underpinning this research is that all children engage in a variety of different experiences, in which they construct or interpret different modes of meaning. It is presumed that children utilise a <strong>range of practices</strong> <em>whilst</em> engaging with various linguistic, visual and digital texts, which can then be built upon in the teaching of school literacies. Subsequently, all children, who do <em>not</em> have a condition or disorder which may affect the learning process, <em>should</em> be able to achieve school literacy outcomes.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[A.1.ad] <em>However</em>, whilst the researcher <em>does not hold a deficit view of certain children and their families</em>, it is acknowledged that children who have discontinuities between their home and school literacy practices <em>may</em> be put at a <strong>disadvantage</strong>. It is presumed that students whose literacy learning out-of-school differs from school literacies may <em>not</em> have their literacy capital acknowledged and valued in the same way as students with continuities between home and school literacies. The <strong>main</strong> reasons that students’ differing <strong>literacies</strong> may <em>not</em> be accessed or used to their full potential are thought to be teachers’ attitudes, skills and available time. It is assumed that many teachers feel that school literacy experiences are <strong>more valuable</strong> than the broad range of meaning-making experiences children <em>may</em> have out-of-school. This may result in teachers considering students to be <strong>behind in their school literacy acquisition for personal reasons</strong>, rather than addressing a possible disparity between home and school experiences.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis Overview</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.1ae] Chapter Two presents a review of the relevant literature. It begins with an overview of the changing views of literacy which have contributed to the definition used for this study. The subsequent sections focus on children’s home/community and school literacies and their experiences of transitioning between these contexts. The review concludes with an investigation of the <strong>Phase 5</strong>: Admitting the subjective assumptions that can influence the results of the Sue’s study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase 5: Admitting the subjective assumptions that can influence the results of the Sue’s study

- **App.1**
  - **Ent:**
  - **Focus:**
  - **Intens:**
  - **Quant:**
  - **App:**

### Phase 6: Indicate the structure of the thesis and providing mini-synopses (previews) of each

- Mostly monograph - which could be utilised
  - **Ent:**
  - **Focus:**
  - **Intens:**
  - **Quant:**
  - **App:**

### As with other... 
- **Ent:**
- **Focus:**
- **Intens:**
- **Quant:**
- **App:**
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Introduction

This study was designed to describe the relationships between the home and school literacies of two children with differing rates of school literacy acquisition. The study aimed to focus on the continuities and discontinuities between the literacy experiences and practices occurring across these contexts. The following review of the literature will begin by considering how the definition of literacy has been re-conceptualised in recent times, before it explores a range of approaches to theorising literacy. This survey of the theoretical context recognises Guba and Lincoln’s (1994, p.115) assertion that novice researchers need to understand the ‘history and structure that serve as the surround for their inquiries’. The review

subsequent chapter (obligatory)

Stage 1. Opening
Phase 1. Setting the scope of discussion by reminding readers about: (1) the theme and topic of the study; and (2) the aim, scope, and with differing rates of school literacy acquisition. (Judg: Cap).
- effective teaching practice.

- … recognises (acknow) Guba and Lincoln’s
- … need to (enter), …
- Despite a (counter)

- … across these …
- … some of the …
- very broad view.
will examine some of the literature surrounding home and school settings; focusing on the differences in children’s literacy acquisition between these contexts. Literature outlining suggestions for effective teaching practice, and ways to strengthen children’s home-school connections, will then be reviewed (see Figure B 2.1 below). Despite a (counter) very broad view being taken in this study of what constitutes literacy (including visual and critical literacies), the restrictions placed on the scope of this review resulted in the information being limited to that which was most relevant to the study’s findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of the Review</th>
<th>Stage 2. Describing what literacy is</th>
<th>Strategy 1A: surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims</th>
<th>Strategy 1B claiming centrality</th>
<th>Strategy 1C surveying the research-related phenomena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aff: 1</td>
<td>… a more desirable future…</td>
<td>- More literate</td>
<td>- A broader perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jud: -1</td>
<td>- the acceptable, conventional way</td>
<td>- a single, measurable competence to</td>
<td>- … are necessary to…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App: +1</td>
<td>- traditional views of</td>
<td>- traditional views of intelligence</td>
<td>- … points out that…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- never-ending</td>
<td>- never-ending</td>
<td>- … argues a…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- For example,…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- … literacy is seen as…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- was initially thought...
  - As education...
  - being considered …
  - … who argue
  - …, for example, …
  - Despite the …
  - … as literacy practices

- … over time, …
  - … both by …
  - … a more desirable future…
  - … was initially thought…
  - … to a higher degree
  - … as more literate.
  - … many who …
  - … as well as,…

... are
- more
- the
- in
- Not
- in

A broader perspective
- … are necessary to…
- … points out that…
- … argues a …
- In contrast, a …
- For example,…
- … literacy is seen as …

other than solely,…
- … with little or nothing …
- … both a product of,
- … some consider …

Sociocultural Approaches to Literacy

[A.2.b] The definition of literacy has evolved over time, in parallel with changes in technology, education and economic need. These definitions are influenced both by the socio-cultural past and aspirations for a more desirable future (Freebody, 2007). Literacy in Western cultures was initially thought to solely involve developing sets of perceptual and cognitive skills for reading and writing print texts (Healy, 2003). As education is designed to prepare students for participation in social and economic life, this traditionally meant learning the acceptable, conventional way to read and write the national language (New London Group, 2000). This resulted in the people who acquired these skills to a higher degree than others being considered as more literate.

[A.2.c] There are many who argue against the view of literacy as a set of skills which can be learned. Freebody (1997), for example, compares the view of literacy as a single, measurable competence to traditional views of intelligence. In the last two or three decades, definitions of literacy have continued to evolve. This has been in response to research conducted in various communities (eg, Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Heath, 1983), as well as wider societal and technological changes (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000). Despite the gradual broadening of what literacy is thought to involve, it is still widely considered to involve the reading and writing of conventional print texts (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Knobel & Lankshear, 2006). Definitions of literacy could seem never-ending, as literacy practices continue to shift with changes in society and technology. This leaves us with questions such as: are definitions of literacy beyond school-valued print texts valid? Or are they concerned with different sets of practices?

Jud: +1
Aff: +1
App: +2/3
Ent: 3
Ack: 1
Cou: 1
Reason: 2
Quant: 2
Intens: 7
notion rips literacy out of any social context and treats it as an autonomous, asocial, cognitive skill with little or nothing to do with human relationships. In contrast, a sociocultural approach considers texts as being produced and consumed within certain cultural contexts, often for social purposes (Campbell & Ryles, 2003; Fairclough, 2001; Luke & Freebody, 1999; Street, 1998). For example, literacy is seen as both a product of, and a tool for maintaining, social relationships (Gee, 1990; Kress, 2000). As similar skills can vary depending on their purpose (e.g., reading a letter or a factual text), some consider literacy as being broad, but with blurred boundaries (Burton, 2001; Freebody & Freiberg, 2001). The inextricable link between language and social interactions means that language and literacy are never learned in a vacuum (Campbell & Green, 2003; Vygotsky, 1978). This is why Freebody (1997) asserts that research needs to study literacy as it occurs in everyday life, accounting for the specific social contexts of the people being studied. The current research responds to this challenge by investigating the literacy practices which are occurring in children’s everyday lives.

[A.2.e] Snyder (2001) also asserts the need to focus on real literacy practices as they occur in modern life. She explains that New Literacy Studies (NLS), originating in the late 1970s as the product of a variety of disciplines, have been developed in education by prominent researchers, such as Heath (1983) and Gee (1990). NLS acknowledge that there are a range of literacies, which have differing levels of value in society, are used for various purposes, and learned in different ways (Baynham & Prinsloo, 2001; Heath, 1983; Luke & Freebody, 1999). Street (1998) explains that the social and cultural contexts, within which texts are produced and used, affect their neutrality. As Heath (1994, p.91) states, “children’s learning follows community paths of language socialization”. This view thus shifts the idea of people being without, or deficient, in literacy to one of everybody having competencies and difficulties with various literacies as a normal part of life. Baynham and Prinsloo (2001) describe NLS as a complex network of continually developing ideas which, among several other areas, is currently focused on home-school literacy practices and community based-literacy practices.

[A.2.f] Luke and Freebody (1999) propose a framework which draws together a range of views about literacy. The four resources which Luke and Freebody (1999-2000) describe as being necessary but not alone sufficient for readers include: code breaker - Phase 2. Creating a research niche by:
  - Strategy 2A counter-claiming
  - Strategy 2B gap-indicating
  - Strategy 2C asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed
  - Strategy 2E abstracting or synthesizing knowledge claims to establish a theoretical position or a theoretical framework

- Strategy 1B claiming centrality
  - Strategy 1C surveying the research-related phenomena
  - Strategy 2A counter-claiming
  - Strategy 2B gap-indicating
  - Strategy 2A research aims, focuses, research questions or hypotheses

- by prominent researchers
  - people being without, or deficient, in literacy
  - to one of everybody having competencies and difficulties with various literacies
  - network of continually developing ideas
  - ... necessary but not alone sufficient ....

- As similar ....
  - ... can vary ....
  - ... are never learned ....
  - ... asserts that ....
  - ... needs to study

Quant:2+/1-
Intens:1

Aff: +1
Jud: +
App: +1/-1

Ack:3
Cou:1
Ent:3
Reason:1
Dny:1
(coding competence); text participant or meaning maker (semantic competence); text user (pragmatic competence); and text analyst or critic (critical competence). Each of these deals with different aspects of textual practice, although they do not operate in isolation. There have been several attempts to diagrammatise the model (Luke & Freebody, 1999–2000), such as Figure B.2.2 (below), which was adapted by Harris, Turbill, Fitzsimmons and McKenzie (2006, p.55).

**Figure 2 Representation of the Four Resources Model**

| A.2.g | The four resources model has been used to inform literacy policies and teaching practice across Australia (e.g., NSW Department of School Education, 1997). Campbell and Green (2003, p.149) propose four amended practices which are more specific to writing: code knowledge, meaning making, genre selection and reflection. **Overall**, the literature on sociocultural perspectives acknowledges that there are differing purposes for literacy, which are embedded within a social context. **However**, there are some who believe that this sole view is perhaps still not broad enough to encompass what it means to be literate in the modern day (e.g., Beavis, 2003; Healy, 2004; Street, 1998). |
| **Strategy 1C** | - |
| **Strategy 2C** | - |

**Multiliteracies**

[A.2.h] A major feature of the current socio-cultural milieu is digital technology. The complexities of modern communication techniques and technologies have added to the need to broaden views of literacy beyond the practices surrounding print and oral texts (Bull & Anstey, 2007; Freebody, 2007; Hammond, 2001; Knobel & Lankshear, 2006). This is not a new phenomenon, according to Murdoch, Parry and Braybrook (2001,p.50): ‘literacy has a long history of attempts to reframe its definition as new technologies including the camera, telephone, radio, television, video have entered the arena and had significant impact industrially, socially and environmentally’. The range of meaning making resources made available via newer technologies allows one to be considered electronically or media literate (Green, 2003; Hill, 2005; Knobel & Lankshear, 2006; Snyder et al., 2002). Literacy can thus be viewed as including the ability to use and understand digital texts, which involves accessing, managing, evaluating, creating and communicating information in regards to Information and Communication Technology (ICT) (Australian Computer Society, 2005; Australian Council for Adult Literacy, 2001). This broader definition accommodates the more diverse range of ways in which meaning can be communicated in the 21st century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.2.i</th>
<th>The linguistic mode is dominant for the majority of print-texts but, in a society saturated with new media and technologies, there is a need to analyse other modes alongside words. Many now consider literacy to involve various</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- ... propose four ... |
- ... acknowledges that ... |
- However, there are ... |
- ... perhaps .... |

- A major feature .... |
- ... beyond the .... |
- ... via newer .... |
- ... the more diverse range of .... |

**Some Observations**
visual, auditory, spatial and gestural semiotic systems (Arthurson & Cozmoscu, 2007; Beavis, 2003; Bull & Anstey, 2007; Hammond, 2001; O’Brien, 1996). Freebody (2003, p.174) thus uses the term ‘texts’ to refer to crafted, communications – visual, graphic and electronic representations of language and objects’. Continuing technological changes have contributed to texts becoming increasingly multimodal (Fairclough, 2000; Kress, 2000). Digital texts can also be hypertextual, with links made between documents within a system that integrates text, audio and visual elements; the internet (Healy, 2003; Snyder, 2001). Northcote, Marshall, Dobozy, Swan and Mildenhall (2007) highlight the rapid nature in which the multimodal communication method of podcasting has been learned about (assisted by the internet itself). The literature cited in this section thus shows that contemporary Western societies have become increasingly more screen-orientated.

| [A.2.j] The evolving view of literacy is not always reflected in research. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Many changes and developments have occurred since previous studies of children’s home/community literacy experiences, such as Heath (1983), Freebody et al. (1995) and Cairney and Ruge (1998). In addition, recent studies sometimes still place limits on what literacy is considered to be. For example, van Steensel (2006) includes literacy-focused television programmes such as Sesame Street as a literacy experience, but not others such as cartoons. This highlights a need for future research on children’s literacies to incorporate a variety of different modes of meaning, as the current research has. | App:1 | Cou:1 | Ent:2 | Cc:2 | Ack:1 | Quant:1 | Intens:4 |

| [A.2.k] Studies that plan to take a broader view of literacy can adopt the theoretical framework of Multiliteracies (Cope and Kalantzis, 2000; New London Group, 1996, cited in Healy, 2004). This model is more relevant to what it means to be literate in today’s society, as it incorporates visual and technological literacies and focuses on the need for various types of texts to be studied alongside print-texts (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000). Such frameworks capture more adequately what it takes to prepare students for being active citizens within the modern world, focusing on building upon children’s individual experiences and identities, rather than making them assimilate to school-valued literacy (Kalantzis & Cope, 2000; Murdoch et al., 2001; Shockley, Michalove & Allen, 1995). | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | | | Ent:1 | Reason:1 | Cou:1 | Quant:1 | Intens:3 |

| [A.2.l] There are similarities between sociocultural views and the Multiliteracies model. Firstly, both work with a much broader definition of literacy than the traditional Basic Skills approach (Christie & Macken-Horarik, 2007). Additionally, new technologies have assisted the development and maintenance of social relationships through increasing the communication methods possible (Campbell, Green & Rivalland, 2003; Freebody, 2007). | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | | | Ent:1 | Reason:1 | Cou:1 | Quant:1 | Intens:3 |
Snyder, 2001). There is thus a bidirectional relationship between social contexts and technologies, both of which, in turn, involve and affect literacy (Luke, 2000). Hill (2005) has developed a version of Luke and Freebody’s four resources model that is more suited to a multiliteracies approach.

| A.2|m | In light of the technological and modal developments in texts, there are changes that need to occur in relation to those who use these texts. Within a multiliteracies view, the words “reader” and “writer” could be replaced with “consumer” and “producer”, which additionally incorporate scripting, designing, drawing and viewing (Bull & Anstey, 2007; Kress, 2000). Being literate, in light of texts such as those accessed via the internet, requires consumers and producers to develop new cognitive processes and literacy practices (Freebody, 2007; Hill, 2005; Kress, 2000; Snyder, 2001). Children born into the technological world are generally more at ease with creating and interpreting multimodal texts than previous generations, who have relied mainly on print and speech to obtain meaning (Snyder, 2001). In fact, students often view technology as a normal part of everyday life and expect it to be integrated into their schooling (Northcote et al., 2007). Beavis (2003, p.21) raises the point that this requires teachers ‘to plan for pedagogy and curriculum that nurtures the skills and dispositions students will need to operate in a world of rapid change’. Across the literature there is evidence that both children and adults learn and practice a variety of new literacies, as they engage in everyday activities.

### Home/Community Literacies

**A.2.n** Many studies of children’s home literacy experiences suggest similar findings and opinions; that all children are exposed to, and engage with, a variety of complex literacies. Hunt (2001) states that the complexity of literacy becomes apparent as more is learned about it. Several prominent studies have investigated children’s home literacies. In her influential ethnographic research, Heath (1983) documented the rich and diverse range of literacies experienced by children in different communities. Home literacy experiences involve combinations of written, spoken, and visual texts (as well as others) and are thus both overlapping and dynamic (Barton, 2001; Barton & Hamilton, 1998). Recent research has shown that many of children’s home literacy practices are linked to popular culture, new media and technologies (Marsh, 2003; Marsh & Thompson, 2001; Snyder, 2001). Such studies document the complex range of literacy practices that children utilise when engaging with digital texts and popular culture.

**A.2.o** Another of the main themes across the literature is that children’s home literacies are closely associated with social interactions and meaningful everyday purposes. As described earlier, literacy practices are strongly linked to the social and cultural contexts in which they occur. The table demonstrates how those literacy practices are linked to a range of topics, including digital technologies, family involvement, and community participation.
to the context in which they occur (Fairclough, 2001; Hunt, 2001; Luke & Freebody, 1999; Street, 1998). Children thus experience a large number of different literacies out-of-school, as literacy is a fundamental part of everyday life, which is involved in (and helps mediate) nearly all activities (Barton, 2001; Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Heath, 1983). Several researchers have categorised the literacies which take place in children’s home/community contexts, as shown in Table B.2.1 (below). The table demonstrates that these literacies take place as children and their families go about their daily lives.

Table B.2.1 Purposes for Literacy in Home/Community Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>social-interactional ('to maintain social relationships')</td>
<td>personal communication</td>
<td>social (i.e. maintain relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumental ('to accomplish personal goals')</td>
<td>organising life</td>
<td>practical organising daily life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memory aids ('to serve as private leisure')</td>
<td>documenting life (photos,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news-related ('to learn about third parties or distant events')</td>
<td>sense making (personal research, interests, hobbies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy C: surveying research related literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H/C L: Arguing for children exposure and engagement with a variety of complex literacies: meaningful everyday purpose, context-influenced, parent as model. Concluding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It can be argued that...  
  - ... summarise these...  
  - ... argues that...  
  - ... may be valued or not  
  - Gee (1990) explains...  
  - Bourdieu (1986) describes...  
  - ... and asserts that...  

- are strongly linked  
- a large number of...  
- ... different literacies  
- ... a fundamental part  
- nearly all activities  
- Several researchers...
are regularly used by groups of people is “funds of knowledge” (Gonzalez et al., 1993). These can range from print literacy to agricultural knowledge and are passed on within families or through wider social networks.

| A.2.q | In addition to the opportunities that parents provide for their children, they are also models when they engage in literacy activities and learning themselves (Barton & Hamilton, 1998). Young children thus do not just learn how to read, but how to be learners of reading (Freebody & Freiberg, 2001). Families can also affect the cognitive skills and motivation displayed by their children throughout their schooling (Kerckhoff, 1986). Interestingly, van Steensel (2006) found that, even if children themselves did not regularly engage in reading and writing activities in the home, their vocabulary benefitted if they had older family members who did. Thus the differences in home literacy experiences also include parents’ own choice of literacy activities and parent-child interactions around available texts. |
| A.2.r | As children are socialised into various types of knowledge and skills from birth, they have already had various literacy experiences by the time they start formal schooling. Emergent literacy is a construct that validates the literacy experiences and practices that children gain at home (Teale & Sulzby, 1986). Much of the reviewed literature (especially sociocultural approaches) supports this perspective, acknowledging diverse home literacy experiences - and the range of texts and genres available - as being highly influential in children’s literacy development (Campbell & Ryles, 2003; Comber & Barnett, 2003; Gonzalez & Moll, 2002; Luke & Freebody, 1999; Payne, 2007; Topfer, 2003). As the knowledge and skills learned from these contexts are often broad and diverse, some argue that there is evidence of a wider range of literacies in children’s home/community settings than at school (Freebody, 2007; Freebody et al., 1995). Overall, there is strong evidence to support the argument that children entering school already have a foundation upon which school literacy can be built. |

School Literacies

School as a Socialising Tool

[A.2.s] School can similarly be viewed as socialising children into the particular ways of talking, behaving and knowing; those which are valued by the dominant society. Gee (1990, p.67) states that “[l]anguage and literacy acquisition are forms of socialization, in this case socialization into mainstream ways of using language in speech and print”. Students from dominant social groups can be advantaged in their school literacy learning by their tacitly acquired knowledge. It has thus been argued that, whilst promising equity, schooling does not provide equality (Bernstein, 1999; Comber & Barnett, 2003; Gonzalez & Moll, 2002; Luke & Freebody, 1999; Payne, 2007; Topfer, 2003).
Although it is important to note that each approach is not completely distinct and that it is possible for aspects of several approaches to be adopted. Although schools today tend to view the technical aspects of literacy, such as
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If education is a matter of transformation, a kind of cultural journey from one state of capacity and being to another, then while some people find it easy to get onto the through train, others can only get on to the all-stops; others can’t get a ticket to go the whole way; and still others never manage to get on at all simply because there are no seats for them

[A.2.1] Some assert that literacy education is at the centre of this process, as it introduces specific skills, associated with the dominant form of the National language, to children from a diverse range of cultural backgrounds (Freebody, 2007; Gee, 1990). It can thus be argued that students’ success is more strongly related to learning “school” literacy practices than demonstrating knowledge of literacy in general (Cairney, 2003; Campbell & King, 2003). Luke and Freebody (1999) place the responsibility on teachers to effectively assist individual students in their literacy learning, rather than assuming that certain children do not have the same capacities for acquiring school-valued literacy.

The Development of Literacy Education

[A.2.u] The important role that children’s early school years play in their literacy acquisition is a recurring theme through the literature. “School literacy” is that which has been developed through prescribed curricula and standards and involves the skills that lead to success at school, such as correct spelling (Knobel & Lankshear, 2006). Luke and Freebody (1999, p.70) highlight that decisions about how literacy is taught in schools are “moral, political and cultural”. A wide variety of approaches for teaching literacy have been implemented historically and these are summarised in Table B.2.2, below (adapted from Campbell et al., 2003; Christie & Macken-Horarik, 2007; Harris, 2007). This table shows that literacy curriculum and pedagogy have developed and changed, from being quite restricted and direct, to being child-centred and flexible and then to approaches which are more balanced and involve broader views of what literacy involves.

Table B.2.2

[A.2.v] It is important to note that each approach is not completely distinct and that it is possible for aspects of several approaches to be adopted.

Although schools today tend to view the technical aspects of literacy, such as
grammer and spelling, as only constituting part of what it is to be literate (Barton & Hamilton, 1998), aspects of all of these approaches can still be found in Australian classrooms (Campbell et al., 2003; Harris, 2007). Some of the literature indicates that school learning often focuses on explicit skills-based teaching, where learning is segregated from meaningful activities and involves students achieving individual tasks for a single purpose (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Knobel & Lankshear, 2006). Students who have difficulties with reading are more likely to experience such a curriculum, focused on phonics and completing worksheets independently (Freebody et al., 1995; Hunt, 2001). The likelihood of a transmission-style approach being implemented is also increased by restrictions, such as limited time (Knobel, 2001). Thus, although an emphasis on basic skills may be thought of as a traditional approach to literacy, it is still strongly evident in teaching practice and policy. 

[A.2.w] It seems that the way in which the education system values the development of certain skills can contribute to teaching and learning becoming more restricted. The national testing of students’ reading and writing against established benchmarks claims to improve student literacy acquisition and the accountability of teachers in response to a perceived “literacy crisis” (Christie & Macken-Horarik, 2007; Freebody, 1997, 2007; Hammond, 2001). These assessments measure discrete skills, which are removed from a social context, but are considered to indicate whether a child has reached an “appropriate” level of literacy acquisition (Commonwealth of Australia, 1998; Curriculum Corporation, 2000; DEEWR, 2000). The continued concerns resulting from such testing are often associated with an argument for returning to the teaching of basic skills (Snyder, 2008). Thus, one of the reasons for the continuing emphasis on basic skills is the way in which literacy is assessed in schools. 

[A.2.x] Research into children’s literacy learning across different contexts is often in contrast to what policies dictate is to be valued and assessed in school (George & Bennett, 2005; Hammond, 2001). While government policy often focuses on the level of basic skills students possess, as well as how they compare to international standards, scholarly research appears more mindful of varying social and educational factors (Lo Bianco, 2001). This tension seems to be because of the differing agendas that politicians and educational researchers have, and the fact that policy documents are often centralised and generalising (Lo Bianco, 2001; Moss, 2004). Some authors argue that even if research and policy are led by the aim of achieving more equitable outcomes for children’s literacy learning, very little is actually
known about children’s homeliteracies (Freethy, 1997; Street, 1998). This identifies a need for further research to be conducted on the prior knowledge and skills that children have at home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.2.aa</th>
<th>Despite the aforementioned diversity found in children’s homes, the education system expects students to learn in similar ways. Hammond (2001) explains that policies often outline that children come from diverse backgrounds.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Transitions between Home and School Literacies**

A number of other researchers advocate the integration of new technologies into everyday teaching (Andrews, 2007; Healy, 2003; Murdoch et al., 2001; Northcote et al., 2007; Snyder et al., 2002). However, there is also tension between the new literacies that children engage with and those which are taught in schools (Knobel & Lankshear, 2006). Some studies have shown, for example, that school computer use is often significantly restricted in regards to the time and choice of activities available (Australian Computer Society, 2005; Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Furlong, Furlong, Facer & Sutherland, 2000; Snyder et al., 2002). The challenge for teachers in the current day is thus one of acknowledging the changing aspects of everyday literacy and integrating these into teaching and learning within the classroom. Freebody and Freiberg (2001) point out that educators who consult research on literacy, to improve their practice, will often miss the vital importance of looking beyond theory and policy and into their own students’ homes.

**Transitions between Home and School Literacies**

| A.2.y | The rapid technological advancements in recent decades highlight the need for changed foci in literacy teaching and assessment. Nixon (2003) points out that the literacy skills which are tested are representative of those which are valued by schools. Despite research into children’s use of multimodal texts and new technologies, these skills are not assessed, which seems to show that school systems ‘have been resolutely nineteenth century in their approach to assessing literacy’ (Freebody, 2007, p.63). Beavis (2003) emphasises that, just as the world children live in has changed, so has the context of literacy education in schools. Kalantzis and Cope (2000, p.147) agree and state that:  

- the familiar territories of curriculum seem eerily irrelevant.  

The ‘basics’ appear to be vacuous now because the main ground has shifted from the old fashioned, page-bound written texts and the dislocated ‘standards’. What literacy teaching used to promise to do, we don’t seem to need anymore; and even if it is of some use, some of the time, it’s certainly not enough. |

- The rapid technological advancements in recent decades highlight the need for changed foci in literacy teaching and assessment. Nixon (2003) points out that the literacy skills which are tested are representative of those which are valued by schools. Despite research into children’s use of multimodal texts and new technologies, these skills are not assessed, which seems to show that school systems ‘have been resolutely nineteenth century in their approach to assessing literacy’ (Freebody, 2007, p.63). Beavis (2003) emphasises that, just as the world children live in has changed, so has the context of literacy education in schools. Kalantzis and Cope (2000, p.147) agree and state that:  

- the familiar territories of curriculum seem eerily irrelevant.  

The ‘basics’ appear to be vacuous now because the main ground has shifted from the old fashioned, page-bound written texts and the dislocated ‘standards’. What literacy teaching used to promise to do, we don’t seem to need anymore; and even if it is of some use, some of the time, it’s certainly not enough. |
backgrounds, without seeming to acknowledge that these may require alterations in curriculum and pedagogy. The process of learning to read and write is therefore a very different journey for individual children (Gregory, Long & Volk, 2004). This is evident in the fact that children already have significantly differing levels of literacy by the age of nine (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 2000). Payne (2007) asserts that the gap between students’ school success, including literacy acquisition, will continually increase throughout their primary school years. This indicates the importance of research focusing on children’s early home to school literacy transitions to ascertain whether this seems to be having an impact on their success at school literacies.

As stated earlier, some children can be put at an advantage in their school literacy learning. The OECD (2004) found that the characteristics which advantaged students (to various degrees) in regards to literacies were: arriving on time for school; having an interest in reading; being confident; being female; having a sense of belonging at school; and having a higher socioeconomic status (SES). Riordan (2004) states that thousands of studies have consistently shown that the most prominent factor in children’s school success is SES. A good deal of research attributes this to a congruence between the language, knowledge and experiences at home and school (OECD, 2004; Payne, 2007; Street, 1998). For example, some children have similar orientations towards text and meanings (Bernstein, 1999), engage in similar Discourses (Gee, 1990), or have congruent cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) at home, to that of school.

However, there are also examples across the literature which do not show a link between students’ literacies and SES. Several studies, for example, have depicted the diverse experiences of children from low SES homes (Heath, 1983; Freebody et al., 1995; Shockley et al., 1995; Snyder et al., 2002). There are also parents from a range of SES backgrounds who believe literacy to be valuable for their children, but do not place emphasis on their own “literacy” use (van Steensel, 2006). Such research suggests that a continuity between children’s home literacies and that which is valued at school will often influence their school success, regardless of SES.

Unfortunately, just as some students are advantaged, others can be put at a disadvantage, by their existing literacy capital not being acknowledged and valued within the school setting. Many sources highlight the difference between the capital of children from non-mainstream homes.
and school expectations and assumed knowledge (Ashton-Warner, 1980; Gonzalez et al., 1993; Gonzalez & Moll, 2002; Heath, 1978, 1983; van Krieken et al., 2000). As schools often define literacy as solely involving reading, writing and spelling, the other literacies which students may have acquired at home are invalidated (Knobel & Lankshear, 2006; Shockley et al., 1995). This means that children may have complex literacy competencies that are not acknowledged, or tapped into, at school (Gregory et al., 2004; Heath, 1994) and who may be subsequently deemed failures (Knobel, 2001). There is thus an issue of power associated with the way in which some knowledge and experiences are valued and others are not (Bourdieu, 1986; Kress, 2003; van Krieken et al., 2000). This can eventuate in some teachers and schools holding a deficit view of children’s homes.

Although children’s experiences at home contribute greatly to their early literacy development, the home cannot be blamed for children not learning school literacies. Riordan (2004) explains that, by categorising students, the problem is distanced from the schools and placed on children and their families instead. Schools have the responsibility to educate all children, regardless of their differing backgrounds or prior knowledge (Luke & Freebody, 1999; van Krieken et al., 2000). Street (1998) states that, unlike some educators and policy makers, social linguists do not believe that either the home or the school setting is superior to the other, but do acknowledge that they may not be congruent. Thus he is emphasising the importance of considering the relationship between home and school contexts, rather than viewing each as a separate unit.

Previous Research on Children’s Early Literacy Transitions

There has been research in the past which documents the discontinuities between home and school literacies. One such study investigated how “disadvantage” seems to affect students’ school experience (Freebody et al., 1995). It was found that there were significant differences in the way in which literacy was undertaken in different homes. Studies have also shown that the reason, or purpose, for literacy experiences can differ greatly (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Freebody et al., 1995). For example, Cairney and Ruge (1998, p.41) found that, whilst ‘texts were resources used to achieve a purpose’ in children’s homes, they ‘were the primary object’ at
school. They also found that home literacy practices were more related to children’s interests than school literacy practices and, additionally, that they were more challenging. Marsh (2003) similarly found that the literacy practices which were most relevant to children were the least often available at nursery (pre-school). Overall, previous research seems to indicate that schools do not integrate the knowledge that students have, and texts that they use, at home.

Despite the majority of the literature supporting the claim that home-school continuity determines school success, it is important not to generalise. Whilst Cairney and Ruge (1998) found that there was a strong connection between school success and home-school continuity, they explicitly state that there is no single or simple answer as to why this is the case. Nichols (2003) asserts that there are both continuities and discontinuities between many children's home and school lives. There are additionally children who have strong continuities that do not equate to success. Rivalland (2003), for example, describes the case study of a boy who struggled with school literacy despite having a wealth of school-like literacy resources and experiences at home. There appear to be very few studies available, such as the current one, which document the home-school transitions of a child who struggles with school literacy despite having school-valued texts available to them at home.

As has been argued, literacy acquisition is a complex process. It involves many factors, such as available time, physical space, available texts and artefacts, and even gender (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Heath, 1983; Marsh, 2003; Moss, 2001; Nichols, 2003). A number of researchers suggest that it is not enough to have continuity between the texts available, as the type of interactions occurring around texts will be more influential in literacy acquisition (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Freebody & Freiberg, 2001; Freebody et al., 1995; Gee, 1990; Heath, 1978; Street, 1998; van Krieken et al., 2000). Some previous research has focused on differences between the interaction patterns at home and school and on the role played by parents. Barton and Hamilton (1998, p.252) explain that '[v]ernacular literacy practices are learned informally...The role of novice or learner and expert or teacher are not fixed'. Students additionally receive more immediate feedback from their parents whilst completing tasks (Freebody et al., 1995).
contrast, in the classroom, interactions usually occur in a particular way, with the teacher controlling most conversations (Campbell & King, 2003).

[A.2.AI] Some of the research has shown the home-school connection to be a one-way process, with school influencing the home rather than the opposite occurring. Several studies found that home literacy learning was rarely acknowledged and integrated into the school curriculum (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Marsh, 2003; Snyder et al., 2002). This was despite the wide range of literacy experiences and practices that were apparent in the children’s home contexts; including those related to school literacy tasks (Cairney & Ruge, 1998). Marsh (2003) explains that the awareness of a need for stronger home-school connections, raised by studies such as Heath’s (1983), has transpired to be nothing more than involving parents in supporting school learning. Freebody et al. (1995) discovered that the teachers in their study often attributed students’ literacy difficulties to the students and their families, rather than questioning their own curriculum and pedagogy. These findings suggest that teachers may not view it as part of their role to discover students’ prior home literacy experiences and to develop a two-way dialogue between school and home.

Teaching: Effective Practices and Related Issues

Discovering Children’s Home Literacies

[A.2.AI] It is not a recent argument that teachers need to discover as much information as possible about students’ backgrounds, so as to build continuity between home and school (Cazden, 2000). However, many studies have shown that such continuity remains elusive in formal educational settings (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Freebody et al., 1995; Heath, 1983; Knobel, 2001; Marsh, 2003; Marsh & Thompson, 2001). The first way in which teachers can find out about students’ prior knowledge and learning is by “listening” to them and their families. The acquired knowledge can then be related to the literacies which are valued by the education system (Comber & Barnett, 2003; Heath, 1983). Topfer (2003, p.146) explains: Gathering information regarding community funds of knowledge values difference and facilitates planning for diversity in practice…Teachers and carers must foster an increased exchange of information from home to school, to assist their understanding of the diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds children bring to school.
Some authors, for example, assert that it is important for teachers and parents to find out about each others’ definition of literacy and the way that literacy is valued and used (Cairney, 2003; Moss, 2004). One way in which teachers can make students’ home to school literacy transitions smoother is by learning about the complex ethnographies of literacy in their households. This process can be akin to teachers becoming researchers; gaining information about the competencies and knowledge children display out of school (Cazden, 2000). Teachers can learn invaluable information about households’ dynamic cultures by conducting sensitively organised home visits themselves (eg, Gonzalez et al., 2002; Gonzalez et al., 1993; Heath, 1983, 1994). Similar findings resulted from a study conducted by teacher- researchers, during which strong parent-teacher relationships were developed through a two-way dialogue in a personal journal (Shockley et al., 1995). Such studies have thus provided useful information about effective teaching practice for improving home-school connections, in addition to teachers learning about students’ home literacies.

| [A.2.AK] | Some authors, for example, assert that it is important for teachers and parents to find out about each others’ definition of literacy and the way that literacy is valued and used (Cairney, 2003; Moss, 2004). One way in which teachers can make students’ home to school literacy transitions smoother is by learning about the complex ethnographies of literacy in their households. This process can be akin to teachers becoming researchers; gaining information about the competencies and knowledge children display out of school (Cazden, 2000). Teachers can learn invaluable information about households’ dynamic cultures by conducting sensitively organised home visits themselves (eg, Gonzalez et al., 2002; Gonzalez et al., 1993; Heath, 1983, 1994). Similar findings resulted from a study conducted by teacher- researchers, during which strong parent-teacher relationships were developed through a two-way dialogue in a personal journal (Shockley et al., 1995). Such studies have thus provided useful information about effective teaching practice for improving home-school connections, in addition to teachers learning about students’ home literacies. |
| [A.2.AL] | The literature consulted on this topic strongly recommends that teachers integrate the information they obtain about home literacies into school learning, rather than supplanting them. If the differing literacy capital that each child brings is valued, there may be improvements in student engagement and the depth of classroom literacy activities (Healy, 2004; Kalantzis & Cope, 2000; Murdoch et al., 2001). Cairney and Ruge (1998, p.59) illustrate the difference between acknowledging and accepting home literacies: ‘empowering children does not mean ‘teaching’ them how to interact ‘appropriately’ so that their knowledge will be accepted and privileged - it means accepting their knowledge regardless of how they interact’. Others also stress the importance of teachers “genuinely” accepting children and their families, by valuing the literacies they have developed from these social contexts (Cazden, 2000; Gee, 1990). Teachers thus need to continually analyse their personal views and pedagogy in an attempt to make learning accessible to all students (Bourdieu, 1986; Heath, 1983; Knobel, 2001; van Krieken et al., 2000). Although the four resources model does not set out a method for teaching literacy, it does allow teachers to assess whether the experiences they provide ‘are indeed covering and integrating a broad repertoire of textual practices that are required in new economies and cultures’ (Luke & Freebody, 1999, p.71). In other words, teaching practice should be focusing on preparing students for the literacies which they use, and will need, in everyday life. Whether the gap between home and school is being bridged effectively in the current technological milieu is an area for future research. |

| [Strategy C] | asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed: [2.AJ] about the teachers’ need to discover as much information as possible about students’ backgrounds, so as to build continuity between home and school
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Initiatives introduced in the 1980s to involve the parents of students experiencing difficulties with school literacy were very one-sided. These tended to involve parents being recommended strategies to implement at home, and home tutoring programs (Cairney, 2003). Several studies in the last decade still show the occurrence of this approach to parent involvement in learning (e.g., Shockley et al., 1995). Others show an apparent lack of two-way communication, such as parents being told about their children’s work and progress (e.g., Barton and Hamilton, 1998). Freebody et al. (1995) recommend that, to discuss children’s experiences and learning in a more reciprocal way, teachers and school staff may need to challenge the way in which communication occurs. Many authors argue that there needs to be more awareness of how the wide range of literacy events and practices that students have and use outside of school can be used to benefit and broaden the schooled literacy curriculum (e.g., Freebody, 2007; Marsh, 2003). So, in what ways can this be done?

### Practical Ideas for Assisting Literacy Transitions

Learning can be made more meaningful to students if it is linked to their lives and if students are given more choice and control (Healy, 2004; Kalantzis & Cope, 2000; Nixon, 2003). This can be achieved through implementing inquiry-based, integrated curriculum, which can allow students to have successful literacy experiences, whilst linking school learning to the "real world" (Murdoch et al., 2001). For example, Nichols (2003, p.96) suggests that everyday issues - such as resolving conflicts between friends - "are a much underrated source of inspiration for children’s literacy. Activities drawing on this social world could give children opportunities to...develop their repertoires of literacy practices". Murdoch et al. (2001) assert that many meaningful topics can be explored through language and technology; including the use of various everyday, multi-modal texts. Such complex and spontaneous curriculum would require teachers to be flexible in their planning and pedagogy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aff:</th>
<th>Judg: +1</th>
<th>App: +2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quant:</th>
<th>Intens:</th>
<th>Focus:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [A.2.AM] Benefits that one child experienced

Some of the literature provides specific examples about how the gap between children’s everyday, social worlds and their school lives can be narrowed. Several authors suggest developing children’s love of reading by allowing them to choose books that are personally meaningful to them (e.g., Ashton-Warner, 1980; Shockley et al., 1995). These authors assert that children can similarly be engaged in writing activities by being allowed to choose the topic of their writing. Rivalland (2003) describes the literacy benefits that one child experienced when his teacher encouraged him to
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integrate **personally relevant** topics, such as video games, into his writing at school. One of the other recommendations Ashton-Warner (1980) proposes is for writing to always be shared, to develop children’s understanding of creating texts for readers.

[A.2.AP] In addition to allowing children more freedom to choose which texts they will read and write, teachers can integrate **meaningful** texts from children’s lives into the classroom. When a **variety** of everyday texts (e.g., television guides, brochures, magazines) are valued and used in practical ways, it shows children that reading is different, depending on its purpose and context (Campbell & Ryles, 2003; Moss, 2004). Cairney and Ruge (1998) suggest this can be done by encouraging students to transfer a diverse range of chosen or produced texts between home and school. Nichols (2003) explains that, in the younger primary school years, the major emphasis for homework is usually on the home reader, but similarly suggests that a **range** of texts might be sent home, to encourage different literacy practices. The notion that children’s interest in reading and writing can be influenced by the texts chosen is a consistent theme across the literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy D: asserting the relevancy of the surveyed claims to her research, by Stating her agreement about involving students’ real-life experiences to make their learning become more meaningful, and urging teachers to explore various everyday multimodal texts close to their students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- In addition to teachers can integrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- When...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cairney and Ruge (1998) suggest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- this can be done by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nichols (2003) explains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is usually on might be sent home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- concede: 1 ack:111 endorse:1 enter:111 justify:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quant: 11 Intens: 111 Focus:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another way in which children’s knowledge and interests can **be** integrated and valued at school is through the inclusion of popular culture and new technologies. This can assist teachers in engaging students and making learning more relevant to them (Badger, 2003; Gonzalez et al., 1993; Marsh, 2003; Marsh & Thompson, 2001; Murdoch et al., 2001; Pitt, 2003). This will bridge the gap ‘between the kinds of worlds schools and education have been built around...and the world young people are increasingly called upon to occupy’ (Beavis, 2003, pp.17-18). Snyder et al. (2002) found the teachers of one child knew very little about his home life. When they reported the boy’s strengths with ICTs to the principal of the school, his response was: ‘I’m sure it’s for pleasure not for anything educational’ (p.378). This shows that merely providing schools with information about children’s home literacy strengths does not ensure they will be valued and included in the curriculum. Instead, future studies should outline specific ways in which their findings could be utilised **effectively** in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offering some ways to narrow the gap between home and school literacies: such as giving freedom to students to choose texts they like.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- can be integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This can assist teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Snyder et al. (2002) found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- When they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- does not ensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Instead,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- should outline could be utilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- concede: 1 enter:111 justify:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>量: 11 Intens: 111 Focus:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preventative Factors in Assisting Literacy Transitions**

[A.2.AR] There are, of course, reasons for teachers either having a **lack of** knowledge about home literacies or for not integrating this knowledge into their learning...
their curriculum and pedagogy. **Firstly**, it is **difficult** for teachers to accommodate all students’ previous learning, as family backgrounds and home literacies are so varied (Heath, 1983; Kalantzis & Cope, 2000). Time and energy were **also frequently** mentioned across the literature. Barton and Hamilton (1998, p.202) **state** that teachers, ‘over-worked and tired at the end of the day, did not see how they could give any more time to parents’. Knobel (2001) **adds** that, **due to** the many strains teachers have on their time and energy, visiting students’ homes to find out about the cultural capital of their family is not an option for many. Gonzalez et al. (1993) **similarly state** that ‘[a]dding to their already overloaded schedule, an effort to visit students’ households, write field notes, and meet in study groups can be a high price to pay for making a connection to the home’. One of the consequences of this is that literacy can be taught in segmented, traditional ways. As mentioned briefly earlier, external demands and expectations, such as standardised testing, can lead to teachers focusing on dominant language and practices in the classroom (Gonzalez et al., 1993; Hammond, 2001; Heath, 1983; Topfer, 2003). Knobel (2001, p.412) **stresses** the need for ‘going beyond’ the literacy benchmarks to teach literacy in ways that make it culturally and sociocritically meaningful to students. Several other sources across the literature assert the value of teachers questioning, listening and observing before planning for learning activities (Arthurson & Cozmescu, 2007; Nicolson & Shipstead, 2002; Topfer, 2003). The **only solutions provided** for these dilemmas relate to teachers being given additional time, support and funding (Carney & Ruge, 1998; Gonzalez et al., 1993).

**Conclusion**

[A.2. as] The literature review has **revealed** that, although definitions of literacy continue to evolve, school curriculum and assessments **often seem** to be based on a **more traditional view**. The diverse range of literacies that children experience and learn out-of-school has been **richly documented** by many studies, several of which have **also examined** the home-school connection. However some of these studies have **focused** exclusively on children who come from lower SES backgrounds, or on a narrower definition than what literacy is thought to involve in the current day. Multiple sources have **asserted** that children’s school literacy will benefit when **more** is found out about their existing home/community literacies. An argument has **thus been developed** throughout about the importance of children having smooth transitions between their home and school literacies. However, the review of the literature has **highlighted an apparent lack of** studies which document a **very wide range** of literacy practices and experiences, at a time when the social purpose of literacy and evolving technologies are extremely influential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3: Closing</th>
<th>- Stage 3B. Occupying the niche</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>knowledge claims to establish a theoretical position or theoretical framework</strong> -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Knobel (2001) adds that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- due to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gonzalez et al. (1993) <strong>similarly state</strong> that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- As mentioned briefly earlier,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- can lead to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Knobel (2001, p.412) stresses other sources across the literature assert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- were also frequently mentioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the many strains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- beyond the literacy benchmarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Several other sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The <strong>only solutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
factors in wider society. Additionally, although studies have been conducted on the effect of discontinuities between home and school, there appears to be a dearth of research about children who experience continuity between their home and school literacy practices. This study was thus designed to ascertain whether there was a need to bridge the gap between the home and school literacies of two students, who had similar socio-cultural backgrounds, but differing rates of school literacy acquisition. The following chapter will describe how the theory and research examined in this review shaped the design of the current study.

| Stage 1: Opening Phase 1 Outlining the boundaries of the chapter |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Communicative Purpose</th>
<th>Stages/phases</th>
<th>Appraisal analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter Three: Methodology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[A.3.A] The aim of this research was to examine two students’ literacy experiences and practices at home and school, in order to (justify) capture the essence of their transitions between these contexts. Barton (2001, p.95) details (acknowledge) the contribution of such (focus) studies, as they: <em>demonstrate</em> the range of literacies in the community and the purposes to which it is put; they show that within a narrow area, such as home relations with school, a variety of literacy practices is drawn upon...By studying the everyday, such studies shift the topic of literacy beyond being solely relevant to learning and assessment. [A.3.B] This chapter will begin by outlining the theoretical underpinnings of the research design and the chosen approach and data sought. It will then (intens) <em>provide</em> detail on the sampling strategy, site and participants. The chapter will <em>explain</em> the data collection methods and data analysis procedures and the reasoning behind the choice of these. Finally (intens), issues of transferability and credibility are addressed. Creswell (1998) <em>explains</em> (acknowledge) that the inclusion of several subquestions <em>can assist</em> researchers in maintaining focus on a</td>
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study’s purpose. The following research questions and subquestions framed this study:

[A.3.C] **What is the nature of the transition between the home/community literacies and school literacies of two children, who have been identified as having differing levels of school literacy acquisition?**
- What are the children’s home/community literacies?
- What are the children’s school literacies?
- What are the similarities/continuities across these contexts?
- What are the differences/discontinuities across these contexts?
- What are the current home-school connections and lines of communication?

[A.3.D] **How might the students be further assisted with their school literacy learning?**
- How might the information obtained about students’ literacies be used to enhance their acquisition of school literacy?
- What does the literature (particularly professional advice for teachers) suggest about assisting students’ literacy transitions?

**Study Design**

[A.3.E] This research investigated the relationships between children’s home and school literacies, within a view of literacy as situated social practice. It was thus (affirm) assumed that texts are always produced and consumed for specific purposes and set within specific social and cultural contexts. Literacy was also (intens) considered to be an **inextricable combination of language and the technology** (+app) used to convey and interpret language. Figure 3.1 (below) has been adapted from various (quant) models (eg, Durrant & Green, 2000; Fairclough, 2001; Luke & Freebody, 1999), to depict this definition of literacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2: Justifying the design and methodology for the research Phase 1 Describing the theoretical underpinning [A.3.E], [A.3.F] and paradigm/belief behind the study [A.3.G]</th>
<th>- <strong>an inextricable combination of language and the technology</strong> (+app)</th>
<th>- It was thus (affirm) assumed (enter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Literacy was also (intens) considered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Figure 3.1 (below) has been adapted from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The research was not attempting to (entertain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- within a view of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- texts are always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- purposes and set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- within specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- social and cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- contexts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- various (quant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- detailed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- descriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- in-depth analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is often (intens) chosen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The research was not attempting to (entertain) provide generalisable answers, but (counter) to provide detailed descriptions of two children’s literacies. It was decided that the study would be situated within the Constructivist paradigm and seek qualitative data. A case study approach was chosen, to allow in-depth analysis of the students’ experiences (Stake, 1995) (acknowledge). Although (counter) a qualitative case study approach is often (soften) chosen for research within the Constructivist paradigm (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Mertens, 2005), both approaches can be utilised in other paradigms (George & Bennett, 2005; Yin, 2003). Case studies can also (intens) make use of quantitative data (May, 2001; Patton, 2002). The shaded square in Figure 3.2 (below) depicts the location of this research design.

**Figure 3.1 Visual Representation of the Study’s Definition of Literacy**

[A.3.F] The research *was not attempting to* (entertain) provide generalisable answers, *but (counter)* to provide *detailed* descriptions of two children’s literacies. It was decided that the study would be situated within the Constructivist paradigm and seek qualitative data. A case study approach was chosen, to allow *in-depth* analysis of the students’ experiences (*Stake, 1995*) (acknowledge). *Although (counter)* a qualitative case study approach is *often (soften)* chosen for research within the Constructivist paradigm (*Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Mertens, 2005*), *both approaches can be utilised in other paradigms* (*George & Bennett, 2005; Yin, 2003*). Case studies can *also (intens)* make use of quantitative data (*May, 2001; Patton, 2002*). The shaded square in Figure 3.2 (below) depicts the location of this research design.

**Figure 3.2 Location of the Study Design**

| App:1+ | - . but (counter) to provide | - both approaches |
| Aff:1 Ent:2 Intens:1 Ack:1 Coun:2 | - *Although* (counter) | - Case studies can also (intens) |
| - | - as it is believed that human knowledge cannot be removed | - Constructivists also (intens) have a natural aspect of such research |
| - | - that various data was consistent with | - |
viewed as a natural aspect of such research, as it is believed that human knowledge cannot be removed from its social context (Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh, 1990; Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Wiersma, 2000) (acknowledge). The ontological (nature of reality) and epistemological (nature of knowledge) beliefs of researchers subsequently determine their methodological choices (the methods employed) (Mertens, 2005) (acknowledge). The main traits of Constructivist methodology are that procedures will be emergent and inductive (Creswell, 1998) (acknowledge) and that various data collection methods will be utilised (Guba & Lincoln, 1994) (acknowledge). This study was consistent with Constructivist beliefs as it actively (intens) sought multiple perspectives (constructions of reality) about a complex, multi-faceted (+app) issue, through the collection of a wide (quant) range of qualitative data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Qualitative Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| [A.3.H] Qualitative research is ultimately (intens) descriptive and is used to depict everyday events and behaviours within their natural setting. A qualitative approach is used when participants' perspectives are sought, whilst acknowledging the effects of their physical and social context (Creswell, 1998; Freebody, 2003; Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995; Richards, 2005; Wiersma, 2000) (acknow). This can be achieved through observing behaviour as (justify) it would naturally (soften) occur, interviewing participants, and collecting relevant artefacts (Burns, 2000; Patton, 2002) (acknow). Studies like the present one, which investigate children’s literacy by utilising these data collection methods, therefore (concede) provide detailed accounts of their everyday experiences (eg, Heath, 1983) (acknow). [A.3.I] There are both positive and negative factors involved with conducting qualitative research into home/community literacies. A significant (intens) advantage is the broad view that can be taken of the observed literacy experiences and practices, whilst (counter) a disadvantage is that a small sample is usually depicted (van Steensel, 2006) (acknow). This study was no exception to these factors and so, although (counter) it focused on the experiences of only (sharpen) two participants, it

Stage 3 justifying for the research methodology
Phase 1 Detailing the approaches
[A.3.H], … [A.3.L]

| App:1+ |
| Ack:6 |
| Just: 1 |
| Dny:1 |

- a detailed (+app) view
- profound view
- a detailed account
- The main (intens) disadvantage
- lacking breadth, making it difficult to
- an emergent and flexible quality.
- the complex and dynamic (+app) human issues
- whilst acknowledging
- ack:1111
- as (justify)
- , therefore (concede) provide
- whilst (counter) a
- This study was no exception to
- so, although (counter) it focused on
- The study thus (concede) aimed to
- is ultimately (intens)
- it would naturally (soften)
- Studies like the present one,
- detailed accounts of
- There are both
- A significant (intens) advantage
- the broad view
- a small sample usually
- of only (sharpen) two participants,
- it aimed to do so thoroughly (intens)
aimed to do so thoroughly (intens) (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004; Stake, 1995) (acknow). The study thus (concede) aimed to collect multiple (quant) sources of data in an attempt to depict naturally (sharpen) occurring events and perspectives in detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.3.J] Case studies are the preferred approach when the natural context is considered an important part of the phenomenon being studied (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003) (acknow). The case itself can be defined as an entity that is bounded by time, people, events, space or context (Huberman and Miles, 1994; Stake, 1995) (acknow). Qualitative case studies are chosen when investigating specific (sharpen), complex (+app) relationships, such as examining a person or social unit in depth (Ary et al., 1990; Burns, 2000; Hitchcock &amp; Hughes, 1995; Stake, 2000) (acknow). Case studies of people offer a detailed (+app) view of their experiences within a real-life context, allowing for the portrayal of multiple realities (Cohen, Manion &amp; Morrison, 2000; Lincoln &amp; Guba, 1985) (acknow). A case study approach was chosen for the present study to enable a profound view to be depicted (Barton, 2001). The cases are two Year 2 students’ literacy experiences and practices, across their home and school contexts, over a two month period. In NSW, Year 2 is the third year of formal schooling, usually undertaken when children are approximately seven years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff: Jug: -1 App: +5/-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a detailed (+app) view of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a profound view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a detailed account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The main (intens) disadvantage of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- making it difficult to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- an emergent and flexible quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the complex and dynamic (+app) human issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The case itself can be defined as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are chosen when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to enable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as (justify) they require</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- However, although</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (counter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- perhaps (enter) leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- George and Bennett (2005) assert (acknow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- if they are not focused and clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The authors suggest (acknow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- an important part of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- specific (sharpen), complex (+app) relationships,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- such as examining a person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- in depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- within a real-life context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- multiple realities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- usually undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There are various (quant) names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ultimately (intens) descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They are also (intens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a small number of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are unlikely (soft) to contribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- only one researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
broadly, making it **difficult** to generalise (transfer) the findings (Ary *et al.*, 1990) (acknow). However, although (counter) case studies are not transferable to wider populations, they will add to current theory and are likely to be applicable to some other cases (Burns, 2000; Yin, 2003) (acknow); perhaps (enter) leading to further research being undertaken. George and Bennett (2005) assert (acknow) that case studies are unlikely (soft) to contribute to theory if they are **not** focused and clear. The authors suggest (acknow) this can be overcome when only one researcher designs and conducts each of the studies, as occurred in this research.

[A.3.L] One of (quant) the main (intens) advantages of case studies is that they have an **emergent and flexible** quality. This is sometimes (soft) called the “funnel approach” (Wiersma, 2000) (acknow) and allows the study design to be modified, based on the collected data (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003) (acknow). This is necessary in qualitative case studies, as (justify) researchers **need to** (enter) be open to the **complex and dynamic** (+app) human issues which they study (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995) (acknow). Another advantage of case studies is that they allow (enter) readers to feel as if (soft) they were present during data collection (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002) (acknow). This is achieved through rich descriptions built from multiple (quant) sources of evidence (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003) (acknow).

### Locus of the Study

[A.3.M] In this research, both the site and participants were initially unknown to the researcher. Although (counter) there are benefits of conducting research at a known site, **such as** the ease of access and prior knowledge of setting and participants (Lofland & Lofland, 1984) (acknow), Creswell (1998) advises (acknow) against doing this. This study made use of a convenience sample, **as** the school and participants were selected *due to* their willingness to be involved (Charles & Merler, 2002; Freebody, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) (acknow). Although (counter) not ideal, this is the **most commonly used** (+app) sampling strategy (Mertens, 2005) (acknow) and was necessary *due to* (justify) the short time period available for data collection. Stake (1995, p.4) asserts (acknow) that convenience sampling is suitable for case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2 Detailing the locus of the study [A.3.M], ... [A.3.V]</strong></td>
<td><strong>the most commonly used (+app) sampling strategy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Although (counter) there</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>both the site and participants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>rich information relevant to this specific study</strong></td>
<td><strong>Creswell (1998) advises (acknow) against doing</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>such as the ease of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>difficulties with acquiring school literacy (- Judg:cap)</strong></td>
<td><strong>as (justify) the school and</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>was also (intens) utilized</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aff: -1/+2</th>
<th>App: +6/-2</th>
<th>Deny: 3</th>
<th>Enter: 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justify: 6</td>
<td>Ack: 17</td>
<td>Counter: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intens:** 9  
**Quant:** 7  
**Focus 1**  
**Soft1**
studies, as: ‘we need to pick cases which are easy to get to and hospitable to our inquiry…many of us case-workers feel that good instrumental case study does not depend on being able to defend [its] typicality’. Purposeful sampling was also (intens) utilised to an extent, as (justify) the school and participants needed to provide rich information relevant to this specific study (Ary et al., 1990; Hoepfl, 1997; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002) (acknow). The sampling strategy is depicted in Figure 3.3 (below). The two students chosen for the case studies were selected on the following criteria:
- They lived within the Greater Wollongong area (for manageability reasons);
- They were aged 6-8, and in Stage 1 of formal schooling;
- They were willing to participate in all aspects of the research;
- One seemed to have (enter) difficulties with acquiring school literacy (-Judg:cap), and the other did not;
- They did not have conditions which may affect their literacy learning (eg, dyslexia);
- They were from similar socioeconomic backgrounds and families who spoke English as their first language.

**Figure 3.3 Sampling Strategy and Method of Entering the Field**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites for Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.3.N] The research took place in the two settings that each student inhabited regularly and consistently (intens), which Burns (2000) describes (acknow) as desirable sites. Local public primary schools were approached about being the research site in the second school term. A pseudonym was given to the school that accepted the invitation to participate, so as to maintain confidentiality (Hitchcock &amp; Hughes, 1995; Mertens, 2005) (acknow). A brief overview of the sites for research follows, with more detail being provided in the findings chapter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- learning difficulties (-judg: cap) |
- literacy difficulties (-judg: cap) |
- all of these things (+app). |
| | Burns (2000) describes (acknow) |
| | According to (acknow) the school-produced documents |
| | Burns (2000) describes (acknow) |
| | According to (acknow) the school-produced documents |
| | - although (counter) not ideal, |
| | - due to (justify) the short time period |
| | - Stake (1995, p.4) asserts (acknow) that as the school and participants needed to provide seemed to have (enter) |
| | - They did not have conditions which may affect |
| | - Deny:4 Enter:3 Justify:4 Ack:6 Counter:1 |

| Judg:|-1 |
| App:+1 |
| Quant:2 |
| Intens:2 |
| Focus:1 |
Wabel Park Primary School (WPPS) and Local Community

WPPS is located in the Illawarra region, NSW, within a mid-
high SES area. According to (acknow) the Australian Bureau of
Statistics 2006 Census, there were just over 10,000 persons residing in
the suburb in which the school is situated. The majority (quant) of the
local residents were born in Australia and speak only (intens) English,
with approximately (soft) 14% aged between 5 and 14. There were
quite (soft) a range of occupations held by local residents at the time of
the 2006 Census, with just (sharp) under one quarter classifying
themselves as professionals. WPPS was established in 1964. According
to (acknow) school-produced documents, the school aims to integrate
the following: formal curriculum; school-home-community links; and
school environment, ethos and organisation. The latter two of these
aims have been achieved through some parents assisting with
landscaping the school grounds, and the former involves a focus on
literacy and numeracy (NSW Public Schools, 2007).

Classroom

The Year 2 class participating (2D) had 23 students at the time
of the research. Of these: all (quant) were identified as being of Anglo-
Celtic or European descent; several had identified or suspected (enter)
learning difficulties (-;jud: cap) (eg, receptive language disorders);
none had major behavioural issues; and the teacher considered several
(quant) as having literacy difficulties (-;jud: cap). It is stated in the
school’s Parent Information Book (2008, p.1) (acknow) that learning
environments are aimed to be ‘safe, attractive, tolerant and supportive’.
2D’s classroom appeared to (enter) be all of these things (+;app). The
classroom was in a block of two, built two years ago.

Participants’ Home Settings

Both of the case study students lived in close proximity to the
school, with one easily within walking distance. Home visits enabled
the researcher to ascertain continuities and discontinuities between their
literacy experiences in these contexts and school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After the teacher had consented to participate, she suggested four children whom she considered as having differing levels of</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>as having differing levels of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>she suggested four children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on only two,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to all participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quant: 5
Intens:7
school literacy acquisition - based on daily observations, work samples and assessments - and whose parents she thought would be willing to participate. Although four students were initially observed, the case studies were completed on only two, for manageability reasons. Pseudonyms were given to all participants to maintain confidentiality (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995; Mertens, 2005) (acknow), although (counter) it was acknowledged that participants could probably (enter) identify themselves or other participants, due to (justify) the small sample (Lofland & Lofland, 1984) (acknow). More detailed information is provided about the participants in the findings chapter.

Mrs Davies

[A.3.S] Mrs Davies is an experienced (+judg:cap) teacher and has worked at WPPS for more than a decade. She stressed (distance) that literacy was the main (intens) part of her curriculum, arguing (acknow!) that literacy in the early years forms a base for all learning. Mrs Davies’ English programme seems to (enter) have been directly influenced by school policies. It focuses mainly (intens) on organisational matters, with an emphasis placed on writing development and levelled reading groups.

Jade

[A.3.T] Jade was seven years old at the time of research and in her third year of schooling. She was hard-working (+Judg:cap) at school, although (counter) quite regularly (quant) got distracted (-Jud:cap). Jade had been identified by Mrs Davies and previous teachers (acknow) as a student who was having difficulties with acquiring school literacies (-judg:cap). She was receiving additional support with reading for half an hour per week at the time of data collection.

Neil

[A.3.U] Neil was eight years old at the time of research and also (intens) in his third year of schooling. He was very (intens) hard-working (+judg:cap) in class, spending the majority of his time on-task (+judg:cap). Neil was identified by Mrs Davies (acknow) as a student with a high level of school literacy acquisition (+judg:cap).
Ethical Procedures

[A.3.V] Ethics is a fundamental element (+app) of this type of research, as (justify) the wellbeing of participants is central to the inquiry and the researchers are guests in their lives (Christians, 2000; Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Stake, 2000) (acknow). An ethics application was submitted to the Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of Wollongong on the 4\textsuperscript{th} of February and received approval on the 3\textsuperscript{rd} of April 2008. The application was forwarded to the regional office of the Department of Education and Training (DET), where it was given approval on the 13\textsuperscript{th} of May 2008. Although (counter) disappointing (-affect) that fieldwork was delayed for so (intens) long, it was acknowledged that ‘[e]thical problems, questions and dilemmas are an integral part of the research experience’ (Lofland & Lofland, 1984, p.18) (acknow). The main (intens) consideration for this study was that the identities and information gathered about participants and the site needed to be kept confidential (Christians, 2000) (acknow). In addition to the use of pseudonyms, very (intens) few details from the children’s lives were sought that would make them identifiable (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995) (acknow). Although (counter) it is important (+app) not to deceive participants about the nature of research (Guba & Lincoln, 1994) (acknow), students were not told they were selected due to (justify) the teacher’s opinions on their literacy acquisition. This was to avoid distress to the child identified as experiencing difficulties and to limit the chance of the “Hawthorne Effect”; where behaviour is affected by feeling special (Mertens, 2005, p.125). Adult participants were fully (intens) informed of the aims and...
procedures, as active consent is preferable to implied consent (Stake, 1995) (acknow).

[A.3.V] There was no tangible (intens) reward offered for participating, but (counter) participants were informed that having access to the findings could (enter) directly benefit students’ literacy learning.

Observations were undertaken without preconceptions or assumptions, particularly (focus) during home/community visits, in order to respect participants’ beliefs and customs (Lofland & Lofland, 1984) (acknowledge). Care was taken to phrase interview questions in a non-judgmental (+app) way and participants did not have to (enter) disclose information of a highly (intens) personal or sensitive nature (Creswell, 1998; Lankshear & Knobel, 2004; Merriam, 1998) (acknow). Effort was also (intens) made not to intrude unnecessarily (+affect) on participants’ time and space, with arrangements always made around their schedules (Stake, 2000) (acknow). It is important (+app) that data are stored securely (Christians, 2000) (acknow).

Data Collection Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
<th>Stage 3 Managing the data</th>
<th>Stage 1Rationalizing the data collection method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entering the Field</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 3 Managing the data</td>
<td>can be (enter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 1Rationalizing the</td>
<td>difficult (-affect),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>data collection method</td>
<td>necessary rapport (+app) takes time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a competent learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As (justify) the purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as (justify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mistakes can be made (enter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bogdan and Biklen(2003) recommend (acknow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation and Justification of Methods</td>
<td>- a clear (intens) explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intens:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a clear (intens) explanation

- as (justify) the purpose

- sufficient (intens) information

- The core (intens) data

[A.3.X] As (justify) the purpose of the case studies was descriptive, the methodology was designed to ensure that sufficient (intens) information was obtained about the students’ literacies. The core

- an emergent and flexible (+app) approach

- as (justify) the purpose

- sufficient (intens) information

- The core (intens) data
Data were obtained by interviewing all (+quant) participants to gain their individual perspectives. A substantial (ints) part of the supporting data was obtained through observing and documenting relevant information (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998) (acknow). Literature on research methodology and previous research studies were used to ensure that the observation and interview guides were suitable and that adequate information was being sought (eg, Barton, 2001; Freebody et al., 1995; Gonzalez et al., 1993; Heath, 1983; Lankshear & Knobel, 2004) (acknow). The third type of data comprised artefacts, produced by the school, teacher and children. The research utilised an emergent and flexible (+app) approach, where initial data provided focus for subsequent data collection (Adler & Adler, 1994; Lankshear & Knobel, 2004; Richards, 2005; Wiersma, 2000) (acknow). Figure 3.4 (below) depicts the types of data which were sought.

**Figure 3.4 Data Collection Methods**

- **Interviews**
  - A useful (+app) tool to explore participants' thoughts and feelings about specific topics (eg, Marsh & Thompson, 2001) (acknow), and they allow respondents to
  
  - always have an
  - Interviews also (ints) provide
provide relevant information in their own words (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004; Richards, 2005) (acknow). Qualitative researchers conduct interviews with “key informants” (+judg:??) who have otherwise unobtainable information to assist in answering the research questions (Gall et al., 1996; Lofland & Lofland, 1984; Patton, 2002) (acknow). As (justify) words always have an element of ambiguity (-app), interviewing is a process of people reaching mutual understandings (+app) (Fontana & Frey, 2000) (acknow). The obtained information is thus (concede) not considered (enter) to be “fact”, but (counter) the interviewees’ ways of viewing the world (+judg:cap) (Silverman, 2000) (acknow). This is why Stake (1995, p.64) asserts (acknow) that the interview ‘is the main road to multiple realities’. Interviews also (intens) provide an opportunity to triangulate other data, by comparing what participants actually “did” with what they “said they did” (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004; Silverman, 2000) (acknow). As (justify) interviews are susceptible to bias, they need to be (enter) piloted (Gall et al., 1996; Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995) (acknow). In this study, the teacher and parent interviews were both piloted, and minor adjustments were made in regards to repetitive and unclear questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[A.3.Z] This study made use of semi-structured interview guides (see Appendix A). These allowed the interviewer to extend on participants’ answers, whilst (counter???) maintaining the focus of the interview (Lankshear &amp; Knobel, 2004; May, 2001) (acknow). Open-ended questions were chosen, to put interviewees at ease, whilst seeking their opinions on reasonably complex (-app) issues (Ary et al., 1990; Wiersma, 2000; Yin, 2003) (acknow). These were as “value-neutral” (+app) as possible and focused on a single idea, with frames of reference provided when necessary, to clarify meaning (Freebody, 2003; Patton, 2002) (acknow). The interviews were conducted fairly (soften) informally and varied (+app) in length and language used, depending on what was appropriate for each interviewee (Burns, 2000) (acknow). Confidentiality was assured before each interview (Fontana &amp; Frey, 2000; Lofland &amp; Lofland, 1984) (acknow).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- “key informants” (+judg:??)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- an element of ambiguity (-app),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a process of people reaching mutual understandings (+app)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the interviewees’ ways of viewing the world (+judg:cap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- As (justify) words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- information is thus (concede)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- not considered (enter) to be “fact”,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- but (counter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stake (1995, p.64) asserts (acknow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- As (justify) interviews are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- they need to be (enter) piloted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- whilst (counter???) maintaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- fairly (soften)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- quant:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- intens:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- soft:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations

Although (counter) highly subjective (-app), observations often form a substantial (intens) part of the data for qualitative studies, as (justify) they provide detailed accounts of what occurs within a specific (sharp) context at a particular time (Adler & Adler, 1994; Merriam, 1998) (acknow). Observations in this study took multiple (quant) forms, which are depicted in Table 3.1 (below). These were suggested across the literature on methodology (Angrosino & Mays de Perez, 2000; Lankshear & Knobel, 2004; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Nicolson & Shipstead, 2002) (acknow). As Constructivist and qualitative researchers believe (acknow) people’s behaviour is affected by the surrounding physical and social context, these were described in sufficient detail (Gall et al., 1996; Patton, 2002; Stake, 1995) (acknow). This allowed the similarities and differences between various (quant) contexts to be ascertained (Knobel, 2001) (acknow). Fieldnotes taken for running records and notations were detailed and as factually recorded as possible (Ary et al., 1990; Hoepfl, 1997; Stake, 1995) (acknow). Some of (quant) the events and behaviours to be observed were defined before data collection began (see Appendices B & C).

Thirteen observations occurred at school, between 23rd June and 21st August. Parents nominated two occasions, during the same time period, when visits were made to their homes.

Table 3.1 Observation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 2008</th>
<th>July 2008</th>
<th>August 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mapping classroom context</td>
<td>Mapping home contexts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running Records</td>
<td>Answering Classroom</td>
<td>Answering Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notations and Anecdotal</td>
<td>Notations and Anecdotal</td>
<td>Focused Notations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tally Event Samples (of on- and off-task behaviours)</td>
<td>Tally Event Samples (of on- and off-task behaviours)</td>
<td>Tally Event Samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Samples</td>
<td>Work Samples</td>
<td>Work Samples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Artefacts and Texts

- Artefacts can (enter) refer to
- as well as to texts.
- as well as being
Artefacts can (enter) refer to general paraphernalia and resources, as well as to texts. They can (enter) provide personal perspectives on an issue, as well as being rich sources of information about organisations and programs (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002; Yin, 2003) (acknow). In this study, literacy-related artefacts were viewed and documented in each setting (eg, textbooks, signs, computer games). In addition to this a range of texts were collected, including those produced by the teacher, school and students. Freebody’s (2003, p.174) broad definition of a text includes (acknow):

- maps, diagrams, photographs, posters, magazines, school textbooks, literary works, notes, students’ exercises and assignments, signs, report cards, vision statements, class notes, institutional regulations, websites, public signs, teachers’ lesson preparation plans, letters between schools and homes, and all the rest.

Many of the above were documented or collected during the data collection period, which provided information about the home-school connection and added to the thick description of students’ literacies. Both State (NSW) and school policies and curriculum materials - which can be considered as both artefact and text - were additionally (intens) viewed, to provide information about the literacy expectations affecting students’ experiences.

**Role of the Researcher**

In qualitative studies, the researcher is the main (intens) instrument of data collection (Creswell, 1998; Lankshear & Knobel, 2004) (acknow). To ensure fieldnotes were as accurate as possible (enter), whilst allowing for a small (unavoidable) (-quant) degree of human error, they were synthesised soon after each observation (Lofland & Lofland, 1984; Silverman, 2000; Wiersma, 2000) (acknow) (see Appendix D). During observations, the researcher’s main (intens) objective was to gain information from a peripheral (-intens) standpoint, whilst participants were aware of their activities; thus (concede) being overt but unobtrusive (Adler & Adler, 1994; Angrosino & Mays de Perez, 2000; Stake, 1995) (acknow). Case studies require (enter) researchers to become personally (intens) involved in data...
collection and evoke empathy to an extent, as they are attempting to describe events and situations from participants’ point of view (Merriam, 1998) (acknow). However (counter), Patton (2002, p.331) asserts (acknow) that it is essential (+app) to ‘be clear about…the tension between insider (emic) and outsider (etic) perspectives’. During this research the effect that observations had on the researcher’s thoughts and feelings, as well as any presumptions or biases that were held, were documented and described in a journal (Gall et al., 1996) (acknow) (see Appendix E).

**Working with Young Children**

There were certain (intens) considerations involved in working with young children. Firstly (intens), it was necessary to build a good (+app) rapport with students, to ensure they felt comfortable with the researcher being present. Research thus (concede) began at the school, with initial observations being made of the site itself. In the classroom, the researcher was friendly and interested (+judg), without (counter) interfering with students’ learning (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Creswell, 1998; Stake, 2000) (acknow). Throughout data collection, observations and interviews were informal and the increasing focus on (and proximity to) the students occurred gradually, with work samples being collected first and observations being conducted from a distance. It was important (+affect) for all interactions to be in child-appropriate language, whilst allowing students to display their competencies and knowledge. The semi-structured nature of the interviews made it possible to follow the children’s lead and give them a sense of control and agency over the information they gave me.

**Sequence of Data Collection Procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2 Explaining the data collection procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- to build a good (+app) rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- was friendly and interested (+judg),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- and interviews were informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It was important (+affect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff: +1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judg:+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App:+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- it was necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Research thus (concede) began</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- without (counter) interfering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- whilst allowing students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- made it possible to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ack:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Patton (2002, p.331) asserts (acknow)
- enter:
- concede:
- as well as any
- Intens: 2
- Quant: 2

- a peripheral (-intens) standpoint.
- become personally (intens) involved
- for all interactions

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>- -</th>
<th>- -</th>
<th>- -</th>
<th>- -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>App:1</td>
<td>Enter:2</td>
<td>Ack:5</td>
<td>Concede:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concede:1</td>
<td>Ack:1</td>
<td>Counter:2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Patton (2002, p.331) asserts (acknow)</td>
<td>Enter:2</td>
<td>Ack:5</td>
<td>Concede:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- enter:</td>
<td>- concede:</td>
<td>- as well as any</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intens: 2</td>
<td>- Quant: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- certain (intens) considerations
- Firstly (intens),
- for all interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intens: 2</th>
<th>Quant: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Patton (2002, p.331) asserts (acknow)</td>
<td>Enter:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- enter:</td>
<td>- concede:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intens: 2</td>
<td>- Quant: 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A pilot study is necessary (+app) to discover the limitations of instruments and procedures (Burns, 2000) (acknow). As (justify) Yin (2003) states (acknow) is common practice, the site and participants for the pilot testing of observations and interviews were selected due to (justify) their accessibility. The pilot study occurred over three weeks, allowing both personal skills and instruments to be refined before data collection began (Hoepfl, 1997) (acknow). This resulted in interview questions being amended to: benefit interviewees’ understanding; elicit more information; and eliminate repetition (see Appendices F & G). The tally instrument was adapted, by removing unclear indicators of on-task and off-task behaviours and adding a timed element (see Appendix H). This enabled the researcher to use it more (intens) efficiently (+app).
### Phase One: Entering the field

[A.3.AF] This stage has been briefly (intens) described and is depicted in Figure 3.3 above. As (justify) it was more (intens) difficult (-app) to obtain the interest and consent of a school than expected, due to (justify) other commitments and priorities, this phase took just over a month. Initial observations were shorter and undertaken as sensitively as possible, as (justify) Stake (1995) and Merriam (1998) suggest (acknow) researchers enter the field in a passive and gradual manner.

- brief (intens) described
- due to (justify)
- as sensitively as possible
- as (justify)
- suggest (acknow)

### Phase Two: Descriptive observations and artefact collection

[A.3.AG] To avoid recording inaccurate representations of participants’ behaviour, the purpose of initial classroom observations was to become orientated with the context (Patton, 2002) (acknow). Maps were drawn of the setting, lists were compiled of the available literacy resources and texts, and relevant documents and records were viewed. As depicted in Figure 3.3 (above), parents were given an opportunity to meet or speak with the researcher. One parent chose not to contact the researcher at this stage and so the first home visits were arranged with the three other parents. This phase lasted two weeks.

- chose not to contact
- and so the first

### Phase Three: Focused observations and first interviews

[A.3.AH] Home visits constituted the first part of this phase and, as participants were very forthcoming with relevant information, three parent interviews and one student interview were conducted. Observations of literacy lessons continued after the school holidays, becoming more focused and selective as time went on (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004) (acknow). Special (intens) care was taken at this stage not to breach issues of confidentiality, which had become more (intens) complex (-app), due to (justify) the rapport built and the close interactions necessary (Guba & Lincoln, 1994) (acknow). This phase lasted approximately three and a half weeks and resulted in two children being selected to be the focus for the case studies.

- and, as participants were
- not to breach
- due to (justify)

Intens: 4

Deny: 1
Justify: 2
Ack: 2
Concede: 1
**Phase Four:** Specific focused observations and interviews

This final phase lasted three weeks and involved **specific (sharp)** data being collected about areas which were lacking information for credibility. More (intens) artefacts were obtained and school observations became **more refined**, informed by the emerging themes. A second visit was made to both students’ homes and the other student interview was conducted. The teacher interview also (intens) occurred during this time. By the end of this phase, **little new (soften)** information was being obtained from school observations and enough consistent information had been collected for findings to be considered “trustworthy” (Adler & Adler, 1994; Lankshear & Knobel, 2004; Lincoln and Guba, 1985) (acknow). It would have been (enter) useful (+app) to conduct another observation in the students’ homes but (counter), due to (justify) time limitations and not wanting to overstretch participants’ generosity, this was not pursued.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis in qualitative research involves making sense of the collected data by dissecting specific instances and reassembling them in a way that clarifies their meaning (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995) (acknow). It is a cyclic process, rather than linear, that initially occurs simultaneously with data collection (Creswell, 1998) (acknow). Patton (2002) defines (acknow) a case study as both a product of, and the process of, data analysis. In this study the initial, “informal”, analyses began with the first piece of collected data. All (quant) of the data were again scrutinized after data collection had ceased, during the subsequent “formal” analysis (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995) (acknow). The techniques used in this study are outlined in Figure 3.6 (below). Qualitative data analysis is often (soft) explained quite (soft) vaguely (-app) in the research methodology literature, but (counter) some authors suggest (acknow) useful steps to be undertaken (eg, Creswell, 1998; Huberman & Miles, 1994; Lofland & Lofland, 1984; Merriam, 1998). The following section is an amalgamation and adaptation of these suggestions.

| - | - | - useful (+app) to conduct | - It would have been (enter) but (counter), due to (justify) and not wanting to overstretch Deny:1 Enter:1 Justify:1 Ack:1 Counter:1 |
| Stage 3 Describing the data analysis techniques | - quite (soft) vaguely (-app) | - rather than linear Patton (2002) defines (acknow) often (soft) explained but (counter) some authors suggest (acknow) |
| - | App: +1 | Ack: 5 Counter: 2 |

Intens: 5
Quant: 1
Soft: 1
**Data Management**

[A.3.AK] The necessity (+app) of managing data needs to be (enter) considered throughout the research. In this study, this first involved writing or typing up observations and transcribing interviews, expanding upon shorthand and editing out less relevant information as appropriate (Huberman & Miles, 1994; Lofland & Lofland, 1984) (acknow). The “clean data” (+app) (Reid, 1992, cited in Merriam, 1998) (acknow) was then organised in a logical manner, for efficient retrieval (Richards, 2005) (acknow). This process occurred during fieldwork, resulting in a complete and manageable (+app) “case study database”, which is the midpoint in transforming a vast quantity of descriptive data into a narrative (Patton, 2002; Richardson, 2000; Yin, 2003) (acknow).

**Content Analysis**

[A.3.AL] Although (counter) originally a quantitative approach (Silverman, 2000) (acknow), content analysis can (enter) be used in qualitative research to “make sense” of data, by identifying central meanings and patterns, whilst allowing multiple realities to be identified (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002) (acknow). In this study, content analysis was used to analyse the collected artefacts (eg, school policies). These texts were scrutinized to ascertain “manifest” (surface) meanings, and occasionally also (soft) “latent” (potentially present) meanings (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004) (acknow). After units of analysis had been classified into themes, it was possible to establish the frequency that these occurred in each artefact (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995; Merriam, 1998; Ryan & Bernard, 2000) (acknow). As (justify) texts are directly related to sociocultural practices, all (+quant) artefacts were analysed in relation to their purpose and the motivation behind them being produced (Freebody, 2003; Gall et al., 1996) (acknow).
Informal Data Analyses

[3.3.AM] Qualitative researchers are required (enter) to record and interpret what they observe and hear, and then continually create, question and modify themes that become apparent from the data (Creswell, 1998; Hoepfl, 1997; Huberman & Miles, 1994; Mertens, 2005; Richards, 2005; Wiersma, 2000) (acknow). Analysis in this study thus involved both “direct interpretations” and “constant comparative coding”. The former is where intuitive and interpretive thoughts are documented, during (or immediately after) data collection (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Richardson, 2000) (acknow). The latter was originally developed by Glasser and Strauss (1967, cited in Gall et al., 1996) (acknow) and is usually (soft) associated with “grounded theory”, but (counter) used by many (+quant) qualitative researchers (Merriam, 1998) (acknow). In this study, individual pieces of data were reviewed, with comments made about possible themes in the margins and a summary being written for each (see Appendix I). By aggregating units of analysis into themes it was established how frequently these recurred (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004) (acknow).

[3.3.AN] It is not usually necessary (enter) to pre-determine themes in qualitative research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) (acknow), but (counter) case studies can require more preparation about information that may (enter) be obtained (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003) (acknow). In this study, several (count) possible (enter) themes were initially identified, which were explicitly linked to the research questions. These were flexible and were continually modified and related back to the data throughout the period of research (Huberman & Miles, 1994; Lankshear & Knobel, 2004) (acknow). The preliminary themes are set out in Table 3.2 (below). Relevant interpretations and themes were compared after each piece of data was analysed (Merriam, 1998) (acknow).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enter: 4</th>
<th>Ack: 9</th>
<th>Counter: 2</th>
<th>Concede: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it becomes clear (+app)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether</td>
<td>Thus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formal Data Analysis and Reporting the Findings

[3.3.AO] When themes have been identified within and across many pieces of data, it becomes clear (+app) whether enough data has been collected for a conceptual model to be assembled (Gall et al., 1996; Hoepfl, 1997) (acknow). In this study, this was determined by displaying the data visually, in a table under the recurring themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A detailed (intens) description of the site and case is actually (intens) part of the data analysis process (Creswell, 1998) (acknow). The obtained data were thus synthesised into rich (intens) descriptions of participants’ experiences by writing in-depth (intens) case studies (Hoepfl, 1997; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Wiersma, 2000) (acknow). It was not possible (enter) to report on all (quant) of the observed literacies, due to (justify) restrictions placed on findings. Thus (concede), it was only (intens) those considered most (intens) significant (+app) which were included, these being: reading; writing; and digital technologies and texts. The case studies were organised thematically and described settings, events and behaviours in detail (intens), allowing readers to understand the complexities of each case (Ary et al., 1990; Merriam, 1998; Richards, 2005; Richardson, 2000; Stake, 1995) (acknow). Several (quant) authors suggest (acknow) a balance between concrete, thick (intens) description and more (intens) abstract analysis, with slightly (soft) more (intens) of the former (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995; Lofland & Lofland, 1984; Merriam, 1998) (acknow). Throughout the report of the present study, the researcher also (intens) aimed to (enter) facilitate the portrayal of multiple (quant) perspectives (Guba & Lincoln, 1994) (acknow), which is consistent with Constructivist ontology and epistemology.

### Table 3.2 Themes Developed from Informal Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sub-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Available texts</td>
<td>1a. Print texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b. Digital technologies and texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1c. Environmental print</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Experiences
- 2a. Reading/viewing (consuming texts)
- 2b. Writing/drawing (producing texts)
- 2c. Using digital technologies and texts
- 2d. Talking and listening
- 2e. Gesture and facial expression
- 2f. Critical/analytical literacy

### 3. Practices
- 3a. Practices used (with different texts and in different settings)
- 3b. Practices valued (in different settings)

### 4. Knowledge of the other
- 4a. Teacher’s knowledge of homes
- 4b. Parents’ knowledge of school

### 5. Boundaries
- 5a. Time
- 5b. Content/activity
- 5c. Difficulty

### 6. Work and play – categorising literacy
- 6a. “Literacy” happens at school
- 6b. Voluntary experiences
- 6c. Required experiences

### 7. Confidence about literacy

### 8. Surrounding experiences
- 8a. Role models
- 8b. Generational/inherited literacy patterns

### 9. Enjoyment/engagement

### 10. Previous learning

### 11. Purposes for literacy
- 11a. Meaningful/integrated
- 11b. Segmented/out of context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3</th>
<th>Refined Themes Developed from Formal Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Sub-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Texts</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences and Practices</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value, Purpose and</td>
<td>Interactions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitions of literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ knowledge of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s knowledge of home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of past learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of other school learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issues of Authenticity and Trustworthiness

[A.3.AQ] Some (quant) Constructivist literature makes use of terms originally (intens) range of various (quant) sources (Cohen et al., 2000; Creswell, 1998) (acknow) used, as outlined below.

| Stage 4 Controlling the quality assurance of the study, by the use of several methods |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Explaining how readers can access the ‘validity’ and ‘reliability’ of the research. |
| - however (counter), |
| - or whether the reader |
| - Creswell (1998) suggests (acknow) |
| least two procedures should be (enter) used |

Enter: 2
Ack: 5
Counter: 1

[A.3.AR] The term “thick (intens) description” was coined by Geertz (1973, cited in Richards, 2005) (acknow) and refers to a detailed (+app) subjective description being built of a particular (sharp) case. This is achieved through collecting a wide (intens) range of data from various (quant) sources (Cohen et al., 2000; Creswell, 1998) (acknow) and using a narrative structure when reporting findings, with raw data included (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002). Stake (1995, p.86) (acknow) describes (acknow) this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thick Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- a detailed (+app) subjective description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- detailed (+app) information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Ack] This: |
| - “thick (intens) description” |
| - a particular (sharp) case. |
| - wide (intens) range of |
| - from various (quant) sources |
To assist the reader in making naturalistic generalisations, case researchers need to provide opportunity for vicarious experience. A narrative account…personalistic description, emphasis on time and place provide rich ingredients for vicarious experience.

[A.3.AS] The authenticity of this study was assisted by providing detailed (+app) information about the cases and the multiple (quant) methods of data collection and analysis (George & Bennett, 2005; Richards, 2005) (acknow). This thick (ints) description enables readers to make a reasonable judgement as to the transferability of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Stake, 1995) (acknow).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triangulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.3.AT] As case studies involve multiple (quant) types of data being collected, the accuracy of the findings relies on the obtained information being triangulated (Merriam, 1998; Mertens, 2005; Yin, 2003) (acknow). This occurred in the current study through using multiple (quant) sources of data and multiple (quant) methods of data collection (Ary et al., 1990; Burns, 2000; Lincoln &amp; Guba, 1985) (acknow). New information was validated by being linked to other data sources which had lead to similar (enter) findings, such as (sharp) observations being used to verify information gained from interviews (Gall et al., 1996; Stake, 1995; Wiersma, 2000) (acknow). Throughout the data analysis and reported findings, examples from different (ints) sources were used to back up themes, as the diagram below outlines (adapted from Yin, 2003):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Clarifying how the study approaches the multiple sources data by methods of data collection. |

App: +3
Ack: 6

Quant: 3
Sharp: 1

- As case studies
- which had lead to similar (enter) findings

Enter: 1
Justify: 1
Ack: 4

- the multiple (quant) methods of
- This thick (ints) description

- multiple (quant) types of
- multiple (quant) sources
- multiple (quant) methods of
- such as (sharp) observations
different (ints) sources

Intens: 1
Quant: 4
Sharp: 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Explain how each evidence is gathered from multiple sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The audit trail thus (concede) provided an overview of all of the data collected (Guba &amp; Lincoln, 1994) (acknow).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Enter: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Justify: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ack: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Concede: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

[A.3.AV] Overall (intens), this research was situated within the Constructivist paradigm and utilised a flexible (+app), qualitative approach, to provide a holistic (+app) view of two students’ literacies across their school and home settings. Descriptive, instrumental case studies were chosen to detail the individual complexities of each student’s experiences. To achieve the desired thick (intens) description of their literacies, multiple (quant) sources of data were collected, including interviews, observations and a range of artefacts. Analyses of these data occurred in an ongoing process throughout data collection and involved content analysis, direct interpretations and constant
comparative coding. The relevant units of analysis were displayed in tables under preliminary themes. Subsequent formal analysis required the identified themes to be reduced and compared and the resulting patterns were used to structure the reported findings. The authenticity of the research was addressed through triangulation of multiple sources of data and the development of thick description. The latter was achieved by providing ample information about the physical context, events and behaviours which were documented during the research. Relevant excerpts from observational data and artefacts, as well as quotes from interviews, help to portray all participants’ perspectives, as well as providing readers with vicarious experience. The next chapter will report the study’s findings.

Chapter Four: Findings

Introduction
[A.4.a] This chapter presents the research findings in the form of a detailed (intens) case study of each student’s experiences in transitioning between home and school literacies. A broad view of literacy underpinned the study and data were collected in relation to students’ reading, writing, talking, listening, gesture, use of digital texts, visual literacy and critical literacy. However (counter), due to (justify) restrictions on the scope of the thesis, the original broad perspective was narrowed to focus on reading, writing and the use of digital technologies and texts. Thus (concede), as with (justify) many (quant) qualitative studies, there is much (quant) collected data which have not been included (Lofland & Lofland, 1984; Yin, 2003) (acknow). To address the research questions, this chapter has been structured around the refined themes, which were developed through formal data analysis (available texts, experiences, practices, value, purpose, boundaries and connections). Information about the sub-themes (confidence, engagement and interactions) is integrated throughout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Communicative Purpose</th>
<th>Stages/Phases</th>
<th>Appraisal analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: Opening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ATTITUDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing how and why the details of the findings are presented and discussed as in the chapter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- a detailed case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: Opening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A broad view of literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Justifying the presentation of the findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- the original broad perspective was narrowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[A.4.[A.4.A], [A.4.[A.4.B].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- which have not (deny) been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To set the scene for the students’ case studies and to avoid repetition (justify),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Through (quant) this chapter,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Through (quant) this chapter,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- were all (quant) given</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Throughout (quant) this chapter,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[A.4.[A.4.B] To set the scene for the students’ case studies and to avoid repetition (justify), this chapter begins with an overview of school experiences that were applicable to both students. The school, teacher, students and parents were all (quant) given pseudonyms to protect their confidentiality. Throughout this chapter, excerpts from data are included to illustrate and support key findings. In relation to observational fieldnotes, artefacts and paraphrased information, it is either explained where these data excerpts are taken from, or a reference to the raw data (eg, D_1) is provided. In relation to quotes taken from interviews and retrospective comments, quotation marks are used to indicate something said by the participant being written about.

The School: Wabel Park Primary School (WPPS)  
[A.4.[A.4.C] As with much of the Illawarra region of New South Wales, Wabel Park is nestled between the mountains and the ocean, and the school’s environmental print reflects the beach culture of the local community. At the time of research, there were 324 students and 19 teaching staff at the school (S_1, 2). The school states (acknow) that it values strong (ints) relationships between parents, teachers and the community (L_1). Whole-school scope and sequences were developed for much (quant) of the Key Learning Area (KLA) of English and school policies outlined clear (ints) requirements in relation to teaching and learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2: Delineating the information applicable for the two cases</th>
<th>Describing briefly the sites.</th>
<th>App: +3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Teacher: Mrs Davies                                      | - it values strong relationships | Justify:3  
| [A.4.[A.4.D] Mrs Davies is an experienced primary school teacher (+judg:cap), with a career spanning thirty years (“between babies!”) (-intens). At the time of research she had been working at Wabel Park for 13 years. Mrs Davies is a caring, organised and conscientious teacher (+judg:cap), who likes planning and preparing. She described herself as “really late” when she arrived at school at 8.20am (+judg:cap) (D_4.18). Mrs Davies stated (acknow) that she does “lean toward literacy and I tend to put literacy before everything else…I do firmly believe that if children have literacy in place in the early years they can get the rest of it” (D_3.3). When asked how she would define literacy, Mrs Davies replied (acknow): | Counter:1  
| Ack:1  
| Quant: 6  
| Intens: 1 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Teacher: Mrs Davies</th>
<th>Describing the participants: the teacher: her personality, belief, and activities</th>
<th>App: +1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - an experienced primary school teacher (+judg:cap),        | - as “really late” when she arrived                                              | Justify:  
| a caring, organised and conscientious teacher (+judg:cap),  |                                                                                  |    1    |
| - From this perspective (affirm),                            |                                                                                  |    1    |
| - Mrs Davies replied (acknow):                               |                                                                                  |    1    |
| - Mrs Davies stated (acknow)                                 |                                                                                  |    1    |
| - She described herself                                      |                                                                                  |    1    |
| - (“between babies!”) (+intens).                             |                                                                                  |    1    |
| - it’s just (sharp) the basic,                               |                                                                                  |    1    |
| - such as (sharp) scope and                                  |                                                                                  |    1    |

Wabel Park is nestled between the mountains and the ocean. At the time of research, there were 324 students and 19 teaching staff at the school (S_1, 2). The school stated (acknow) that it values strong (ints) relationships between parents, teachers and the community (L_1). Whole-school scope and sequences were developed for much (quant) of the Key Learning Area (KLA) of English and school policies outlined clear (ints) requirements in relation to teaching and learning.

Mrs Davies is an experienced primary school teacher (+judg:cap), with a career spanning thirty years (“between babies!”) (-intens). At the time of research she had been working at Wabel Park for 13 years. Mrs Davies is a caring, organised and conscientious teacher (+judg:cap), who likes planning and preparing. She described herself as “really late” when she arrived at school at 8.20am (+judg:cap) (D_4.18). Mrs Davies stated (acknow) that she does “lean toward literacy and I tend to put literacy before everything else…I do firmly believe that if children have literacy in place in the early years they can get the rest of it” (D_3.3). When asked how she would define literacy, Mrs Davies replied (acknow):
I suppose (enter) it’s just (sharp) the basic, being able to read and understand what you’re reading. Uh, it’s getting meaning…gaining meaning from reading and writing. Being able to, um, write and being able to speak and communicate…written literacy and verbal literacy. I suppose the whole thing.

[A.4.[A.4.E] From this perspective (affirm), Mrs Davies’ English teaching covers her definition of literacy, although (counter) there is an absence (deny) of information about oracy in her programme. When first viewed, this programme contained information about homework, spelling, grammar and reading groups, with the majority of the content covering organisational matters, such as (sharp) scope and sequences, daily routines and the texts to be read. When Mrs Davies had updated the programme at the beginning of Term 3, it included an English overview, aims for students’ reading, aims and outcomes for students’ writing, and the foci for grammar in Terms 2 and 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Class: 2D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.4.[A.4.F] There were 24 students enrolled in 2D, one of whom was overseas during the research. All (quant) of the students came from families whose first language was English. Mrs Davies considered (acknow) there to be a range of rates of school literacy acquisition amongst the students, with most (intens) being of ‘average ability’ (D._19). Figure 4.1 (below) provides a map of the classroom context and Appendix L provides a narrative description, written from notations immediately after the first data collection session at the school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>at school at 8.20am (+judg:cap)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aff:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judg:+3/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- although (counter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- there is an absence (deny) of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Class: 2D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.4.[A.4.F] There were 24 students enrolled in 2D, one of whom was overseas during the research. All (quant) of the students came from families whose first language was English. Mrs Davies considered (acknow) there to be a range of rates of school literacy acquisition amongst the students, with most (intens) being of ‘average ability’ (D._19). Figure 4.1 (below) provides a map of the classroom context and Appendix L provides a narrative description, written from notations immediately after the first data collection session at the school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Describing the class: the population, the map (classroom arrangement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| - Mrs Davies considered (acknow) there |
| Ack: 1 |

| - All (quant) of the a range of (quant) rates of school literacy |
| - with most (intens) being of |

| Quant: 2 Intens: 1 |
Literacy at School

[A.4][A.4.G] Literacy learning occurs across the six main KLAs in NSW curriculum, with some integrated units addressing multiple (quant) KLAs. However (counter), this research is primarily (intens) concerned with the implementation of the English Syllabus (NSW Board of Studies, 1998), as this document addresses: reading, writing, talking and listening. The research was also (intens) interested in obtaining information about how digital texts were integrated into school learning.

Available Texts

[A.4][A.4.H] In Mrs Davies’ English programme she states (acknow) that her aims include ‘to provide a variety (quant) of Reading resources and experiences’, ‘to promote interest in a variety (quant) of genres’ and ‘to foster a love of reading’. At the time the research was being conducted (focus), there were 10 dictionaries and 15 atlases as permanent resources in the classroom, as well as 37 books about transport. The other available books were levelled readers and ‘class books’. Mrs Davies explained (acknow) that the latter were for children whom she considered (distance) to be ‘independent readers’ (above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 4.1</th>
<th>Context Map of 2D’s Classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literacy at School</td>
<td>Bordering the concerns of the research discussed in the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[A.4][A.4.G] Literacy learning occurs across the six main KLAs in NSW curriculum, with some integrated units addressing multiple (quant) KLAs. However (counter), this research is primarily (intens) concerned with the implementation of the English Syllabus (NSW Board of Studies, 1998), as this document addresses: reading, writing, talking and listening. The research was also (intens) interested in obtaining information about how digital texts were integrated into school learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Texts</td>
<td>Describing the literacy program: the aims of the program, the texts available, kinds and amount, intended users (readers), and the division of the children literacy levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[A.4][A.4.H] In Mrs Davies’ English programme she states (acknow) that her aims include ‘to provide a variety (quant) of Reading resources and experiences’, ‘to promote interest in a variety (quant) of genres’ and ‘to foster a love of reading’. At the time the research was being conducted (focus), there were 10 dictionaries and 15 atlases as permanent resources in the classroom, as well as 37 books about transport. The other available books were levelled readers and ‘class books’. Mrs Davies explained (acknow) that the latter were for children whom she considered (distance) to be ‘independent readers’ (above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Describing in detail the literacy practices at school</td>
<td>- However (counter), as this document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justify: 1 Counter: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- multiple (quant) KLAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- primarily (intens) concerned with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- was also (intens) interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- quant: 1 intens:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- a variety (quant) of Reading resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- a variety (quant) of genres’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- At the time the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- both literary and factual books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- such as print-texts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level 25. In addition to these texts, Mrs Davies and Mrs Taylor (the teacher-librarian) provided children with access to both literary and factual books through regular “modelled reading” (a strategy where an adult leads the shared reading of a text). There was no (deny) observed inclusion of other reading materials, such as print-texts from popular culture. In relation to writing lessons, Mrs Davies had compiled booklets for grammar, spelling and editing lessons by photocopying various (quant) parts of commercially-produced textbooks. In addition to these, students had a “Targeting Handwriting 2” textbook (Pinsker, 2004) (acknow), as well as several (quant) lined notebooks for handwriting, story-writing, and “publishing” (writing a neat version of a text).

[A.4][A.4.I] The school is quite (-Intens: quality) well resourced (+app) in regards to communications technologies and digital texts. There is a television and DVD player and six Mac computers in a small adjoining room. In addition to these, there are approximately (intens:qual) 25-30 flat-screened Mac computers in the technology laboratory. All (quant) computers are connected to the internet and have a variety of (quant) software programs installed. As well as housing a vast collection of books (+app), the school library has two personal computers (PCs). All (quant) three rooms had a variety of (quant) posters, signs, artworks and work samples displayed. These were chosen by the teachers, with many (quant) related to their (that is, the teachers’) interests (eg, soccer or environmental issues).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literacy Experiences and Activities</th>
<th>Judg:1+ cap App: +2</th>
<th>- There was no (deny)</th>
<th>- (Pinsker, 2004) (acknow),</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.4][A.4.J] 2D had a standard morning literacy block (+app), the content of which varied (quant) for each day of the week, but (counter) the routine of which the children seemed to (enter) know well (see Appendix M). Each morning block was observed, but (counter) most of (quant) the data collection occurred on Mondays and Thursdays. Mrs Davies explained (acknow) that literacy (reading) groups were the only (quant) group-work that took place in literacy lessons (D.3). The groupings were decided upon in relation to the students’ current rate of literacy acquisition (+judg:cap), as determined by Mrs Davies through describing the literacy experiences and practices of the class. Explaining the literacy practices at the class. Describing the activities the students do during.</td>
<td>- quite (-int:qual) well resourced (+app) - housing a vast collection of books (+app).</td>
<td>- is quite (-int:qual) - are approximately (int:qual) - All (quant) computers are - have a variety of (quant) - As well as (Intens) - All (quant) three - a variety of (quant) - with many (quant) related to</td>
<td>- but (counter) the children seemed to (enter) know well - but (counter) Mrs Davies explained (acknow) that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
running records (which occurred outside of the observed periods). These lessons involved activities based around a text, which was at, or just (intens) above, the average level of the group. Students were sometimes (quant) given opportunities to read books independently when they had finished other work and this was observed to occur once as a whole class activity. Various practices related to Luke and Freebody’s (1999) (acknow) framework were modelled during whole-class reading lessons, including: code-breaking (eg, giving synonyms for difficult words); text participant (eg, asking students questions about their prior knowledge); and text user (eg, using the contents page) (L_12). However (counter), these examples of learning “through” language (eg, skills being introduced as a secondary purpose for the activity) appeared (enter) much less frequent (intens) than lessons concerning learning “about” language (where these skills were the main focus).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.4,[A.4.K] Most (quant) English lessons focused on apprenticing students into knowledge about specific features of language through discrete lessons. Students completed spelling and homework activities individually, but (counter) grammar lessons (eg, learning about a word group) usually (intens) involved “modeled”, “guided” and “independent” teaching strategies. Students also (intens) regularly (intens) constructed pieces of writing, consistent with a certain genre or text type (eg, diary writing): one of which was published every two weeks (D_4.5, 4.7). Such (sharp) lessons mainly (intens) focused on children’s text encoding and text participant skills. Text user practices were included to an extent, as students had been taught about the appropriate language and structure to use for various (quant) text types, but (counter) text analyst practices were not apparent during the observed lessons (see Appendices B, M &amp; O).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.4,[A.4.L] Perhaps (enter) due to (justify) the school having a specialised technology teacher (Mrs White), Mrs Davies did not seem to (enter) place focus on communications technologies and digital texts. These were mentioned once (quant) in Mrs Davies’ English programme, in relation to publishing work (L_19). Other than being used for this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the practices that should have done, but did not occur in the practices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Perhaps (enter) due to (justify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mrs Davies did not seem to (enter)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.4,[A.4.K] Most (quant) English lessons focused on apprenticing students into knowledge about specific features of language through discrete lessons. Students completed spelling and homework activities individually, but (counter) grammar lessons (eg, learning about a word group) usually (intens) involved “modeled”, “guided” and “independent” teaching strategies. Students also (intens) regularly (intens) constructed pieces of writing, consistent with a certain genre or text type (eg, diary writing): one of which was published every two weeks (D_4.5, 4.7). Such (sharp) lessons mainly (intens) focused on children’s text encoding and text participant skills. Text user practices were included to an extent, as students had been taught about the appropriate language and structure to use for various (quant) text types, but (counter) text analyst practices were not apparent during the observed lessons (see Appendices B, M &amp; O).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailing what students do generally in most English lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- but (counter) grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- but (counter) text analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- were not (deny) apparent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.4,[A.4.L] Perhaps (enter) due to (justify) the school having a specialised technology teacher (Mrs White), Mrs Davies did not seem to (enter) place focus on communications technologies and digital texts. These were mentioned once (quant) in Mrs Davies’ English programme, in relation to publishing work (L_19). Other than being used for this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the practices that should have done, but did not occur in the practices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Perhaps (enter) due to (justify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mrs Davies did not seem to (enter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- determined by Mrs Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- However (counter), appeared (enter)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| App1+ |
| Judg+1 |
| Aff: |

| Ack:111 |
| Counter:111111 |
| Justify:11 |

| Deny: |
| Enter:111111 |

- Students were sometimes (quant) to occur once (quant) as a whole
- Various (quant) practices
- much less frequent (intens) intens: 7 quant: 17 sharp: 2

- Most (quant) English lessons
- usually (intens)
- also (intens)
- regularly (intens)
- one of which (intens)was
- every (quant)two
- Such (sharp) lessons
- mainly (intens) focused on
- for various (quant) text types
**Purpose (focus)**, they were seen to be used occasionally (-quant) for playing games during free-choice time. Students had a variety (quant) of opportunities to engage with computer technologies in library and technology lessons. Activities included: making and printing labels; creating a flashing advert in *Array*; accessing the internet; and using the library computer catalogue (L_9, 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect: +1/-1</th>
<th>Purpose, Value and Associated Boundaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>was strictly regulated (-app)</td>
<td>Describing the literacy practices in Mrs Davies’ programme: what are valued, practiced and expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Mrs Davies’ programme (acknow)</td>
<td>all of which (intens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should be treated (Enter)</td>
<td>were strongly (intens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as when she said (acknow),</td>
<td>There was also (intens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t expect</td>
<td>them all to produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This belief is evident (endorse)</td>
<td>It’s all very, very (intens) different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There appeared to (enter)</td>
<td>are always (intens) different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it was considered (enter)</td>
<td>strictly (intens) regulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mrs Davies regularly (quant)</td>
<td>be varying ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- She also (intens)</td>
<td>various other texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- For example (sharp),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to be used just (intens) once (quant),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mrs Davies regularly (quant) mentioned and made links to digital texts and popular culture, including “Shrek”, “Harry Potter” and “Indiana Jones” (D_4.25, 36; L_1). She also (intens) discussed what students had watched (on television) of the Olympics at the weekend and asked them to write about it in their diaries (L_15). However (counter), perhaps (enter) influenced by her own experience and professional development, Mrs Davies seemed to (enter) integrate new technologies and digital texts to a minimal extent. For example (sharp), the television was observed to be used just (intens) once (quant), when the class had “earned” an hour of free time and watched the second half of The Wizard of Oz (D_4.8).

In Mrs Davies’ interview when she said (acknow), “I don’t expect them all to produce the same work. It’s all very, very different….expectations are always different and it’s getting to know the kids and what they’re capable of” (D_3.12). This belief is evident (endorse) in her inclusion of levelled readers in the classroom. Their use was strictly regulated (-app) during an independent reading lesson, when students were directed to choose a book from their level and: “during quiet reading, you….stick…with…that… book” (D_4.37, 4.38). There appeared to...
Expectations.

Writing lessons, with her feedback related to what had been read (L_6, 7).

Mrs Davies values writing and had been read (L_6, 7). In contrast (counter), during the reading of a factual text, short sections of text were read to prompt long discussions, which were only sometimes (quant) directly related to what had been read (L_6, 7).

Mrs Davies' English program was valued, and the content of produced texts were adequately valued in one lesson but not in another. For example, spelling was practised daily, but Mrs Davies was heard to tell students in other writing lessons (eg, handwriting, grammar and text construction) to not focus on correct spelling (L_5, 6). There were several entries in Mrs Davies' English programme about students' ability to understand that writing is for an audience, and to be able to communicate information in differing ways. In the observed lessons the only audience was Mrs Davies, who marked the majority of their work samples. Mrs Davies integrated commonly occurring errors into future lessons, such as highlighting words that several students were misspelling (D_4.32). She also regularly scaffolded students during writing lessons, with her feedback reflecting both warmth and high expectations.

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Intens</th>
<th>Quant</th>
<th>Sharp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Davies emphasised in her literacy practices.</td>
<td>was necessary</td>
<td>warmth</td>
<td>high expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascertain whether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or whether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whilst handwriting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but not in another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For example,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but Mrs Davies was heard to tell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to not focus on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a long period of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short diversions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only sometimes (quant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directly (intens) related to intens: 7 5 5 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quant: 6 7 6 3 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp: 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A4.4.0) Mrs Davies values writing and more (intens) emphasis was placed on this than other areas of English in her practice (D_39; L_19). The main (intens) purpose of writing lessons at school was to learn and practise specific skills, which were then assessed to ascertain whether they had been adequately acquired, or whether further instruction was necessary. The way in which basic concepts were taught in different time-slots resulted in learning being quite segmented. Whilst handwriting and the content of produced texts were consistently valued, certain skills and conventions were appreciated in one lesson but not in another. For example, spelling was practised daily, but Mrs Davies was heard to tell students in other writing lessons (eg, handwriting, grammar and text construction) to not focus on correct spelling (L_5, 6). There were several entries in Mrs Davies' English programme about students’ ability to understand that writing is for an audience, and to be able to communicate information in differing ways. In the observed lessons the only audience was Mrs Davies, who marked the majority of their work samples. Mrs Davies integrated commonly occurring errors into future lessons, such as highlighting words that several students were misspelling (D_4.32). She also regularly scaffolded students during writing lessons, with her feedback reflecting both warmth and high expectations.
| A.4.[A.4.P] New technologies and associated texts were primarily used for entertainment purposes, such as in free-choice time and as a wet-weather activity (D_4.17). Playing computer games was only viewed as a learning activity with one text, Daisy Maths, where “they have no idea that actually during free time they’re choosing to do a maths activity” (D_3.14). Students were not seen on the computers for longer than approximately 40 minutes at school; usually less. When these were used for work, it became apparent that Mrs Davies’ priority was the written task: “play with the font afterwards. It’s more important to get the words down now…then you can play” (J_46.6). The frequency and purpose for digital texts being used was related to what Mrs Davies valued: “I do focus on word processing. I do want them to develop those skills. I’m not so much interested in the fact that they can research on the internet. I want them to be able to produce a simple piece of writing” (D_3.10). There seems to be some tensions between Mrs Davies’ use of ICTs and various school documents, in which technology is stated to be a priority area and specific skills are to be integrated into each KLA (S_7, 8, 9). | Evaluating the use of new technology and associated texts learning activities. | - Mrs Davies’ priority (intens) was - It’s more important to - I’m not so much interested in - a priority area - specific skills - they have no idea - Students were not seen on - I want them to - There seems to be | - were primarily (intens) used - such as (focus) in - was only viewed as - for longer than approximately 40 minutes - usually (intens) less (quant). - Mrs Davies’ priority (intens) was - I do (intens) focus on - I do (intens) want - some tensions - various school documents, - in which (focus) - very anxious once in a while, when I realise you cannot meet all their needs, all of the time…You can only do the best that you can with what you’ve got and the timeframe and all the rest of it (D_3.4).# | smallest | - | - | - | 353 |
| A.4.[A.4.Q] The external boundaries of school-produced documents were often quite explicit and the majority of their requirements were consistent with Mrs Davies’ English programme, including: scope and sequences (S_21, 22, 29); the emphasis on writing (S_2); homework involving reading and minimal writing (S_10); and assessment procedures (S_19, 20). The other external factor that influenced Mrs Davies’ teaching seemed to be time, as she stated that she occasionally gets: | Evaluating the external boundaries and factors influencing Mrs Davies teaching-learning activities | - were consistent with | - seemed to be time, - as she - she stated that | - were often quite explicit - the majority of their - she occasionally gets | | A.4.[A.4.R] Mrs Davies also said she had converted to using commercial resources due to time restrictions (D_4.19). Mrs Davies allowed students to contribute their prior knowledge in discussions | - | - | - | Mrs Davies also said | Also - and often made links |
(when deemed appropriate), and often made links to their interests (eg. D_25, 36, L_1). However, lessons were still very much structured around previous school learning and school-valued literacy practices (L_5, 7, 12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connections</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home-School Relationships</td>
<td>Describing and evaluating the parent-teacher relationships and the supporting document for the practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4[A.4.S] Various school documents place an emphasis on the importance of parent-teacher relationships (eg, S_13, 15, 24, 26). For example, the “Parent Information Book 2008” states: ‘we believe in a strong parent/ teacher relationship and encourage you to be an active participant in the education of your child’ (S_1.1). Several ways in which “parents” can be become involved and assist with school needs and learning are subsequently listed. In the “Community Participation Policy” (S_13,4), the only time it is suggested that “teachers” should initiate contact is in response to their right to ‘expect support’ from parents/ community/ carers’. The recommendations made in various school documents thus seem to advocate one-way lines of communication (eg, S_20). It can also be argued that a deficit view is apparent from the wording used in the “Home Reading Policy” in which it is stated that the program was ‘developed as a support for students who had limited access to appropriate reading material in their homes’ (S_11.1).</td>
<td>- Phase 3: Portraying the parent-teacher and teacher-teacher relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Teacher Relationships</td>
<td>Evaluating the relationships between teachers and between their literacy practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 [A.4.T] There appeared to be a certain lack of communication between teachers about their theoretical and pedagogical beliefs: “they tend to come in [to Year 2] with a, um, belief that they must spell every word correctly and it does stifle their writing… I have to work on [this fear of mistakes] almost every year… They can’t understand when I say ‘I don’t care if it’s wrong’” (D_3.6). When asked about her communication with other current teachers, Mrs Davies stated, “the communication I have with [Mrs White, the ICT teacher] is basically letting her know of skills that I feel they haven’t got on the computer and she will remind them” (D_3.10). There was not any communication</td>
<td>- They can’t understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- “I don’t care if it’s wrong”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There appeared to be a lack of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- “they tend to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- they must spell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I have to work on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- when I say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mrs Davies stated,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- due to time restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- However,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- were still very much structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Due to time restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- However,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- For example,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- states:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- can be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- it is suggested that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- “teachers” should initiate contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- thus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- seem to advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- It can also be argued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Deny: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enter: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ack: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Counter: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Concur: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Various school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Several ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the only time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- in various school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- is apparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- in which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Intens: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Quant: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Focus:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study: Neil

[A.4.U] At the time of research, Neil was eight years-old and lived with his Mum, Brenda, and Dad, Brian. His interests include Lego, monsters/dragons and computer games (eg, N_32, 66). Neil is an only child, which is perhaps reflected in his independence and certain adult mannerisms and comments (eg, N_57, 62, 80). At school, Neil is slightly competitive (D_21; N_68, 70), but also generally compliant and hard-working. He appeared able to self-regulate his attention, as he spent over 90% of the time on-task during each of the tally event sample observations (N_54, 56, 67, 81). Mrs Davies stated: “he’s a very capable child in literacy and he knows it” (3.8), which summarised what was found across the data (eg, N_1, 5, 27, 33, 64, 78). Neil displayed his confidence when he was asked what was hard to do at school and replied: “ummmmm…[pause]…get over chairs when they’re not pushed in…just to get to my tray, I always have to trip over [Sam’s] chair!” (N_78.2). Neil had been considered an ‘independent reader’ since the beginning of Year 2 (N_64.1) and Mrs Davies said she had high expectations of his literacy (D_3.11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neil's Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.4.V] Neil lived in a modern block of large units, a few minutes drive from the school. The family’s large unit was split onto three floors, with the open-plan design of the ground floor and the white walls contributing to its spacious feel. Framed photos of the family, and of Neil alone, were displayed around the house, along with a number of...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 3: Detailing case 1: Neil
Phase 1: Describing the character and the home of the main participant of case 1, Neil.

- Neil is slightly competitive
- generally compliant and hard-working.
- to self-regulate his attention,
- he’s a very capable child in
- and he knows it
- his confidence
- ‘independent reader’
- had high expectations of his literacy

Affect: Judgment: Appreciation:
- a modern block
- but
- which is perhaps reflected in
- but also
- He appeared able to
- as he spent
- Mrs Davies stated:
- Neil displayed
- Neil had been considered
- Mrs Davies said
- Deny: 6
- Enter: 39
- Ack: 38
- Counter: 20
- Concur: Justify: 14
- Endorse: 9

Intens: 60
Quant: 47
Focus: - - - -
- There was not any
- Although
- did not cross
- For example,
- Mrs Davies said that
- At the time of research.
- Neil is an only child,
- certain adult mannerisms
- At school.
Neil’s artworks (N_31). Neil had assembled a pile of things that he wanted to show me on the kitchen table, including: his coin collection; Lego magazines; some Lego constructions; and his handwritten and typed journals, scrapbooks, stories and poems. After we had talked at length about these belongings, Neil showed me his room (N_32.1-5). Colourful wooden letters spelt out Neil’s name on his bedroom door, above two artworks and two posters. The décor in Neil’s room was gender-neutral, with white walls, a brown carpet and a colourful, fish-patterned doona cover on the wooden single bed in the centre of the room (see Figure 4.2 below). The room had floor to ceiling windows along the back wall. Certificates, cards and artworks were pinned to a large, rectangular corkboard. On the opposite wall stood a wide, wooden bookshelf, which was stacked with books, toys, photos, trophies, and a tape/CD player (N_31). Neil pointed out almost all of the toys and Lego (including those in his cupboard), but only talked about his books once, in response to me commenting on a jigsaw of an illustration from *Animalia* (N_32.5).

![Figure 4.2 Context Map of Neil’s Bedroom](image)

**Figure 4.2 Context Map of Neil’s Bedroom**
### Available Texts

As Neil is classified as an ‘independent reader’ at school, he is allowed access to the ‘class books’ (D.4.1). These are 119 books split randomly into two tubs and include 67 literary books and 37 factual books. Neil said that he prefers “non-fiction books about monsters and dragons” (N.78.6), which was confirmed by his choice of several such books from the school library (N.76.2). At home, Neil had approximately 150 books in his room, which included a large variety of picture books and several volumes of poetry and nursery rhymes (N.31.2). There were no reference books and few factual texts apparent. His favourite books at the time were three series of fictional, fantasy books called Dragon Quest; “that’s what really got me into dragons” (N.76.2). His Dad, Brian, was currently reading him a series of Alfred Hitchcock books that Neil said were about investigators (N.76.3).

In regards to writing print-texts at home, Neil is given blank notebooks by his parents to complete required journal entries in. Neil’s writing and drawing resources were stored in the communal lounge room space (N.31/32). Other books and print-texts evident at Neil’s house included: newspapers and associated magazines; television guides; shelves of war books; books and folders relating to primary teaching; and various print-texts pinned to the corkboard in the kitchen. The digital technologies and associated texts that Neil had access to at home included: a computer, with Internet access; various computer games; CDs; a medium-sized television; a DVD player; 10-20 National Geographic wildlife DVDs; and approximately 15 children’s movies, about which Neil explained: “I don’t really watch these anymore” (N.32.6). Neil and his Mum told me that they go to the local public library quite regularly and borrow both books and DVDs (N.32.6).

### Experiences and Activities

According to the parent checklists (see Appendix N), Neil engaged with print texts much more regularly than digital texts at home. Print and visual texts made up 67% of the texts he used on the 16th July and 72% on the 17th August, with these including reading books, the TV guide and Lego instructions (N.74, 75). Brenda explained that Neil

| Evaluating while describing the participant’s literacy practices at home and | - independently
| - voluntarily read
| - read independently
| - a “preferred area of literacy”,
| | - According to the parent checklists
| | - Brenda explained that
| | - although he did
| | - in contrast,
| | | - much more regularly than
| | | - Neil usually only read
| | | - and occasionally looked at

| Phase 2: Portraying Neil’s literacy practices, available texts at school and at home he can access, the and values, purpose and boundaries he experiences | - is classified an ‘independent reader’
| - the ‘class books’
| - His favourite books
| | - As Neil
| | | - Neil said that
| | | - which was confirmed by
| | | - There were no reference
| | | - Neil said were about
| | | - “I don’t really watch these anymore”
| | | - Neil and his Mum told me
| | | - split randomly into
| | | - of several such books
| | | - Neil had approximately
| | | - a large variety of picture books
| | | - several volumes of poetry
| | | - and few factual texts
| | | - what really got me
| | | - was currently reading him
| | | - a series of Alfred
| | | - various print-texts
| | | - various computer games;
| | | - and approximately quite regularly

| - as Neil
| - which was confirmed by
| - There were no reference
| - Neil said were about
| - “I don’t really watch these anymore”
| - Neil and his Mum told me
| - split randomly into
| - of several such books
| - Neil had approximately
| - a large variety of picture books
| - several volumes of poetry
| - and few factual texts
| - what really got me
| - was currently reading him
| - a series of Alfred
| - various print-texts
| - various computer games;
| - and approximately quite regularly

usually only read books **independently** when required to, *although* he did **voluntarily** read Lego magazines and occasionally looked at commercially produced magazines or cartoons in the newspaper (N_33). In contrast, Neil was *often* observed to read **independently** in class and at the school library (eg. N_57, 62, 66). When Mrs Davies was asked if Neil has a “preferred area of literacy”, she replied “he *loves* reading and, if there is ever a gap in any lesson or between any lessons, *because* he’s capable, he **tends** to be one of the first finishers… he will always say ‘can I get a book and read?’… he dives into his books” (D_3.8-9).

Neil was **very engaged** during modelled reading experiences at school as well (N_56, 59, 61, 66), **usually sitting in the front row** (N_57.2, 61.1), and often **participating in** related discussions (N_57.2, 68.1). Neil was in the **highest reading group** (see Appendix O) and was **regularly seen to be engaged** in these lessons (N_62, 67, 68). During the times that Neil was observed to read aloud, he **did not make any errors and kept up with the pace of his peers** (N_68.1, 71.2).

[58x66] shows that Neil was observed to **read independently** in class and at the school library (eg. N_57, 62, 66). When Mrs Davies was asked if Neil has a “preferred area of literacy”, she replied “he *loves* reading and, if there is ever a gap in any lesson or between any lessons, *because* he’s capable, he **tends** to be one of the first finishers… he will always say ‘can I get a book and read?’… he dives into his books” (D_3.8-9).

Neil was **very engaged** during modelled reading experiences at school as well (N_56, 59, 61, 66), **usually sitting in the front row** (N_57.2, 61.1), and often **participating in** related discussions (N_57.2, 68.1). Neil was in the **highest reading group** (see Appendix O) and was **regularly seen to be engaged** in these lessons (N_62, 67, 68). During the times that Neil was observed to read aloud, he **did not make any errors and kept up with the pace of his peers** (N_68.1, 71.2).

Neil **regularly displayed code-breaking and text participant skills**, both at home and school (eg. N_55.3, 66.1, 71.3; 76.3), *such as deliberately looking at peers* whilst orally spelling the week’s words from the board (N_55.1, 59.1, 71.2). He **demonstrated** his **developing metalanguage**, when verbalising a code-breaking strategy: “if you try to figure out a hard word… you could miss it and read the rest of the sentence” (N. 71.4). Neil **was also able to verbalise how the syntax of a title**, “The Mystery of Monster Mountain”, had confused him, *as he had presumed* that it was about a mountain of monsters (N_76). This **shows his awareness** that two meanings *can be interpreted* from the sentence.
same words. Neil also **displayed text user skills** in both settings. He had a **good understanding** about the purpose of magazines, comics, newspapers, factual texts and fictional texts, and how the way in which each is read varies (N_32.3, 57.1, 66.1, 71.3). For example, he said: “I don’t really like the, um, fiction books, cos they’re like…they’re like stories, story books. Like ‘once upon a time there was a fairy’. Like them ones” (N_78.6).

![A.4.AA] When asked directly what he was good at (at school) Neil listed the lessons associated with writing: story-writing, publishing, editing, spelling and grammar. He seemed to measure these by the marks he received: **I don’t really get any mistakes in that** (N_78.2). Neil often spent the vast majority of the time on-task during these lessons (e.g., N_54-57, 67, 81) and was often **the first to finish activities**, including: handwriting (N_57.2); editing (N_57.2); grammar (N_59.2); and reading group worksheets (N_62.2, 68.1). The latest he was observed to finish a writing activity, in relation to others in the class, **was fifth** (N_55.3). This was when he had included several **quite complex** adjectives in his descriptive sentences (see Figure 4.3 below). Neil was also seen to complete homework **very quickly**, perhaps an indication that these written tasks are **not often challenging for him** (N_69, 76.1). Brenda marked both Neil’s homework and his required journal entries - which he had written at home since Kindergarten - by writing comments and ticks and including occasional stickers (N_32.2). Another similarity between home and school was **were seen to prompt** Mrs Davies and Neil’s parents **were seen to prompt** and scaffold him, **rather than** telling him answers (N_60.6, 76.2, 80.3).

| Relating the practices at school to the ones at home | Neil was also able to verbalise how the syntax of a title, had confused him, his awareness text user skills He had a **good understanding** about | - can be interpreted from displayed - For example, he said: |
| - “I don’t really get any mistakes in that” was **often the first to finish activities** in relation to others in the class, **was fifth** when he had included several **quite complex** adjectives to complete homework **very quickly** these written tasks are **not often challenging for him** | - He seemed to measure he was observed to finish a writing activity Neil was also seen perhaps an indication that were seen to prompt and scaffold him . **rather than** telling him answers | - When asked directly Neil often spent - spent the vast majority of the time including: handwriting The latest Brenda marked both - and including **occasional** stickers Another similarity |
Brenda said that Neil occasionally wrote stories voluntarily, but more often chose to complete various word games in his Lego magazines and on the computer (e.g., cloze passages) (N_32). Neil was aware of how to write differing text types (N_32.2) and demonstrated knowledge of making meaning clear for readers (N_76.2). He was heard to tell peers “I’m a good story-maker” (N_80.2), but Mrs Davies and Brenda did not seem to consider Neil as being particularly imaginative (D_3; N_80.2). Neil did seem to have difficulty starting an imaginative narrative: “what should I say?” (N_80.2), but then found it hard to stop: “no, half an hour…another half an hour” (N_80.3). The following extract from the resulting narrative will allow readers to ascertain whether they think it is imaginative (spelling and grammar are not altered):

The octopus is huge. It keeps changing colour…He goes to another land. He hits the octopus at sunrise…He thinks about it for about two hours. The he knows. The octopus’ ate them…he jumped in its mouth He finds his mum, dad, brother and sisters. He tell them to go down to his bum! They pop out of it’s bottom They immediately go home (N_85.1/2).
The parent checklists show that 38% of the texts Neil engaged with on 16th July were digital and 28% on 17th August (N_74, 75). Brenda told me that Neil would “watch television all day if you let him” (N_33.1). Neil said that the television programmes he enjoys watching include “Collectors”, “Wild at Heart” and “Dr Who”. These choices and other data seem to show that Neil is less interested in watching programmes and movies aimed at children (N_32, 33, 78). However, Neil said he liked watching “Looney Tunes: Back in action”, because it is “half cartoon, half real” (N_78), showing his awareness of the use of different modes in some television programmes and movies. Brenda told me that, when watching movies as a family, they will talk “constantly! Cos he’ll be asking all along about, you know, ‘why does that happen?’” (N_33.11). In contrast, Neil reported that he does not ask many questions, stating that most television and movies “just make sense” (N_78.8). However he revealed that he sometimes does not understand scene changes:

when they just skip things, and you’re like ‘what did they do? So like, um, you know, Spiderman’s, like, about to save the world and then they skip something and you’re like ‘what just happened?’” Should finish what he’s about to do (N_78).

According to Brenda, they do not use the internet very much at home, but she said that Neil knows how to ‘Google’ and that he writes e-mails and downloads photos with her (N_33). When he was asked: “what are you good at, at school? What are some of the things you’re best at?”’, the first thing he replied was “getting onto Firefox, computer…I’m good at fixing up computers when they’re stuffing up” (N_78.2). One of Neil’s main experiences in relation to computer use was typing and printing written texts, as he did this both at home and
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school. Neil displayed good computer navigation skills when using both the PC at home and the Mac computers at school (N_32, 60). For example, he was seen to: log on and off quickly; manipulate text in Word (eg, centring and italicising it); and respond to dialogue boxes (eg, about overwriting saved files). He also demonstrated knowledge about the computer catalogue in the school library (N_66.1), which had only recently been taught (L_9).

[A.4.AE] Neil plays various computer games at home, at school and at the public library. Brenda also uses educational computer software with Neil (N_60) and suggested that “sometimes, he might ask for help too easily…too early” (N_33.11). She seemed to scaffold his learning in this situation as well: “now I’ll just sit there, and let him work it out himself. If he’s really struggling, I’ll tell him” (N_33.10). Other experiences that Neil had with digital texts out-of-school included choosing and playing CDs (N_31.1) and sending text messages. Neil also told me that he enjoys playing Playstation at a peer’s house. Brenda told me that she tries to make links between books, TV episodes and the internet spontaneously; giving examples as to how this was done (N_32.7). Mrs Davies made similar spontaneous links, such as when asking Neil if the Scooby-Doo book he was reading was like the television show (N_71.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value, Purpose and Associated Boundaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.4.AF] The purpose of reading books at home seemed to be for pleasure if Neil was being read to, as he spoke about this eagerly. However, Neil did not seem to view independent reading at home as a leisure activity. He explained that he gets to relax after dinner, when his required reading and writing have been completed. Brenda seemed to value the educational benefits of reading at home. She explained that she and Brian have always tried to use rich oral language and have read daily to Neil since he was a baby. She thought this had contributed to his school literacy success, stating: “I tried to teach him to read before he started school but he wouldn’t learn from me, he wasn’t interested. But I, I think all the things that we did, leading up to him starting school, gave him that very strong foundation” (N_33.2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparing how different the value and purpose of the participant’s literacy practices within the participant himself, and other adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- He also demonstrated knowledge about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If he’s really struggling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- he enjoys playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- he was seen to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- and suggested that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- he might ask for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- She seemed to scaffold his learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- told me that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brenda told me that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- she tries to make links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- log on and off quickly;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- which had only recently been taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- various computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brenda also uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sometimes, he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- too easily…too early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neil also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spontaneously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mrs Davies made similar spontaneous links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- seemed to be for pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- if Neil was being read to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as he spoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- However,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neil did not seem to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- He explained that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brenda seemed to value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- She explained that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- rich oral language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**[A.4.AG]** In the school’s “Home Reading Policy” (2001) reference is made to Mem Fox’s “Reading Magic” (S_11). This book was also mentioned by Brenda several times, providing a pathway of continuity between home and school in regards to what is believed and valued about reading. Another similar connection was that Brenda and Mrs Taylor (the teacher-librarian) both mentioned Pamela Allen as being one of their favourite authors. Brenda’s apparent love of picture books seemed to have influenced the texts available to Neil at home.

Describing the continuity between school and home’s belief and values on reading
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**[A.4.AH]** There were similarities between home and school in relation to writing as well. The biggest continuity was that Neil’s parents seemed to value depicting events and memories through written and visual texts (N_32.2), as is often done at school. Another similarity was the value placed on the “appearance” of writing (48; 59.1). In both settings, it was stated that the purpose of Neil writing was to develop his skills, although it seemed that spelling was valued more at home than school, as Brenda corrects all spelling mistakes in Neil’s journals (eg, N_40, 47, 51), whereas Mrs Davies tries to encourage students to use ‘invented spelling’ (D_4.4). Neil’s other “main” writing experience is for a social purpose, as he sometimes writes letters with his Mum, which he understands are being constructed for a meaningful, social purpose (N_79.1/2). Neil’s writing and knowledge about the English language were positively reinforced and scaffolded in both settings, occurring much more regularly on a one-to-one level at home, during an observed homework session (N_39.55, 71, 76). The boundaries in regards to writing seemed similar across these contexts as well, with Neil being required to write in a particular genre, with various features of language being emphasised as important.

Describing the continuity between home and school’s belief and values on writing in spite of some minor differences
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**[A.4.AI]** Brenda explained that Neil’s main reason for using new technologies and digital texts at home is for enjoyment and leisure, although he also sometimes watches the news, and uses the computer for

Describing other continuities (and discontinuities)

- bad habits”
- Brenda explained that

- Neil’s main reason
learning or social purposes (N_{79.2}). Neil was seen to be quite engaged at school whilst engaging with digital texts as well (N_{60.70}). When asked if he plays on the computer a lot at home, Neil replied “yeah, I try to”, seeming to imply that there was a restriction on his ability to do this (N_{32.6}, 32.7). When asked, Brenda explained that there were time limits placed on digital texts: “his time” (eg, playing Marble Blast); “our time” (watching a movie as a family); and “learning time” (playing an ‘educational’ game) (N_{33}). The former usually only occurred once a day, but the latter two did not rule out his option to engage with another digital text. Brenda seemed to place boundaries on the content of computer games as well, stating: “you can choose games that have an educational benefit, and you can choose games that don’t; so why not choose the games that do?” (N_{33.15}). There were also restrictions placed on Neil’s television viewing at home - in regards to time and content - with at least one programme deemed unsuitable, as Brenda “thought it was teaching him bad habits” (N_{33}). When Brenda was asked if Neil had any video games at home, her reply was: “He wishes he did! But I said no, we’ll never get one of those” (N_{33.14}). These boundaries seem to have influenced the amount of time and frequency with which Neil engages with different technologies and associated texts (N_{74}, 75).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connections</th>
<th>Comparing the adult views of literacy and of Neil’s competence</th>
<th>Phase 3 Comparing the participants’ associations with literacy practices surrounding the case 1</th>
<th>- he is very competent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.4.AJ] Brenda gave a similar definition of literacy as Mrs Davies. although hinting at the inclusion of visual literacy: “the reading, the writing, the talking, the listening, the road signs” (N_{33.3}). They seem to have similar opinions about Neil’s literacy; both stating that he is very competent, but that his listening and handwriting could be improved.</td>
<td>relating to the use of new technologies and digital texts, and showing the different perceptions between the Neil and the other adult participants.</td>
<td>- although hinting at - They seem to have - but that - could be improved. Deny: 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- new technologies and digital texts - he also sometimes watches - quite engaged - When asked - a lot at home - When asked - The former usually only occurred once a day. - as well - There were also in regards to - with at least one programme - When Brenda was asked - although - Neil was seen to be - whilst engaging - if he plays - Neil replied “yeah, seeming to imply - Brenda explained - but the latter two did not rule out his option - Brenda seemed to place - stating: - deemed unsuitable - as - Brenda“thought - if Neil had - her reply was - seem to have influenced
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### Brenda and Brian’s Knowledge about School

[A.4.AK] When Brenda was asked in her interview about the similarities between home and school, she *listed* required writing, type of talking and digital maths software (N_33). When she and Brian were both asked *if (and how)* they felt school reflected Neil’s home interests and experiences, they *seemed slightly stuck for an answer*. Brian *said* that reading was a link, *whilst* Brenda *mentioned* two integrated units: “Olympics” and “Wet and Dry Environments”, *thus* mentioning school learning coming home instead (N_79).

[A.4.AL] Brian *said* that he *was aware* of the range of literacy acquisition that *different children seemed to have*, *due to* his experience with helping in the classroom. Mrs Davies *was observed to have* a brief informal conversation with him during one of these occasions. She *said* that the parents who *are not able* to help out and see classroom learning first-hand are reassured by others, who do (D_4.15). *Thus* she *seemed to assume* that “all” parents are in contact with other parents out-of-school. *In contrast to this*, Brenda and Brian *seemed to regularly be* in touch with *only one* other student’s parents.

[A.4.AM] *In July*, Brenda requested an interview with Mrs Davies, which was the first time she had met her. She *told* Mrs Davies that she *did not think* Neil was extending himself in relation to reading. *However* Mrs Davies *explained* that he is *always willing* to “grab the *more difficult* book…he will taken on *anything challenging*” (D_3.8) and later *said* “I *don’t think he sees much as too difficult for himself*” (D_3.12). Mrs Davies *had told* Brenda in the interview that *Neil was top in the class for English* and gave her his completed tests (D_4.21). She
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also suggested that they both start encouraging him to read more complex factual texts (D_4.21). Apart from the above mentioned interactions, Brenda and Brian did not seem to know a lot about what happened in relation to school literacies (N_33). Brenda said that she assumes Neil is being extended: “because he’s never said he’s bored, but I’m not, I’m not sure how it’s done” (N_33.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mrs Davies’ Knowledge about Home</th>
<th>Evaluating the lack of knowledge of Mrs Davies of Neil’s interest out of school.</th>
<th>- seemed to regularly be</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.4.AN] When asked about Neil’s interests out of school, Mrs Davies said “he plays soccer with the boys after school, and that’s about it...I honestly can’t say I know a lot more about what happens at home” (D_3.12). When given toys she might know Neil to be interested in as a frame of reference, she said that “he doesn’t seem to be a boy that’s interested in toys” and that this was not something she saw “happening in class” (D_3.13). However, across the data collected at Neil’s home, it</td>
<td>- has quite a strong interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mrs Davies said can’t say I know she might know she said that he doesn’t seem to be a boy this was not something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- When asked about Neil’s interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I honestly a lot more about what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- across the data collected at Neil’s home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mrs Davies had told suggested that did not seem to know - Brenda said that she assumes because he’s never said but I’m not, I’m not sure how it’s done
was apparent that he has **quite a strong interest** in certain toys, particularly Lego, models, Bionicles, jigsaw puzzles, and computer games (eg. N_32, 33, 74, 75, 78).

[A.4.AO] In relation to home literacies, Mrs Davies *stated* “Mum’s a teacher, so I’m just assuming that….there may be actually more literacy happening at home than in the average household….other than that I have no idea. I know he does his home reading, I know he’s *keen, he’s always going into good books*” (D_3.14). The assumptions about reading and writing experiences aligns with that *revealed* by other data, but Neil *does not display* the same interest in reading at home as he does at school. *Thus, in regards to* both Neil’s literacies and interests, it *does not seem* as though a lot *is actually known* about what occurs at home.

Mrs Davies’ Knowledge of other Current School Learning

[A.4.AP] Mrs Davies *said* about Neil that: “he’s not out, actively seeking a book on a particular subject that interests him. He *doesn’t actively seek things out*, whereas he *really needs* to do that” (D_3.9). *In contrast to* this statement, Neil *showed a strong interest in* finding **quite complex** factual books about monsters: searching the library catalogue for them; asking a peer who had one (N_66.2); and hiring three to take home during the data collection period (N_66.1, 76.2). *Thus* individual interests did *not seem to be* a topic of discussion between Mrs Davies and Mrs Taylor, perhaps due to a *lack of time* or that it was *not considered* relevant.

---

| Appreciating Mrs Davies assumption about Neil’s literacy practices at home. | - Mrs Davies stated - he’s keen he’s always going into good books | - Mrs Davies stated - he’s not out, actively seeking a book whereas he really needs to do that |
| - *she saw* “happening in class” - *However,* it was apparent that particularly Lego |
| In relation to home literacies, actually more literacy in regards to as though a lot |

---

| Evaluating the teachers’ limited knowledge of Neil’s interests. | - He doesn’t actively seek things out Neil *showed a strong interest in* |
| - *In contrast to* this statement *quite complex* factual books a lack of time |

---

| Evaluating the teachers’ limited knowledge of Neil’s interests. | - He doesn’t actively seek things out Neil *showed a strong interest in* |
| - *In contrast to* this statement *quite complex* factual books a lack of time |
### Brenda’s and Mrs Davies’ Knowledge about Past Learning

[B.4.AQ] Brenda’s knowledge about past learning from school reports is that: Neil’s effort in English *has always been ‘excellent’* and his *achievement in English has been ‘high’ or ‘outstanding’* (N_1). When Mrs Davies was asked in the interview about communication that occurred with Neil’s past teachers, she *answered*: there was a big disruption last year and honestly I keep forgetting which year they’ve come from…I tend to communicate with the past teachers if I’m having a concern or a problem…because honestly, the first few weeks, I’m sorting out…children in my own head (D_3.10).

[B.4.AR] She *explained* on different occasions that, *due to staff illness and casual replacements, some of the children had started this year behind the level they should have been at* (D_4.15). This *seemed* to be something that Brenda *also had knowledge about, as she told me that she thought Neil had been ahead of a lot of students in Year 1, but that they were catching up now.*

### Generational Patterns

[B.4.AS] Neil *seems to have gained considerable knowledge about the purposes for reading and writing from what he sees his parents doing at home.* He *stated* in his interview: “if you don’t know how to read and write, ummm, you won’t be able to write letters and you won’t be able to read other people’s” (N_78). *When asked* “what else do you need reading and writing for when you grow up?” he *listed*: “…just for quick notes to write on your hand…Well I guess you need to read, um, to be able to do research for scientific things…oh! E-mails, you probably...Wouldn’t be the kind of reading we do with [Neil].

Revealing the general patterns of Neil’s literacy practices and his mother’s knowledge about the practices.
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need to write” (N_78.7). *Whilst* all of these are things that he *sees* his parents doing (some of which he also engages in at home), the scientific research *shows a very direct link* between what his Dad, Brian, was using reading and writing for at the time of data collection. Brenda *remembered* Dick and Dora books from her childhood, stating “they were boring books...Yeah, *wouldn’t be the kind of reading we do with [Neil]*” (N_33.5). Brenda *said* that “it’s *not very often* he chooses to read for pleasure”, which differed from her own childhood: “when we were growing up, we would read all the time” (N_33.2). She *added* that she had not had a television when growing up, which perhaps affected the value she places on this medium.

**Neil’s Literacy: Summary**

*[A.4.AT]* In summary, the close observations of Neil at home and school, together with the interview data, *reveal* a child being *consciously and successfully socialised into* a range of literate practices. The data *show* that many of the literacies valued and taught at school are also valued and used at home. *However*, the *complexities* of literacy also became apparent, as Neil’s attitude to these school-valued literacies *seemed to differ* between home and school settings. There were also *many* literacy experiences occurring at home for different *meaningful purposes*, which *did not appear to be acknowledged or integrated* into the school curriculum. *Although* Brian was assisting with reading groups at the time of research, *it did not seem* that much was known by either Mrs Davies or Neil’s parents about the experiences which were provided in the other setting. *However*, Brenda and Mrs Davies had *both made assumptions* about the learning occurring, *due to the insider knowledge* they had as primary school teachers.
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### Case Study: Jade

[A.4.AU] Jade lives with her mother, Anna, her father, Steve, and two younger brothers. It seemed as though Jade had three main interests or types of activities out-of-school at the time of research: physical activities, using digital texts; and making things with paper (J_24, 27, 48, 70). At school, Jade appeared to be relatively quiet and shy, although she often talked to her peers; especially several particular girls. She usually spent the majority of lesson-time on-task, although seemed to regularly get distracted by listening to, talking to, or watching people around her. Jade had been identified by Mrs Davies as a “child that struggled in every way in literacy” (D_3). At the time of research Jade was considered to be on Level 15, according to the PM Benchmarks (PM Library, 2005). As this was behind grade expectations, she was receiving half an hour of additional support from a DET assistant per week.

#### Describing and judging the second participant: Jade.

Data are displayed to support the argument.

#### Stage 3: Detailing case 2: Jade

Phase 1: Describing the character and the home setting of the main participant of case 2, Jade. [A.4.AU], [A.4.AV]
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### Jade’s Home

[A.4.AV] At the time of research, Jade lived in a medium-sized house, situated a few minutes walk from the school. In an open-plan kitchen, living and dining area there was a large, flat-screened television in front of comfy leather lounges. Another large, flat-screened television dominated the family lounge room and there were framed photos of the family everywhere. Jade’s brothers’ room had a royal blue feature wall and matching doona covers with green, blue and red stripes. Between their beds was a large cubed display unit, each section of which contained either books or a fluffy character from Winnie-the-Pooh. Jade’s bedroom had a similar minimalist feel in the lack of visible toys (which were stored in her cupboard) (see Figure 4.4 below). Three of the walls were painted slightly off-white, with a feature wall painted hot white, with a feature wall painted hot.

#### Describing Jade’s home and room in detail completed with the map of it.

- a large, flat-screened television
  - in front of comfy leather lounges.
  - Another large, flat-screened television
  - be able to write

- Deny: 20
  - Enter: 65
  - Ack: 88
  - Counter: 51
  - Concur: 5
  - Justify: 11
  - Endorse: 13

#### Proclaim:
- at the time of research
  - a few minutes walk from the school
  - photos of the family everywhere.
  - Jade’s bedroom had a similar minimalist feel
  - in the lack of visible toys

#### Assumptions about
due to the insider knowledge

- At school.
- she often talked to her peers
- especially several particular girls.
- She usually spent the majority of lesson-time on-task,
- to regularly get distracted
- At the time of research
pink. Along the feature wall, and into the adjacent corner, stood a large piece of white furniture, comprising of a desk, three drawers and display shelves. Among the items on the shelves were: a clock; a plastic castle; a gymnastics trophy; a statue of a fairy; and a CD/tape player. In the corner opposite the door there was a double bed. Five small soft toys were lined up at the foot of the bed, half covered with a light pink blanket.

**Figure 4.4 Context Map of Jade’s Bedroom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Jade’s Home and School Literacies</strong></th>
<th><strong>Available Texts</strong></th>
<th><strong>Describing and evaluating the texts available for Jade the school provided. Real data used seem to guide readers to evaluate the participant.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Phase 2: Describing Jade’s literacy practices available texts at school and home she can access and dealing with the texts</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Available Texts** | Jade was asked directly: | - More were limited to those appropriate to her identified reading level  
- students ‘need to experience many different text types within the level over a period of time’ | - It is stated  
- However, due to the resources being shared  
- Jade could choose |

[A.4.AW] The texts that Jade was allowed to read in class were limited to those appropriate to her identified reading level (that is, at Level 15 or below). It is stated within the school’s Home Reading Policy that students ‘need to experience many different text types within the level over a period of time’ (S.11). However, due to the resources being shared between classrooms, there were only 19 books Jade could choose from in 2D’s Level 15 tub (including 12 literary and 3 factual texts). Jade was asked directly:
**Interviewer:** What sort of books do you like reading at school?

**Jade:** Um…

**Interviewer:** Do you get to choose the books that you read or do you have to read certain books?

**Jade:** Certain books

**Interviewer:** You have to read certain ones? OK. Do you like the books that you read at school?

**Jade:** Um, well, not really cos you have to read, like, the same ones over and over again

**Interviewer:** Oh do you? So you read the same books more than once?

**Jade:** Yeah

**Interviewer:** And are they fun books, or boring books, or OK?

**Jade:** OK

**Interviewer:** They’re OK? Yeah. So you’d prefer it if you could read things like Dr Seuss would you?

**Jade:** Yeah

---

**Interviewer:** What sort of books do you like reading at school?

**Jade:** Um, well, not really cos you have to read, like, the same ones over and over again

**Interviewer:** Oh do you? So you read the same books more than once?

**Jade:** Yeah

**Interviewer:** And are they fun books, or boring books, or OK?

**Jade:** OK

**Interviewer:** They’re OK? Yeah. So you’d prefer it if you could read things like Dr Seuss would you?

**Jade:** Yeah

---

**Classroom observations and conversations with her parents confirmed** that Jade did not like the levelled readers very much (J_50, 68), and she was seen to spend more time choosing books at the school library (J_60). In contrast, at home, Jade shares approximately 200-250 books with her two younger brothers (J_66). The large majority of these were literary picture books, including several that were related to popular culture (eg. Walt Disney’s Donald Duck). Various series of levelled readers and phonics books were reasonably numerous in the collection, but not many factual books were seen. Anna said that books were also borrowed from the public library when Jade shows an interest in them (J_50.1). Jade told me that she does not read magazines or comics very often: “only like once a year I get them” (J_24.4).
In regards to writing. Jade had an A2 sized 2005 desk calendar pad, several notebooks and copious amounts of stationery. Anna explained that Jade chooses to write on the PC more regularly. This computer was connected to the internet and had several installed games, including educational software associated with reading and phonics. The new technologies available at Jade’s house included: two large flat-screened televisions; a DVD player; an iPod; a Nintendo DS; a Playstation; and an Eye-toy (J_48). There were about eight Playstation games and hundreds of DVDs, most of which were family or children’s movies, including: Thomas; Barbie; Transformers; Scooby Doo; and Hi-5. Visible environmental print included: a Winnie-the-Pooh measuring chart; a calendar; several paintings; and items stuck on the fridge (an artwork, Jade’s laminated name, a rewards chart Jade had made, 8 fridge magnets, and a magnetic pad of paper).

Experiences and Activities

Anna said that Jade had been read to since she was approximately two years old, with some sight word books being looked at when she was a baby. At the time of research she was read to, and encouraged to read, almost daily (J_67). Anna said that it is only in the last twelve months that Jade has been reading independently (J_66), but that this is not a voluntary activity: “she won’t just sit down and read a book. There’s no way she would do that” (J_48.7). However, Anna mentioned that Jade will choose to read some other texts, such as toy catalogues or reading names from the credits after television programmes (J_48). In addition to Jade having had various tests out-of-school (eg, for dyslexia), a phonic programme called MULTILIT ® (Macquarie University, 2008) was implemented over the two school terms before data collection began. This required Jade to complete phonics-based worksheets, lists of sight words and reading after school, for an hour and a half, five times a week. According to the parent checklists of the texts that Jade used at home on particular days, 31% of the texts that Jade used at home on particular days, 31% of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>comics very often</th>
<th>- Anna explained that</th>
<th>- Anna said</th>
<th>- In regards to writing.</th>
<th>- to write on the PC more regularly,</th>
<th>- most of which</th>
<th>- since she was approximately</th>
<th>- At the time of research</th>
<th>- almost daily</th>
<th>- it is only in the last twelve months</th>
<th>- reading independently</th>
<th>- had various tests</th>
<th>- According to the parent checklists of the texts that Jade used at home on particular days,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.4.AZ]</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>

Appraising the writing practices Jade had at home and her connection with new technologies. -

Describing others’ efforts in helping Jade with the practices of reading and other written literacy practices, in spite of what limitation in the literacy practices that she did. -

- she was read to, and encouraged to read -

- Anna said that this is not a voluntary activity
  - However, - Anna mentioned that
  - This required Jade to
the texts Jade engaged with on 16th July were print or visual texts, and 46% on the 24th July (J_51, 52).

[A.4.BB] When asked about Jade’s strengths in relation to literacy, Mrs Davies responded:

I think the biggest success I’ve had with Jade is, um, building her self-esteem and her belief in herself, that she can do it …it’s been really encouraging because she truly does believe she can do it, you know? She believes that she can do anything and she knows that she has come a long way and she really has (D_3.15).

[A.4.BC] She continued that Jade “doesn’t feel she’s the straggler in the class anymore and she doesn’t identify herself as a child with reading problems” (D_3.16). This was reflected in Jade’s comment that reading was something she was good at, at school (J_24), as well as being apparent across multiple pieces of data (eg, J_27, 43, 56, 62, 67). Jade’s reading has improved quite a lot since her dyslexia assessment in September 2007 (J_53) and class records show an improvement in this school year (J_58). However, Jade is still developing awareness of the purpose of punctuation and her use of terminology related to books and authors (J_26, 27). Jade also seemed to have some trouble reading certain sight words, when they are in the context of a book (J_48, 59), as shown in the following excerpt from an audio-recorded reading sample:

his there is “…Come and look at this book,” Kate tells him. “It has lots of animals in it. That’s a /g/ /g/ /g/era/ [told] he sais there giraffe and this is a crocodile,” she says. “And there’s a baby one…” (J_26).
This excerpt also shows that Jade was heard to pronounce a couple of words phonetically, such as ‘says’ being read as “/səis/” (J_26). Additionally, when told ‘giraffe’, she repeated “/g/raffe” (J_26). Jade occasionally made similar mistakes when orally reading the week’s spelling words (J_41.1, 45.1), which seems to show that she may rely heavily on phonics. Various other data sources (such as the MULTILIT assessments) show Jade has made improvements in relation to phonics and other decoding skills, in the last year, but not in relation to comprehension. However she was observed to answer comprehension questions easily in reading groups (J_56, 62), perhaps showing she finds this easier when she does not have to read all of the text herself, or when she is being scaffolded in a group situation. Evaluating mistakes Jade made in oral/ pronunciation, in spite of the improvement she made - she may rely heavily on phonics. - Jade has made improvements - answer comprehension questions easily in reading groups - This excerpt also shows that - that Jade was heard to pronounce - when told ‘giraffe’, she repeated “/g/raffe” - which seems to show that - Various other data show - but not in relation to comprehension. - However - was observed to - perhaps - showing she finds this easier - when she does not have to read all of the text herself - or when she is being scaffolded in a group - such as - Additionally, - Jade occasionally made similar mistakes - During modelled reading lessons, Jade usually sat in the middle of the group, to one side and seemed to become disengaged sporadically (J_43, 45). She seemed much more engaged when a
A scripted play was being performed in a library lesson, as she sat at the front and smiled throughout (J_60). Jade was in the third of four ability-based groups, for which the activities seemed to revolve around phonics and the grammatical features of texts (see Appendix O). She read quite methodically during the observed periods and appeared to like being prepared, by reading ahead when possible (J_62). Jade was seen to use verbal expression when reading a play for the second time (J_56). She seemed to enjoy reading aloud in these guided lessons, as she smiled and laughed regularly and spent more of her time on-task (J_41, 45, 55). However, Jade did not show the same engagement during an observed independent reading lesson (J_68). Jade was on-task constantly whilst she was being scaffolded by Kate (the DET assistant), who: linked illustrations to the text; explained the meaning of words; and connected the story to Jade’s life. However, when Kate was helping other peers, Jade often looked around the room instead of reading. Anna said that Jade will ask her to read instead sometimes, but explained: “I won’t, I won’t. I say “you try, you try” and then I will help her if she’s, she’s having problems” (J_48.7). This, and other interview data, seemed to show that Jade is prompted in both settings, but that the level and type of this differed. However, as reading sessions at home were not observed, this information cannot be triangulated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Lesson</th>
<th>Much More Engaged</th>
<th>As She Sat at the Front and Smiled Throughout</th>
<th>She Read Quite Methodically</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jade often looked around the room instead of reading.</td>
<td>- She seemed to enjoy</td>
<td>- She was seen to appear to like</td>
<td>- Jade was on-task constantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She’s having problems</td>
<td>- The activities seemed to</td>
<td>- Jade was seen to</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarly to her reading, Jade’s writing seemed to benefit when she was scaffolded, resulting in more logical and grammatically correct texts. For example, when Kate prompted: “you’ve got a lovely full stop there, but you’ve forgotten something”, Jade responded “capital letter” and corrected the case (J_68.2). Other data also showed that Jade was aware of this writing convention, but that it did not yet seem to be something she did subconsciously (J_46, 74, 75). Jade’s level of on-task behaviours seemed to increase when she was in a guided group lesson. When a worksheet was completed question by question, with a parent helper, Jade was on-task for over 90% of the lesson (J_61) and finished first out of the group of six children (J_62). In contrast, when finishing other written work, Jade: finished her spelling words 7th (J_41) and 10th (J_45) on the two recorded occasions; was 9th to finish her handwriting pages (J_43); and was one of the last to finish descriptive sentences (J_41) and a grammar worksheet (J_45).

Evaluating Jade’s struggles in literacy practices in one of writing lesson that may be different from the other.

Jade was aware of this writing convention.

Jade’s writing seemed to benefit

For example,

Jade responded

but that

it did not yet seem to be something she did subconsciously

seemed to increase

Similarly to her reading

Other data also showed

Jade regularly displayed confidence in her writing ability (J_45, 46) and answered that story-writing was something that she was good at (J_24). Mrs Davies said “what is there is reasonable quality for a child who’s had difficulties” (D_3.16 and did not mention any issues, except for stating that she would expect Jade to write longer texts by the end of the year (D_3). Out of the 16 weekly spelling tests that she had taken, Jade had spelt 94% of the words correctly. However, her overall results for the term show much lower levels of success (see Appendix P). Jade thus seems able to learn the spelling of words on a short-term basis, but appears to find it harder to remember them. She also made regular spelling mistakes in her written work (J_8, 15, 20, 41, 46), usually in relation to blends in the middle of words (see Figure 4.5 below). External assessments recommend a focus on blends and kinaesthetic activities (J_53.2; 59.2). However, the focus in class is on developing children’s visual and oral/aural memory of spelling words. In addition to spelling and punctuation, Jade seemed to have some difficulties in structuring her texts so that her meaning was made clear. For example, ‘I watched the bike racing the girl kold her last name is kold rice she win the swimming race she was very very insiting’ (J_68). Jade was observed to correctly complete a worksheet on adverbs.

Appraising Jade’s confidence and her short term memory of word spelling, evaluating Jade’s struggles in some written literacy practices in one type of writing lesson which her disconnection to text construction.

A child who’s had difficulties

have some difficulties

displayed confidence

Mrs Davies said

and did not mention any issues

that she would expect Jade

However,

the term show much lower levels of success

Jade thus seems able to learn the

but appears to find it harder to

However,

Jade regularly

She also made regular spelling mistakes

usually in relation to

correctly complete a worksheet

on adverbs

immediately after the modelled and guided phases of a lesson

observable improvements
immediately after the modelled and guided phases of a lesson (J_45). However, she did not seem to integrate other word types, that had been recently taught (L_19), into her writing (J_41, 46); perhaps showing that she was not connecting her construction of texts to these discretely learned skills. However, there are observable improvements between the work samples Jade produced at the beginning of the year and during the data collection period (see Figures 4.5 & 4.6 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jade seemed to</th>
<th>For example,</th>
<th>Jade was observed to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.5 Jade’s Work Sample (30.6.08)
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Figure 4.6 Jade’s Work Sample (31.1.08)
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Anna told me that Steve does not usually bring work home, and most of the writing that occurs around Jade at home is for organisational purposes, such as shopping lists and writing on the calendar. Anna said that Jade will cross items off the shopping list, but does not write it out herself. Jade did not seem to do any writing at home with Anna or Steve and was not required to do any writing herself, other than her homework. On Jade’s display board were pinned four pieces of paper with Jade’s handwriting on, which read: ‘I love you mum and dad’; ‘I love you’; ‘I love dancing’; and ‘[Liam’s (her brother)] selles’ (on an envelope full of cut squares of blank paper). However, similarly evaluating Jade’s literacy practices at home and school and how other see the practices.

| -                | -            | -                    |

- she prefers writing in
- Jade was engaged
- and showed similar
- enjoyment and interest when
- a variety of
- computer skills
- when using the Mac

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-</th>
<th>Anna told me</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ann told me
- Anna said that
- but does not
- write it out
- herself
- Jade did not seem
to do any writing
- and was not
required to do

- Steve does not usually bring work home
- most of the writing
- such as shopping
- lists and
- other than her homework.
to her reading, Jade does not often choose to write at home. When she does, it is most often on the computer. Anna explained that Jade:

likes to do lists, lists of kids’ names in columns. Like being a teacher…she did a list the other day – I haven’t got it, she’s got it – and, um, she had all the kids names, and on Monday they’ve got running, so she, she got on Kid Pix and did a column for Monday and for running. So she likes to be, like, organised. Yeah, organised (J_48.11).

[4.BI] When asked directly, Jade told me that she prefers writing in her story-writing book (J_67.1). However, in addition to writing voluntarily at home on Kid Pix, Jade was seen to write voluntarily on Word during a technology lesson (J_64).

[4.BJ] Jade was engaged throughout the whole hour of this technology lesson, and showed similar enjoyment and interest when using other digital texts at school (J_46.5). Despite having a PC at home, Jade displayed a variety of computer skills when using the Mac computers: navigating through a maths game and the school intranet; efficiently using word processing software; and using some computer terminology (J_46, 62, 64). She was also seen to verbalise her actions and read relevant text aloud on several occasions. Another digital text Jade was seen to engage with at school was the computer library catalogue. She was aware that a keyword needed to be typed into the search bar on the first page but then asked “now what do you do?”, perhaps showing she did not remember what they had recently been taught (J_60).

[4.BK] At home, Jade plays various computer games (J_48) and was observed to be very competent at navigating through two Playstation games (J_27). Anna explained that the internet is utilised regularly in the household, to follow up areas of interest or to answer unknown questions, although this might be done by her parents, rather than together:

- She was aware that a keyword needed to be typed into the search bar
- any writing herself
  - However, similarly to her reading.
  - Jade does not often choose to write at home.
  - Anna explained that
  - Jade told me that
  - However,
  - Jade was seen to write voluntarily on
  - Despite having a
  - Jade displayed
  - She was also seen to verbalise
  - Jade was seen to engage with
  - but then asked
  - perhaps showing
  - she did not remember

- On Jade’s display board
  - When she does,
  - it is most often on the computer
  - When asked directly
  - in addition to writing voluntarily at home on Kid Pix,
  - throughout the whole hour of this technology lesson,
  - read relevant text aloud on several occasions

- Evaluating the use of new technology in the literacy practices of Jade both at home and school.
  - very competent at navigating
  - Jade had been using the computer and
  - and was observed to be
  - Anna explained that
  - although

- At home,
  - Jade plays various computer games
  - the internet is utilised regularly rather than together
Interviewer: And do you go on the internet sometimes at home or at school?
Jade: Um, at school
Interviewer: At school sometimes?...and is that hard or is that easy?
Jade: Um, OK

[A.4.BL] Anna told me that Jade had been using the computer and watching television since she was about 2-2 ½ years old (J_66.1). According to the parent checklists, playing on the computer made up 38% of the texts Jade engaged with on 16th July and watching television made up 31% (J_51). Similarly, on the 24th July, 54% of the texts she engaged with throughout the day were digital (J_52). When Jade was asked if it was easy to understand television and movies, she said “kind of” (J_24). Anna said that Jade usually only asks whether things are real whilst watching movies and television, but that she will ask more questions about the news or about particular words that are used (J_48.15). When asked “does she have any, sort of, favourite programs or movies that, that she watches?” Anna replied “where do I start!” and listed 12 of Jade’s favourites, which included both children’s and family programmes (J_48.14). Jade did not seem very engaged whilst watching the Wizard of Oz at school (J_23.1/2), but showed much more interest in popular culture associated with a more recent movie, Kung-Fu Panda (J_45.3).

Value, Purpose and Associated Boundaries
[A.4.BM] When talking about their own literacy experiences, Anna said: “we’re not readers. We don’t read any novels or anything like that. I guess the only thing we both probably do is, um, get on the net…if I’m interested in something, I’ll have a look on the net …but other than that, we don’t really” (J_48.13). Anna told me that when they do read, the main reason is for enjoyment and leisure, including looking at junk mail, catalogues, local newspapers, and the Saturday Mercury (newspaper). Thus Jade does not see her parents reading very often, especially not books. Jade saw one of the benefits of reading at night as being able to stay up later (J_67.1), which was also mentioned by her mum (J_48.13). The main purpose for Jade’s reading at home is either related to school work or for enjoyment and leisure.
and learning or is not the sole purpose of the activity itself, such as: following instructions on a computer game or reading names from television credits.

| A.4.BN | There seemed to be a strong emphasis on Jade’s reading at home being “correct”, with other interaction about books seeming to be initiated by Jade rather than Anna (J_48). Anna also seemed to place regular emphasis on phonics books. When Mrs Davies was asked about Jade’s reading, she similarly mentioned levelled readers: Interviewer: “what would you say her strengths and limitations are in regards to, to literacy?”
[Mrs Davies]: “…She has come on fantastic. Her, um, her reading levels have come up great”
…Interviewer: “and so what else do you realistically expect [Jade] to, to be able to achieve?”
[Mrs Davies]: “Well, I expect [Jade] to achieve, she’s got to 15, I think she’ll get to 18 by the end of the year” |

| A.4.BO | Jade’s voluntary writing at home seems to be for social and organisational purposes, as she constructs notes, letters, lists and tables (J_66.2). Anna did not seem to convey a strong positive or negative reaction to these texts (J_48) and Jade’s writing development does not seem to be viewed as being as important as her reading development at home. In relation to the sentences written for homework, the spelling had been corrected for: ‘I laugh when by friend aid something’, but no other comments had been added. Mrs Davies also mentioned spelling and legibility when talking about Jade’s writing skills, but seemed to place more value on the length and content of her texts. When asked about her expectations for Jade’s future writing development, she stated: I expect her to continue the type of story writing and writing tasks, but perhaps, be able to write a little bit longer, uh. |

|  | Evaluating how adults value and expect about Jade’s (voluntary) writing practices |
|  | - a strong emphasis on these texts |
|  | - home seems to be for social and parents’ expectations |
|  | - Anna did not seem to convey her expectations |
|  | - but no other comments |
|  | - Mrs Davies also mentioned but seemed to |
|  | as important as these texts |
|  | In relation to the sentences written |
|  | more value on |
|  | When asked about her expectations |
|  | experiment a little bit more. |
|  | Add a little bit more into her stories |
continue her lack of fear of getting anything wrong and perhaps start to experiment a little bit more. Add a little bit more into her stories (D_3.16-17).

[A.4.BP] Although she had not been diagnosed with dyslexia, one of the recommendations in Jade’s dyslexia assessment was to give her more time than other students and to be aware that she may be distracted by glare and noise (J_53.2), which seemed to happen frequently (eg. J_40, 42, 43, 45, 68, 71). However, due to the way lessons are structured, Jade was not given additional time to complete work and thus usually just produced a smaller amount of writing than her peers, such as the following being the result of a 36 minute writing lesson:

a hairy monster was under my bed it was eating chocolate It was called roxy I loved that name. there was two monster. The clock was real and the fridge was real aswell was not-produced a 36 minute writing lesson:

1. Evaluating the lack of extra time adult gave Jade as recommended by Jade’s dyslexia assessment
2. to be aware that
3. Although she had not been diagnosed with
4. That she may be distracted by glare and noise
5. However
due to the way
6. Jade was not
7. and thus usually just produced
8. give her more time than other students
9. additional time to complete work
10. a smaller amount of writing than her peers

[A.4.BQ] Anna told me that the main reason for Jade using digital technologies at home was enjoyment and leisure, including constructing short texts (similar to school). However, the value placed on digital texts (and associated boundaries) differed greatly between these settings. Anna seemed to value the television programmes that Jade enjoyed: “all the shows she likes we pretty much tape them and play them for her when she comes home in the afternoon” (J_48.15). The use of digital texts at home also seemed to be chosen more spontaneously, such as searching on the internet in response to a query.

Connections

[A.4.BR] When asked about her definition of literacy, Anna said: “I would put it down to reading. Reading. That’s basically what I think literacy is. Whether they can read and, I guess, write…would be part of that” (J_48.2). This was similar to Mrs Davies’ answer, although Anna did not mention oracy. There seemed to be similarities between Anna’s

| Acknowledging how adults view literacy | Jade’s creativity was stronger than her literacy skills | When asked about her definition of literacy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>literacy development in Jade.</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<th></th>
<th></th>
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</tr>
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<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
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and Mrs Davies’ opinions of Jade’s literacy acquisition, as well as in the terminology they used to explain this. Anna said that Jade’s creativity was stronger than her literacy skills: “but I guess she’s [got to] have those building blocks behind her” (J.48.17). She and Steve both said that Jade had made a lot of improvements this year. Mrs Davies similarly stated that Jade had “developed a lot of skills and I think she’s got a good basis there now. She’s overcome that hurdle that she’s had for the last 18 months” (D.3.16). Anna attributed this to both the MULTILIT ® programme and Mrs Davies’ teaching (J.48).

Anna’s Knowledge about School

[A.4.BS] Anna said that she asks Jade about what she does at school but will usually just “get all of what happened at lunch time!” (J.48.9). However Anna explained Jade sometimes makes spontaneous connections, as occurred in relation to the current integrated unit: she said “what are we going to have for dinner?” and I said “Chinese”. She said “oh, that comes from China then, does it Mum?” and I said “yes, it does”, you know. And she said “I’m learning all about China” and I said “what’s happening in China soon?” And she said “the Olympics”, so, yeah, it’s just. Yeah, little things like that, she will… I guess it sort of sticks in her head and then when, you know, she hears something that might be relevant she says it (J.48).

[A.4.BT] Anna told me that she also got information from friends who were parents (of which she had about twenty), notes home, informal conversations, and interviews organised by both herself and Mrs Davies. During the latter, Anna had been told about Jade’s improvements this year and shown examples of her work, such as handwriting. Anna additionally had first-hand knowledge about what Jade is like in the school setting: “she’s quite an outgoing little girl, which is quite
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Despite the knowledge Anna has about what Jade does at school, she found it difficult to answer how school builds on Jade’s interests (J_48.17). When asked about the similarities between home and school literacies, Anna replied: “Well, definitely the computer, because she does both there…she doesn’t watch TV at school. Although they do at lunch time!” (J_48.12). She did not mention reading at all and only mentioned writing as being different. There appeared to be tension between the reading strategies being promoted between home and at school. Anna placed emphasis on all words being read correctly (J_48.16) and phonics instruction: “we weren’t taught the phonics way and that’s how they are taught now, which I think is brilliant…so much better” (J_48.3). However Mrs Davies said that her focus is now on comprehension and fluency and Kate additionally suggested that Jade might rely too much on sounding out words and needs to check whether her reading makes sense (D_3; J_59.2).
Mrs Davies’ Knowledge about Home

[A.4.BV] Jade’s main hobbies seemed to be physical activities (such as dancing), digital texts and making creative crafts with paper (J_24, 27, 48, 70). However, when Mrs Davies was asked about Jade’s interests and activities out-of-school she said:

Jade is a girl, she is a real girl, you know, at this, the girls she hangs with, they’re all very similar. They’re only interested in putting their lipgloss on in the morning and, um, who’s whose friend. Um, what toys they get. Umm, who’s got the prettiest hair clip in and the nice scarf. [Jade] is a girly girl (D_3.18).

[A.4.BW] This answer was thus more aligned with the non-school interests Jade displayed at school, rather than what she does at home. Mrs Davies was aware of school-related literacy activities that occurred at home:

I know in Term 1 a lot of her time, Mum put into with a, a reading programme at home, so I do know that that took, cos Mum’s got other children, so that took up a lot of their time and I don’t believe she had a lot of after school time, in Term 1…I know Mum puts time in with [Jade], and whatever tasks she takes home, and the reading, I know Mum goes along with what I, the reading books, great support at home (D_3.18).

[A.4.BX] However, apart from Mrs Davies knowing about Jade being a “girly girl” and having had a reading programme implemented at home, she told me: “I honestly can’t say I know a lot more about what happens at home with [Jade]…I don’t know about other things that she does” (D_3.18). This seems to indicate that Mrs Davies does not attempt to learn about home interests and activities; perhaps influenced by a lack of time or other external restrictions: “you can only do the best that you can with what you’ve got and the time frame and all the rest of it” (D_3.4).
Mrs Davies does not attempt to learn about perhaps influenced by Anna’s and Mrs Davies’ Knowledge about Past Learning

When talking about the teaching that had been experienced previously by Jade’s class, Mrs Davies told me:

assessment tended to be anecdotal and not purely, not correctly assessed...So, the danger of that is that, um, children slip under the radar and are not, children with difficulties and problems are not identified (D_3.17).

However Anna stated that it was Jade’s Year 1 teacher who had identified her difficulties:

She was crying every [day]...this sort of continued and went on, on and off and she went into Year 1 and I said, I said to the teacher in Year 1, I said “oh, how’s she going?”. She said “she’s really, really struggling” and I went “what?”. First time I even knew about it...that Kindergarten teacher sort of said “look, she’s doing fine (J_48.3).

Jade’s reports from Year 1 and this year depict her effort in English as ‘excellent’, but her achievement as ‘limited’ or ‘basic’ (J_4.1).

Indirectly evaluating the literacy practices of Jade’s parents that affected her very much.
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- I always really struggled with school
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- he always struggled with, um, sounds and, and the

- Anna told me in the interview and I think that’s why poor [Jade], um, struggles with it a lot.

- I always was
got, we both struggled with that and I think that’s why poor Jade, um, struggles with it a lot (J_48.3).

[A.4.CC] Steve similarly said that he wondered if the reading difficulties were hereditary (J_50). Anna remembered watching a lot of Playschool when she was younger, but answered that she did not have any books at home, or get read to, when she was a child. She joked that they wouldn’t have recognised a book or known what to do with one. However, she stated that it was a personal choice not to read books as an adult, and that her sisters read a lot (J_66). Anna explained that she and Steve can find it hard to get Jade to read at home sometimes, due to their own personal literacy practices:

we do make her read, well she’s gotta do reading for [Mrs Davies], 15 minutes every night. So she does that. Um, we do try and do that on the weekends too, cos we know, well, she’s like me and my husband. We don’t read books at all either, so it’s hard to push her, but obviously, we wanna see her to, er, to do quite well, so, and we know she struggles with it, so we get her to read as much as we can (J_48.7-8).
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Jade’s Literacy: Summary

[A.4.CD] Jade’s case study data reveals a less successful and uneven process of school literacy acquisition thus far. This is despite the relationship which has been built between her parents and teacher; all of whom are supportive and anxious to support her progress. There appears to be considerable disjuncture between her home experiences, and those at school, despite a good deal of communication among adults in both sites.

Sumarizing what the author had in the discussion about the finding of Jade’s case.

- a less successful and uneven process
- to be considerable disjuncture between her home experiences, and those at school

Conclusion

[A.4.CE] This chapter has detailed the literacy experiences and practices of two children in their home/community and school contexts. Firstly it provided a comprehensive picture of the literacy programme fostered by the teacher in the classroom and experienced by both children. Then case study data pertaining to each child was presented. This included details being given of each child’s home environment, and of the interactions and practices observed and discussed in those settings. In addition, glimpses of the children’s lives in their classrooms were provided. Together these sections provide rich descriptions of the ways in which the children are negotiating their literate identities at home and school. The case study data reveals that for one child, school and home literacies are relatively smoothly aligned. However, for the other, there is considerable disjuncture. The descriptions also reveal major differences in the connections between homes and school, in regards to what knowledge the adult participants had about the other context in which the students’ learn literacies and to past learning in these contexts. The next chapter will explicitly address the research questions, by linking the findings described above to relevant information from the reviewed literature.
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### Chapter Five: Discussion

#### Introduction

[A.5.A] In the current climate, with an increasing emphasis on measurable literacy outcomes from the early years, the very practices which are intended to ensure such outcomes can militate against children drawing on their social experiences, producing disconnections even for children whom one would expect to be advantaged (Nichols, 2003, pp.85/6)

[A.5.B] This research investigated and described the diverse literacy experiences of two children across their school and home contexts. It was underpinned by sociocultural approaches and the framework of multiliteracies, and thus took a very broad view of what constituted “literacy”. This chapter brings together the information obtained from relevant literature, the study’s methodology, the data analysis and research findings. In doing so, it responds to the questions framing the study by detailing the continuities and discontinuities that the case study students experience when transitioning between their home and school literacies. As (justify) Stake (1995) asserts (acknow) may be (enter) the case with qualitative case studies, some of the findings of the research were unexpected (attitude). In answering the second research question, specific (focus) suggestions are proposed (enter) for furthering the students’ school literacy learning, in addition to general implications for teaching practice. **Finally** (focus), recommendations are outlined for future research in this area.

#### Section One: Transitions between home and school literacies

[A.5.C] This section addresses the first research question: **What is the nature of the transition between the home/community literacies and school literacies of two children, who have been identified as having differing levels of school literacy acquisition?**

[A.5.D] Due to (justify) the narrow focus of each sub-question, as well as the limitations placed on the extent of this discussion, each will not be addressed individually. The findings of the students’ home and school literacies were explicitly described in the previous chapter and have been summarised in Figures B.5.1 and B.5.2 (below). These diagrams depict the ways in which

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Communicative Purpose</th>
<th>Stages/phases</th>
<th>Appraisal analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1: Introductory Restatement of Phase 1. Referencing to previous research</strong></td>
<td>- were unexpected (attitude).</td>
<td>- and thus took a very broad view of - it responds to the questions - by detailing the continuities and - As (justify) - Stake (1995) asserts (acknow) - may be (enter) the case with - are proposed (enter) for</td>
<td>- the diverse literacy experiences - In doing so. - some of the findings - In answering the second research question. - specific (focus) suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2. Orienting readers and justifying the presentation of the discussion</strong></td>
<td>Neil was found to have greater continuity than</td>
<td>- Due to (justify) - each will not be addressed individually. - These diagrams depict the ways - what the data showed - The diagrams show - that the adults, in turn, are affected by - conveys the connections between</td>
<td>- the narrow focus of - as well as the - were explicitly described - as well as outlining - the main literacy experiences - were directly influenced by - multiple factors - in regards to the - as well as the purposes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Phase 1. Summary of Findings** | Neil was found to have greater continuity than | - Due to (justify) - each will not be addressed individually. - These diagrams depict the ways - what the data showed - The diagrams show - that the adults, in turn, are affected by - conveys the connections between | - the narrow focus of - as well as the - were explicitly described - as well as outlining - the main literacy experiences - were directly influenced by - multiple factors - in regards to the - as well as the purposes | | | |**GRADUATION** |**ENGAGE** |**ATTITUDE** |
reading, writing and the use of digital texts occurred at school, as well as outlining what the data showed to be the main literacy experiences for each child in their home/community context. The diagrams show that both students’ experiences were directly influenced by the decisions made by Mrs Davies and their parents, and that the adults, in turn, are affected by multiple factors in their decision making. In the side columns of Figures B.5.1 and B.5.2 there is a summary of: the purposes for literacy practices being undertaken; what was found to be valued in relation to these literacies; and the level of student choice and control over their literacy experiences. The direction of the arrows in these diagrams convey the connections between the students’ home and school experiences, thus providing insight into both the level of continuity between these settings and the lines of communication which were found to occur. As will be explained throughout this section Neil was found to have greater continuity than Jade in regards to the experiences occurring, as well as the purposes, value and boundaries associated with these experiences. This section will firstly examine the similarities and differences between the students’ home and school literacies and will then address the home-school connection separately.

| A.5.E | a. - What are the children’s home/community literacies?  
| b. - What are the children’s school literacies?  
| c. - What are the similarities/continuities across these contexts?  
| d. - What are the differences/discontinuities across these contexts? |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------|
| A.5.f | Neil demonstrated a high level of knowledge and skills in relation to all areas of observed literacy. It was found, perhaps unsurprisingly, that there was greater continuity between his home and school literacies than Jade; in relation to (focus) the literacies which were valued, the experiences provided and the purpose of using literacies (see Figures B.5.1 and B.5.2 above). This seemed to be (enter) principally (intens) because (justify) his mum, Brenda (a primary school teacher herself and thus in possession of “insider” knowledge), encouraged a variety of school-type literacies at home. For example, documenting everyday events through linguistic and visual modes (eg, required journals) was highly valued in Neil’s home, providing a direct link between his home and school literacy experiences. Another similarity was the volume of books available to Neil and the fact that he was read to and encouraged to read regularly in both settings. In a large-scale study of children’s home and school literacies, Cairney and Ruge (1998, p.57) similarly found (acknow) that ‘the students who were most academically successful were those whose family literacy practices reproduced school literacy practices. Those who were less academically successful did not share the home dominance of school literacy’. Whilst Jade had made dramatic improvements this school year in regards to reading and writing, she was still struggling to meet some school literacy standards. | - Phase 2. Claims about the literacies of both children: their advantaged or disadvantaged; and adult influence.  
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[A.5.g] The adults’ decisions about which literacy experiences to provide for the children seemed to be guided (enter) by: the children themselves; external factors or requirements; and what they personally valued (see Figures B.5.1 and B.5.2). The latter is linked to their definitions of literacy, which were reasonably similar for Mrs Davies, Anna and Brenda. These primarily involved reading, with writing included afterwards. This view is consistent with assertions that literacy is still widely assumed to solely involve print texts (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Knobel & Lankshear, 2006). Mrs Davies and Brenda subsequently mentioned talking and listening, possibly (enter) due to (justify) their knowledge of the NSW English K-6 Syllabus (NSW Board of Studies, 1998). Brenda also added “road signs”. Thus digital texts were not (deny) involved or mentioned; despite (counter) many authors and researchers arguing that being literate in the 21st century involves the construction and interpretation of various digital, technological, visual, audio and multimodal texts (eg, Bull & Anstey, 2007; Durrant & Green, 2000; Hill, 2005; Kalantzis & Cope, 2000; Kress, 2000; Snyder, 2001).

[A.5.h] Brenda stated (acknow) that she believes (acknow) many parents think literacy is something which happens at school. She appeared to be (enter) trying to provide a balance by requiring Neil to undertake certain reading and writing activities at home, although (counter) did not seem to think (enter) it necessary for school to integrate Neil’s other home literacies (eg, consulting television guides, completing word puzzles and browsing Lego magazines). Anna also seemed to (enter) view the reading of print texts as a school activity that was being practised at home. She similarly did not seem to consider (enter) the other practices that Jade displayed at home (eg, reading television credits, navigating through a video game, or writing notes using Kid Pix) as being learning experiences. Thus literacy seemed to be (enter) viewed by all of the adult participants as a school-learned and -valued product, which was not necessarily connected to the everyday needs and reasons for using various literacy practices in home/community settings. Cairney and Ruge (1998) propose (acknow) four ways in which literacy has been defined or constructed, two of which seem (enter) consistent with the views of the adult participants in this study. These are “literacy as knowledge”, where an adult monitors the acquisition or reproduction and was both read to, and encouraged to read, regularly. - what they personally valued These primarily involved reading - seemed to be guided (enter) by - These primarily involved reading - Mrs Davies and Brenda subsequently mentioned talking - possibly (enter) - due to (justify) their knowledge of - Brenda also added - Thus digital texts were not (deny) involved - despite (counter) - ) many authors and researchers arguing that
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Neil to undertake certain reading and - by all of the adult participants - which was not necessarily connected - In relation to school.
of certain knowledge, and “literacy as performance”, through which literacy is seen as (enter) a set of skills that students demonstrate proficiency in. In relation to school, these definitions place the teacher as an expert about what “literacy” is and how it can be appropriately assessed.

| [A.5.i] The fact that both Jade and Neil had a variety of books at home seems to show (enter) that it is not just the available texts which are influential to their literacy acquisition. Brenda explained (acknow) that she and Brian have always tried to (enter) extend Neil’s vocabulary, by “using big words” and never “talking down” to him, and have read to him every day since he was a baby. Brenda additionally stated (acknow) that she had tried (enter) teaching Neil to read before he started school and that, although (counter) he had not wanted to, she believes (distance) his rapid acquisition of school literacies is related to the “strong foundation” which he already had through their activities and interactions with him. Thus Neil has acquired a variety of school-valued literacies from his mum who, as a teacher, has a wealth of knowledge about the kind of reading, writing, speaking and listening that is expected at school. Although (counter) Jade’s homework and home reading sessions were not observed, interview data seemed to (enter) indicate differences in the type of interactions and prompting which occurred at home and school; particularly in regards to the reading strategies used. Additionally, despite (counter) the reading experiences provided for her, writing and oracy did not seem to be emphasized (enter). These findings are congruent with the views of many authors, who have written (acknow) that having access to particular texts is not sufficient to develop literacies (eg, Freebody & Freiberg, 2001; Gee, 1990; Heath, 1978; Street, 1998; van Krieken et al., 2000; van Steensel, 2006). These authors assert (acknow) that learning to read occurs through a process of socialisation and thus that the interactions occurring around texts are vital. |

| [A.5.j] As already argued, the idea that tacitly acquired knowledge can (enter) put some children at an advantage at school has been asserted by influential authors such as Bourdieu (1986), Gee (1990) and Gonzalez et al. (1993). Neil’s gradual acquisition and understanding of particular cultural capital, Discourse or funds of knowledge, has been occurring since he was very young. Bourdieu (1986) argues (acknow) that teachers may assume (enter) some children to have more ability than others because (justify) they have unconsciously acquired |
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certain ways of thinking, speaking and acting. Mrs Davies “did” consider (acknow) Neil to have a much higher level of school literacy acquisition, but (counter) also assumed (enter) “there may be actually more literacy happening at home than in the average household because mum is a teacher”, with “literacy” obviously representing her definition, involving print texts and oracy.

[A.5.k] It seems (enter) that the type of literacies parents participated in themselves may also have affected (enter) the children’s view (and value) of literacy. For example, when Neil was asked what he thought he might need (enter) reading and writing for as an adult, he listed many activities related to what he sees his parents doing, including: “to be able to do “research” for scientific things” (Brian was studying at home at the time). The fact that the majority of the literacy experiences that Neil’s parents engaged in were related to print texts is another point of continuity between his home and school literacies. Alternatively, Jade did not see (deny) her parents engaging with print-texts as regularly, as neither (deny) of them were studying. Steve did not (deny) bring work home and Anna stated: “we’re not readers. We don’t read any novels or anything like that. I guess the only thing we both probably do is, um, get on the net…if I’m interested in something, I’ll have a look on the net…but other than that, we don’t really…yeah, we’re not readers at all”. Thus the funds of knowledge that Jade’s parents had were strongly linked to new technologies, and digital texts were highly valued and used more often in their household. This was the main (ints) discontinuity between Jade’s home and school literacies.

[A.5.L] Research studies have found similar links between parents’ choice of literacy experiences and their children’s literacy acquisition (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; van Steensel, 2006). Some authors make a clear connection between mid-high SES homes, particular literacy experiences, and school success (Freebody et al., 1995; Gee, 1990; Marsh, 2003). Although Jade comes from a mid-high SES background and “does” have school-valued literacy experiences (in relation to reading) at home, this has not yet (deny) equated to her acquiring school literacies easily; thus showing the importance of not (deny) generalising or assuming. The findings of Jade’s case study is more congruent with those of van Steensel (2006), who found (acknow) that there were parents from a range of SES backgrounds who seemed to (enter) consider literacy as being important for their children, but who did not (deny) place emphasis on their own (print) literacy use. For example, Jade’s parents valued her development of reading skills, despite not regularly reading print-texts themselves: “she’s like me and my husband. We don’t read books at all either, so it’s hard to (enter) push her, but obviously, we want to see her...do quite
well, so, and we know she struggles with it, so we get her to read as much as we can”. It must be noted (enter), however, that van Steensel (2006) did not consider (acknow) general television viewing (eg, non-educational programmes) and the decoding of visual images as being examples of literacy. In contrast (counter), various multimodal digital texts were an integral part of this study.

| A.5.M | Amongst the aims for reading stated in her programme, Mrs Davies has included (acknow) aspects which are consistent with three of the practices of Luke and Freebody’s (1999) four resources model. For example: ‘to develop meaning making strategies through use of cueing systems’ (code-breaker practices); ‘to develop fluency and confidence through acquisition of knowledge, structure and flow of language’ and ‘to foster a love of reading’ (text participant practices); and ‘to promote an interest in a variety of genres’ (text user practices). Although Mrs Davies was seen to (enter) model text user skills, decoding and comprehension were the only assessed factors when Mrs Davies was deciding if a child was ready to move onto a higher reading level; as outlined by the schools’ emphasis on levelled readers (S.11) and the assessment kits used (PM Benchmarks, 2005). There are no (deny) listed aims in Mrs Davies’ programme which relate to text analyst practices, or critical literacy, and there appeared to (enter) be a lack of emphasis on these skills in observed lessons. This is consistent with the assertions of Freebody et al. (1995) and Hunt (2001), who state (acknow) that these complex literacies are often not (deny) apparent in classrooms.

| A.5.N | Also similar to Freebody et al.’s (1995) findings, Mrs Davies placed more emphasis on explicit, skills-based teaching for students with lower rates of literacy acquisition. She stated (acknow) that children need to learn (enter) to read with books that are closely associated with their current abilities (in relation to vocabulary and length), so that they can experience success. She believes students should broaden the books they read when reaching the level of being an independent reader, so that they can then choose to read books they are interested in. In her practice, this was apparent in the strict boundaries on which texts different children could choose from. There were wider school decisions which were similar, such as a five finger test being used during library lessons; where children are advised not to choose books of which they cannot
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read five or more words on any one page. These boundaries may have affected Jade’s motivation to read in class, as she did not have access to a range of books that were meaningful and relevant to her (Ashton-Warner, 1980).

[A.5.0] Thus far, the discussion has focused on the greater continuity found between Neil’s home and school literacies than Jade’s. However another main finding of this research was that there were actually discontinuities between both of the children’s home literacies and school. At school, the main purpose of literacy activities were learning, practising and being assessed on particular skills (see Figures B.5.1 and B.5.2). There was a strong emphasis on learning “about” the features of language, in English lessons, and learning “through” language in other subject areas (including integrated units). This was evident in the separation of the teaching of spelling, handwriting, grammar and text types, which is consistent with the value placed on these skills by school-produced documentation and wider policy and curriculum documents (Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, 2005; NSW Board of Studies, 1998). Cairney and Ruge (1998, pp.35-36) made similar findings and asserted that at most classroom tasks and activities were, at best, simulations of ‘real’ activities...[and that]...children’s engagement in literacy-related tasks was overwhelmingly directed towards learning how to successfully engage in school literacy tasks’. This is why Shockley et al. (1995) refer to school literacy practices as “artificial”. It is argued that the chance of literacy being taught in segmented ways is increased by teachers not having enough time, as external demands can result in teachers focusing on dominant pedagogy (Gonzalez et al., 1993; Hammond, 2001; Heath, 1983; Knobel, 2001; Topfer, 2003).

[A.5.P] In contrast to school, it was found that many home literacies were strongly linked to practical purposes with relevant, meaningful outcomes. This was true of both the students’ experiences, and the activities occurring around them, such as consulting the calendar, writing shopping lists, or spontaneously searching the internet. Similar findings have resulted from previous studies of children’s home literacies (eg. Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Freebody et al., 1995; Heath, 1983; Marsh & Thompson, 2001). Barton and Hamilton (1998), for example (enter), categorised (acknow) six areas of daily life in which reading and writing were integral. These are depicted in Table B.5.1 (below), which shows how these areas were relevant to the home and school lives of the case study students (although this is limited to information collected during the study).

[A.5.Q] This table demonstrates that the majority of school experiences were related to sense making (learning and researching), whilst home literacies were more diverse, with the majority revolving around various texts being used for the
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purpose of fun and leisure. Table B.5.1 shows that a major school literacy experience (diary writing) is also required in Neil’s home, but that there is no known equivalent that Jade engages in. Both children constructed texts with the purpose of communicating with others and Jade’s voluntary texts also sometimes had an organisational purpose. However, none of these were apparently known about at school. Previous studies have also shown that the texts and literacy experiences most relevant and meaningful to children were the least often integrated into the school curriculum (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Heath, 1983; Nichols, 2003). Many researchers have asserted that school literacy activities are often individually completed, for a singular purpose (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Freebody & Freiberg, 2001; Heath, 1983; Nichols, 2003). As depicted by Figures B.5.1 and B.5.2, both children engaged in various literacy experiences regularly as a natural part of life. Thus, as a number of researchers have argued (eg, Freebody, 2007; Gonzalez et al., 1993; Heath, 1983), a wider range of literacies were apparent in children’s home/community settings than at school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose/area of everyday life</th>
<th>Neil – Home</th>
<th>Jade – Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organising life</td>
<td>- Constructs charts and tables</td>
<td>- Constructs charts and tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal communication</td>
<td>- Writes and reads letters and e-mails</td>
<td>- Writes notes and letters to friends and Mrs Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private leisure</td>
<td>- Limited chances for voluntary reading, writing and use of digital texts during free-choice time</td>
<td>- Occasionally reads (magazines, books and papers) - Occasionally writes (stories and poems) - Restricted opportunities with digital texts (TV, computer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting life</td>
<td>- Required diary writing (sometimes published on the computer)</td>
<td>- Required journal writing - Scrapbook of holiday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense making</th>
<th>Social participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Frequent learning about specific features and conventions of language</td>
<td>- Whole-class and small-group shared reading lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Opportunities to learn from books and the internet in relation to an integrated unit (The Olympics/China)</td>
<td>- Opportunities for sharing and discussing books during library lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Researches school projects with his mum (for her teaching)</td>
<td>- Shared reading at bedtime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Researches personal interests in dragons and monsters (books)</td>
<td>- Movies watched as a family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family regularly researches topics of interest (internet)</td>
<td>- Joint engagement with cartoons and article headings in papers/magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visits to the public library</td>
<td>- Visits to the public library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Joint use of the internet and</td>
<td>- Joint use of the internet (possibly)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[A.5.S] Table B.5.1 highlights another major discontinuity between the students’ home and school literacies, which is the differing level that digital texts are integrated into everyday activities. It was especially pertinent to Jade - but a similarity between the students - that digital texts were enjoyed and used in a variety of ways for multiple purposes at home. For example, interview data revealed that members of both households regularly watched movies and used the internet or computer software (which involved other areas of literacy, such as reading, as well). However, there were boundaries placed on Neil’s use of digital texts which mirrored school boundaries. At school, computers were used for a limited length of time, when directed by the teachers. Often the predominant purpose was to publish writing: “I do focus on word processing. I do want them to develop those skills. I’m not so much interested in the fact that they can research on the internet. I want them to be able to produce a simple piece of writing”. Mrs Davies also made a clear distinction between software that was beneficial to other areas of learning and that which was not, which was again similar to Brenda’s views: “you can choose games that have an educational benefit, and you can choose games that don’t; so why not choose the games that...”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense making</th>
<th>Social participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- another major discontinuity</td>
<td>- another major discontinuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a limited length of time, where the predominant purpose was</td>
<td>- a limited length of time, where the predominant purpose was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I’m not so much interested in</td>
<td>- I’m not so much interested in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I want them to</td>
<td>- I want them to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- was beneficial to other areas of</td>
<td>- was beneficial to other areas of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- and that which was not</td>
<td>- and that which was not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- an educational benefit, why not</td>
<td>- an educational benefit, why not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- that don’t</td>
<td>- that don’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- that do?”</td>
<td>- that do?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are sufficient</td>
<td>- are sufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Table B.5.1 highlights but a similarity between the students. For example, Mrs Davies also made a clear distinction between software that was beneficial to other areas of learning and that which was not, which was again similar to Brenda’s views: “you can choose games that have an educational benefit, and you can choose games that don’t; so why not choose the games that...”

- It was especially pertinent to Jade, who was interested in educational benefits, especially in a variety of ways for multiple purposes at home. At school, Mrs Davies focused on word processing and software that was beneficial for educational purposes. In addition, these sources argue that...
It has been identified that many schools place time and content restrictions on ICT use (Australian Computer Society, 2005; Furlong et al., 2000; Snyder et al., 2002). In addition, these sources argue that it is common for schools to hold the belief that having access to computers, and the teaching of word processing and basic computer skills, are sufficient to constitute ICT literacy.

The other way in which adult participants’ decisions about literacy experiences were affected was by external factors (see Figures B.5.1 and B.5.2). In Anna’s case, this appeared to mainly relate to day-to-day requirements (eg, shopping) and what she was expected to implement to assist Jade’s reading (eg, homework and the MULTILIT programme). However, Brenda and Mrs Davies also had the influence of knowledge about the English K–6 Syllabus and current and future outcomes (NSW Board of Studies, 1998). Mrs Davies’ curriculum and pedagogy was additionally affected by both the time available, and by school policies and decisions which, in turn, are influenced by wider policy and curriculum requirements (Commonwealth of Australia, 1998; 2005; NSW Department of School Education, 1997). It seemed that the intensification of teachers’ work had restricted Mrs Davies’ ability to respond to children’s individual literacies. She explained that she had begun to use commercial resources due to time restraints and now made booklets from photocopied worksheets for lessons on discrete writing skills. She also stated in her interview: “you can only do the best that you can with what you’ve got and the time frame and all the rest of it”. Much of the literature similarly identified time and energy as being factors that can prevent teachers finding out about children’s home literacies (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; González et al., 1993; Heath, 1983; Knobel, 2001).

### Phase 5. Raising another case of external factor that influences adults’ decision on literacy experiences
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### Phase 6. Claiming the distinctiveness of the study
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e. - What are the current home-school connections and lines of communication?

Unlike the findings of Cairney and Ruge (1998) and Freebody et al. (1995), this study did not indicate that the teacher linked Jade’s lower rate of literacy acquisition to a lack of parental support. Mrs Davies actually spoke very admirably about the time and effort that Anna dedicated to assisting Jade’s reading. It was found that there was a stronger relationship between Mrs Davies and Anna than Mrs Davies and Brenda, which was surprising in light of the themes apparent in the literature about home-school connections benefiting students’ learning (González et al., 1993; Heath, 1983; Shockley et al., 1995). The rapport between Anna and Mrs Davies had been built up through frequent contact, which Anna explained included school reports, notes coming home, newsletters, interviews and informal conversations. Brenda, however, met Mrs Davies??
Davies for the first time during the data collection period and seemed to know slightly less about school activities and learning. Barton and Hamilton (1998) state that, although there was a mixture of formal and informal modes of communication between home and school in their study, the parents actually found out more from each other. This form of gaining information was mentioned by all adult participants but, whilst Brenda only seemed to have regular contact with one other mum from the school, Anna stated that she was friends with a group of about twenty parents.

[A.5.V] There was a dominant school discourse regarding the importance of strong home-school relationships, which Mrs Davies seemed to participate in. This discourse was strongly associated with ways in which parents could become involved (by helping) in school activities and learning. Suggestions for parents included volunteering with reading group activities and assisting students with homework. The homework set by Mrs Davies was consistent with school policy, in that it mostly involved reading a particular text over the course of a week, which Nichols (2003) explains is often the focus for the early primary school years. The school specified explicit ways in which parents should be involved in home reading:

For the first night they should discuss the title and illustrations, and ask the child to predict what the story is about. The parent should then read the book fully, talk about it and ask questions… (S.11).

[A.5.W] In addition to home reading, Neil and Jade were expected to write out the week’s spelling words daily and construct a sentence involving one of these words. Thus, the homework activities were extensions of school lessons, which were removed from the social context in which other home literacies occur. Cairney and Ruge (1998, p.63) similarly found that, although homework can be a vital link between home and school learning, it was often just another task to be completed in any way possible. The way in which school-type activities were extended as homework activities also seemed to have been influenced by school requirements. The school’s “Homework Policy” (1999) states that homework helps to build on what students have learnt in the classroom…It is a vital part of the home-school partnership. Several authors assert that home-school partnerships are quite often limited to parents participating in ways specified by the school, in this way (Cairney, 2003; Freebody et al., 1995; Shockley et al., 1995).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A.5.X) Although homework and other school-related activities were observed to pervade both children’s homes, their home literacies did not seem to be integrated into the school curriculum. Anna and Brenda initially found it difficult to answer when asked about home-school similarities and how school built on their child’s interests, before subsequently mentioning school learning which Neil and Jade had shown an interest in. Similar patterns of answering these questions were noted in Marsh’s (2003) study. Other research has similarly shown school practices to be evident in homes, but diverse home literacies not seeming to be acknowledged and integrated at school (Cairney &amp; Ruge, 1998; Heath, 1983). Interestingly, the school learning that both parents mentioned in this study was related to integrated units (such as The Olympics) rather than specific English lessons. These units made links to knowledge and experiences the students had out-of-school, such as watching Olympic events on television. The resulting interest shown by the children had led to additional literacy practices being undertaken at home, including conversations and internet research. Thus, it seems that these flexible, integrated units made a more meaningful connection to a variety of home literacies than other literacy lessons (Cope &amp; Kalantzis, 2000; Murdoch et al., 2001; Nichols, 2003).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A.5.Y) As mentioned briefly above, it seemed as though literacy was viewed by all participants as something which occurred at school, and that home literacies were not integrated because they were deemed as being separate from school curriculum. When Mrs Davies was asked about Jade’s home literacies, for example, she mentioned homework and the phonics programme that had been implemented at home. Similarly Brenda and Anna often spoke about school literacies in their interviews (eg. reading certain texts), but did not seem to view some other practices (eg. navigating through computer games) as being equivalent literacy learning. As a result of this apparent distinction, the home-school communication tended to be a one-way dialogue. In interviews and school-produced documents it became apparent that the purpose of school interviews was to share and explain school learning to parents and suggest possible learning strategies to be implemented at home in order to support school literacy development. School-produced information for teachers also outlined this process in a linear mode: Figure B.5.3 Linear Method of Reporting to Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A.5.Z) As explained by authors such as Hammond (2001), departmental policy and curriculum documents can sometimes assert the importance of a concept without making it clear how it will be achieved. This could be seen as being true in relation to reciprocal parent-teacher partnerships and the integration of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students’ home learning. For example, it is suggested in the NSW English K–6 Syllabus that teachers should [d]evelop shared beliefs and understanding in the school community about the teaching and learning of talking, listening, reading and writing’ (NSW Board of Studies, 1998, p.86). However, no further advice is provided as to how this should be achieved, or what it will look like when it has. Another preventative factor in developing more reciprocal home-school relationships is the limited time available for teachers to meet the many demands placed on them. This is a recurring theme asserted across much of the literature (eg, Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Gonzalez et al., 1993; Knobel, 2001).

### Section Two: Implications for teaching practice

[A.5.AA] This section addresses the second research question:

**How might the students be further assisted with their school literacy learning?**

**a. How might the information obtained about students’ literacies be used to enhance their acquisition of school literacy?**

**Neil**

[A.5.AB] As Neil is apparently already benefiting from the continuity between certain literacy experiences he has at home and school, less attention will be given to his further literacy acquisition in this section. However, implications for teaching have arisen in regards to the discontinuities that are present between his home and school literacies. This is predominantly in relation to the purpose for activities, with many of his home literacy experiences occurring for a specific, meaningful reason. Such activities could be integrated into the school curriculum, without affecting the outcomes which are being worked towards. For example, Neil could be asked to write letters or e-mails to his peers or people outside of the classroom or school. He could also be required to create texts that may be displayed around the school, such as posters or expositions arguing a certain point. This is a way in which more text-analyst skills could be integrated into English lessons (Freebody et al., 1995). It may also assist in improving Neil’s presentation of work; an aspect which both Mrs Davies and his mother mentioned.

[A.5.AC] Another way in which Neil’s handwriting, or other writing conventions, could be improved is for the current practice of self-editing to be extended to self-assessing. This could take the form of a portfolio, which integrates a practice that occurs at Neil’s house; the compilation of a brag book, where photos of completed jigsaws are displayed. By self-editing and assessing his produced work, as well as sharing texts with a wider variety of audiences,
Neil may be assisted in developing from ‘conventional writing’, to ‘proficient writing’ (Campbell et al., 2003, pp.139-141). Another way to link Neil’s home and school literacies would be to set tasks (such as for homework) which are more flexible, and personally relevant. Examples may be requiring him to gradually construct his own ‘Lego magazine’, writing cloze passages, designing games and drawing comic strips (which he was seen to have done in one of his home journal entries). These could then be ‘published’ by being copied and shared with peers.

| A.5.AE | In relation to Brenda’s concerns about Neil not extending himself, Mrs Davies’ suggestion could be adhered to, that of providing him with access to more complex factual texts. Neil was seen to search for and locate several factual texts in the school library, which he subsequently seemed to enjoy reading during the remaining borrowing time and at home. However, he was observed to choose the same books regularly in the classroom, indicating that Mrs Davies may be able to further extend Neil’s reading by borrowing a range of complex factual texts from the library which are more relevant to his personal interests, such as dragons, monsters and investigators. |
| A.5.AF | During whole-class and individual work, Jade was seen to spend more time engaged and on-task when sitting near the front of the group during modelled reading lessons; sitting with a smaller number of peers (who were not her close friends) during writing; and when typing her diary entry directly onto | - Phase 2. Proposing possible way to help Jade by more scaffolded small-group work, or by buddying with a peer with a higher level of school literacy acquisition |

| Jade | [A.5.AE] Jade often got distracted during literacy lessons and spent time looking around the room or talking to peers. Tally event sample observations showed that Jade frequently spent the largest amount of time disengaged during the middle of an activity. However, this only seemed to be the case when students were completing individual tasks. During one observation of a guided reading group activity, Jade was observed to spend over 90% of her time on-task. She was also seen to answer questions and orally read more often in reading group activities, because of both the greater opportunity to participate and an apparent increase in her confidence in these situations. Thus, Jade may be assisted in increasing her on-task behaviours, and the quality of the work she produces, if more scaffolded small-group work occurred. If not possible for Jade to be scaffolded by an adult in a small group situation, Jade’s writing development may alternatively be assisted by providing opportunities for group construction of texts, or by “buddying” Jade with a peer who has a higher level of school literacy acquisition. |
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the computer. Thus, Jade may also be assisted in spending more time on-task if she is seated where she can see the text being read or written, and where other visual or aural distractions are limited. A similar recommendation was given in Jade’s assessment for dyslexia (although she was not diagnosed with this condition). It may also reduce the amount of time Jade spends off-task if she is required to work beside peers who are not her close friends, particularly in lessons where she has been identified as perhaps requiring more time than other students, such as story-writing. Requiring Jade to write texts directly onto the computer is one way in which a link might be made to her home literacies, whilst she is seated away from the distractions of multiple peers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[A.5.AG] Jade seems to have a very social nature. This was indicated by multiple sources of data depicting her regular interactions with peers and the socially-orientated texts she produced at home. This aspect of her personality could also be used as a way of further assisting her school literacy learning. Nichols (2003, p.96) states that:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mundane dramas [such as mending a ‘temporarily broken friendship’] are a much underrated source of inspiration for children’s literacy. Activities drawing on this social world could…develop their repertoires of literacy practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[A.5.AH] Some literacy activities could thus be designed which involve interviewing, recording notes and opinions, writing and exchanging letters and organising classroom and friendship matters. This would allow multiple outcomes to be worked towards, whilst the literacy experience itself has a meaningful and engaging purpose which links to activities Jade chooses to do at home. Being required to share texts with peers may also assist in Jade’s consideration of the audience for her writing (Campbell et al., 2003). Additionally, she may be more motivated to read books or stories that have been written by herself and peers (instead of, or as well as, levelled readers).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A.5.A] Jade seemed to demonstrate that she has comprehended and learned various writing conventions in the short-term, but did not appear to remember spelling words on a longer-term basis, and does not seem to use some learned writing conventions (eg, descriptive language) in general writing activities. This may show that the segmented learning which Jade is exposed to at school is not as suitable for her as it may be for other students (Freebody et al., 1995).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>who are not her close friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>requiring more time than other students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a very social nature. she may be more motivated to read books or stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jade seems to have been identified as perhaps requiring multiple outcomes Being required to share texts with peers may also assist in Jade’s consideration of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>that she has comprehended and learned is not as suitable for her</th>
<th>Jade seemed to demonstrate but did not appear to remember and does not seem to use This may show</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>various writing conventions some learned writing conventions the currently occurring modelling and in light of new knowledge For example,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>multiple sources of data the socially-orientated texts Some literacy activities Additionally,</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Perhaps the currently occurring modelling and discussion of a new concept could be followed by Jade being encouraged to display this knowledge on a piece of her own past writing (rather than a commercially produced worksheet). This might assist her in making the connections between the concept under consideration and everyday writing. According to the information given by Campbell et al. (2003, p.138), Jade was displaying examples of ‘early writing’ at the end of the data collection period, and may be assisted in developing ‘conventional writing’ through self-editing past work examples in light of new knowledge. For example, Jade could be asked to choose (or be designated) a particular diary entry or story and asked to re-draft it, perhaps using more detail and description.

[A.5.AJ] In relation to reading, Jade may be more likely to reach Mrs Davies’ aim of developing ‘a love of reading’ if she was provided with a greater range of texts to choose from in the classroom. Such books would not have to contradict Mrs Davies’ belief in catering to students’ individual developmental needs, to allow them experiences of success. Instead, texts which Jade was observed to read from cover to cover and which multiple sources of data showed that she enjoyed (such as Dr Seuss) could be integrated into school reading. Jade’s engagement in such experiences may be further enhanced if her apparent interest in art (including Kid Pix) was integrated, such as being asked to design a poster or advert for her favourite book. This is a way in which Jade’s reading could be linked to more complex skills (text user and text analyst practices), in addition to involving multiple literacies (linguistic, visual, digital and critical).

[A.5.AK] The last suggestion for Jade’s school literacy development is to integrate drama activities. This is a way in which reading experiences can be made more engaging (Hertzberg, 2000; Pitt, 2003). It would also cater to Jade’s apparent preference for being prepared when orally reading, by providing the expectation that a text will be read multiple times. Jade’s apparent dislike of this aspect (“you have to read, like, the same ones over and over again”) would not be such an issue, as the reading would develop and change as this is done. For example, Jade was heard to use more expression and emphasis during the second oral reading of a play and displayed enjoyment throughout this lesson. This opportunity could be extended to involve more complex literacies if there was an expectation to perform for an audience and to integrate other modes of
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communicating, such as gesture, visual elements (eg, costume), audio (eg, sound effects or music) and digital mediums (eg, video recording).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[A.5.A] b. What does the literature (particularly professional advice for teachers) suggest about assisting students’ literacy transitions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-way Home-School Communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[A.5.AM] One of the most important implications that this research has highlighted is for the home-school connections and lines of communication to be designed in a more reciprocal way. Some authors, for example, assert that it is important for teachers and parents to find out about each others’ understandings about literacy and of the way in which literacy is valued and used in home and school contexts (Cairney, 2003; Moss, 2004; Topfer, 2003). A more dialogic approach may assist teachers’ and parents’ knowledge of children’s literacies, which will in turn benefit their school learning. This may require school staff to challenge the way in which communication currently occurs (Freebody et al., 1995). One way in which this could be done would be for a mandatory parent-teacher interview to be conducted once or twice a year, which is designed for the purpose of both parties learning about each other. If parents were comfortable with the suggestion, the interview could take place in their homes. This would then help achieve the recommendations of other authors (eg, Arthurson &amp; Cozmoscu, 2007; Campbell, 2003; Nicholson &amp; Shipstead, 2002), that teachers need to learn from children and their families through observation and conversation. Teachers could learn about children’s rich and diverse home/community literacies, whilst addressing the dilemma of limited time to conduct separate home visits (Gonzalez et al., 1993; Knobel, 2001).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[A.5.AW] Phase 3. Suggesting how to assist students’ literacy transitions by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. reciprocal way of home-school connection and line of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. using various texts designed for differing purposes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Meaningful Connections/Homework

[A.5.AW] Another way of improving the connection and mutual learning between home and school would be for meaningful homework to be designed. Many authors advocate the use of various texts, which are designed for differing purposes (Campbell & Ryles, 2003; Moss, 2004; Nichols, 2003). Diverse texts could be made available for use in the classroom and as home readers, such as magazines and comics, which children could be encouraged to read and analyse. If students were encouraged to question the purpose and aim of these texts, they would be developing more complex reading skills, such as text user and text analyst practices (Freebody et al., 1995; Freebody & Luke, 1999). Other suggestions for meaningful homework include the implementation of a flexible approach, which provides parents with input into deciding on activities and how Jade was heard to use could be extended to involve if there was
these will take place (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Shockley et al., 1995). Written texts could be set as homework, encouraging children to write in their home contexts, but without the boundaries associated with school; such as limited time. Additionally, if there are not strict boundaries placed on the content of writing (or even the text type), children may be more engaged and produce work of a better quality than at school. For children who are likely to find choosing a topic or genre hard, suggestions could be given for them to choose from. For example, ‘write a narrative about your best birthday party (remember to use lots of describing words to give me a picture in my head)’ or ‘choose a meal that you like having at home and write out a recipe that I could follow’.

[A.5.AO] A way in which students’ diverse home literacies could each be valued is for students to be asked to share the literacies which occur in their home. This is aligned with sociocultural approaches, as (justify) students will broaden their knowledge about the purposes of literacy and how it is integrated into most everyday situations. In addition to encouraging students to be researchers of literacy, it is also an opportunity for teachers to discover more about their students’ home/community literacies. To again provide flexibility, whilst valuing differing modes of communication, students could be given the option to share this through oral, written, visual or multimodal forms of communication (Bull & Anstey, 2007). An additional possibility is for parents to be invited into the classroom to be interviewed about their own use of various literacies and how these relate to their job, home-life and social-life (Rogovin, 1998). For those parents who cannot make classroom visits, due to other commitments, a letter, video or series of photos could take place of the interview.

Integrated Units and Digital Texts

[A.5.AP] Interestingly, both Anna and Brenda referred to integrated units when asked about school learning that builds on their children’s interests. When this was being explained, it seemed that these provided more of a connection between school and home learning. Thus, students may be further assisted in their literacy learning if discrete skills, such as spelling, are taught alongside these units (rather than in separate lessons using blackline masters), such as the one Mrs Davies had designed based on the Olympics. This way, learning is made more meaningful and evolves naturally alongside students’ other interests (Ashton-Warner, 1980). Some assert the value of students having more control and choice over the topics related to their literacy experiences (Nixon, 2003; Rivaland, 2003). An example might be asking students to write a review on a video game or movie of their choice (as opposed to all students completing a review of a particular text), demonstrating their critical analysis and recognition of the social and cultural contexts and implications (Beavis, 2003).


[A.5.AQ] It seemed that both Neil and Jade were interested in digital texts and were more engaged during lessons which integrated their use. Firstly, students’ opportunities with computer technologies can be broadened beyond using ICTs for typing and printing various text types (Australian Computer Society, 2005). Examples of ways in which this could be done in relation to reading are actually given in a WPPS school-produced document, such as: designing book covers; manipulating images; and making adverts. Several authors assert that students’ reading, writing, talking and listening can benefit from other literacies being integrated into the curriculum. A case study conducted by Pitt (2003) gives the example of a unit based around researching and presenting the news (using video), which resulted in engaging a student who did not usually show enthusiasm for literacy activities. Such a unit would probably engage both of the case study students, as interview data revealed that they both watch the news with their parents (and ask questions about it).

[A.5.AR] Another example of integrating ICTs is provided by Badger (2003), who reports on a study where a child who often avoided reading was encouraged to participate and improve his skills through making and analysing audio-recordings. The result was an improved attitude towards broader school literacies, as well as an increase in the student’s confidence. Podcasting also provides a way for integrating new communication technologies as well as a way of building connections between home and school (Northcote et al., 2007). Recordings taken in the community could be brought into school and school activities could be broadcasted into homes.

Section Three: Recommendations for Future Research

[A.5.AS] A vast amount of information was obtained from the observations, interviews and (viewed or collected) artefacts during the two home visits (for each student) in this study. However, it was found that the researcher’s presence seemed to affect the natural behaviours and events which occurred on the first visit to students’ homes. It is thus recommended, for research attempting to observe naturally occurring behaviours and interactions in students’ homes, to involve several home visits.

[A.5.AT] Due to rapidly changing technologies and definitions of literacy, there is a need for more up-to-date research which examines and compares the home/community and school literacies of children. It would be advantageous for future studies to capture the experiences of a greater number of children. This study has shown that the literacy experiences of two children, both from mid-high SES households, differed significantly. Thus, it may be beneficial for future studies to include children from various SES backgrounds, as well as including children from a range of geographical areas, age groups, and cultural and language backgrounds.
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This research was situated within the Constructivist paradigm and the methodology was designed to investigate the home-school transitions of two children, who had been identified as experiencing different rates of school literacy acquisition, in their early school years. The theoretical underpinnings of the research involved a view of literacy as social practice, which acknowledged the important role that new technologies and media play in communicating meaning. During the review of the literature, it was identified that literacy is a concept which evolves with wider societal and technological changes and that its definition is neither clear, nor unanimously accepted. Much of the relevant literature proposed that there were differences between home/community and school literacies, although these did not seem to be considered completely distinct. It was more frequently asserted that school literacies were aligned with discrete skills, which are valued and assessed by governments, resulting in students being considered to be more or less successful at literacy. Alternatively, home/community literacies were portrayed as being rich and diverse, with many being intertwined with daily activities and undertaken for meaningful, social purposes. There was a thus general consensus across the literature that the transition between home and school literacies is a very different experience for individual children.

This research was not designed to present generalisable findings, as the

Conclusions

This research was designed to investigate the home-school transitions of two children, who had been identified as experiencing different rates of school literacy acquisition, in their early school years. The theoretical underpinnings of the research involved a view of literacy as social practice, which acknowledged the important role that new technologies and media play in communicating meaning. During the review of the literature, it was identified that literacy is a concept which evolves with wider societal and technological changes and that its definition is neither clear, nor unanimously accepted. Much of the relevant literature proposed that there were differences between home/community and school literacies, although these did not seem to be considered completely distinct. It was more frequently asserted that school literacies were aligned with discrete skills, which are valued and assessed by governments, resulting in students being considered to be more or less successful at literacy. Alternatively, home/community literacies were portrayed as being rich and diverse, with many being intertwined with daily activities and undertaken for meaningful, social purposes. There was a thus general consensus across the literature that the transition between home and school literacies is a very different experience for individual children.

This research was not designed to present generalisable findings, as the
**significant diversity** between students’ experiences is acknowledged. *Instead, the aim was to depict in detail the literacies of the participating children.*

[A.5.AX] It was found that the physical context of the classroom and the texts available (including new technologies, digital texts and environmental print) had the potential to provide rich opportunities for literacy learning. Additionally, the teacher displayed obvious concern about and dedication to assisting students in their school literacy learning. *However, as a result of limited time, external requirements, and personal beliefs about literacy, many opportunities were restricted.* Much literacy learning was segmented and taught as discrete skills; removed from social contexts that were meaningful to the children. *In contrast - and aligned with the theoretical underpinnings of sociocultural approaches - it was found that the students’ literacy learning at home was diverse, and closely linked to activities conducted for meaningful (and often interpersonal) purposes.* Consistent with the multiliteracies model was the discovery of other modes of meaning, which were often integrated into these everyday activities, including the daily use of various digital texts, for differing purposes. *However, the model of literacy evident in the school curriculum was not congruent with the significant body of research into literacy which subscribes to the aforementioned theoretical approaches.* *For example,* the boundaries placed on literacy learning included the minimal integration of ICTs, which were used solely for word processing or entertainment purposes. *Thus it appears that the school, despite being the institution preparing the children for the future, was operating with an outdated model of literacy.*

[A.5.AY] The findings revealed a greater level of home-school continuity for the child with a higher rate of school literacy acquisition. This continuity involved factors beyond the texts available to him. It included similarities in the types of interaction and scaffolding which occurred around texts in each setting, as well as the similar literacy practices which were valued by both his parents and teacher. *Although the other student had continuities in regards to the value placed on reading and the texts made available to her in each context, other aspects of school-valued literacy, such as writing, were not required experiences at home.* In addition, there was a clear distinction between her families’ value (and regular use of) various digital texts and their use at school. *A greater level of home-school continuity as well as the similar.*

[A.5.AZ] It was also found that the lines of communication between the home and school contexts involved the teacher transmitting information to parents, in parallel with school policy and documentation. This discussion does not intend to allocate blame to the teacher for the apparent discontinuities and somewhat one-way nature of communication. Indeed her curriculum appears to be meeting the requirements of school and government authorities. *Interestingly,* her practice appears to be shaped and constrained by the limited time available for rich opportunities obvious concern about and dedication to assisting students. *The findings revealed - Although the other student - were not required experiences at home. - It was also found that - This discussion does not intend to allocate blame to the teacher - Indeed her curriculum appears to be meeting - her practice appears to be shaped and constrained by.
meeting multiple, external pressures and expectations; from both school policies and wider curriculum documents.

[A.5.ba] This research proposed general implications for teaching practice, outlining possible ways to incorporate students’ home/community literacies into school settings. Overall, the case studies have highlighted for teachers the importance of not making generalisations and assumptions about students’ literacies. It is recommended that future research be undertaken about the literacy experiences of students from a diverse range of backgrounds. There are two questions raised by this study. In the current technologically-focused society, with evidence from multiple studies showing strong connections between literacy and everyday social and practical purposes, does the literacy taught in schools make meaningful connections to children’s lives? And is it sufficient to adequately prepare all students for their futures?
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### CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION
Describing the research she did in this dissertation

[B.1.a] This chapter presents the background of the study, the reasons for choosing the topic, the statement of the problem, the objective of the study, the significance of the study, and the outline of the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Communicative Purpose</th>
<th>Stages/phases</th>
<th>Appraisal analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Framing the chapter | **Stage 1** Describing the object of the study  
**Phase 1**: Briefly outlining the content of the chapter by reproducing the headings of the sections | Positive declarative with lack of modality | ATTITUDE: -  
ENGAGE: -  
GRADUATION: - |
| 1.7 Background of the Study | Setting up the background for the research by orienting the reader to language assessments in general using an expert’s view | Phase 2. Showing that the general research area – Assessment, is important, central, in ‘human life’ | ATTITUDE: -  
ENGAGE: -  
GRADUATION: - |
| | Leading the discussion in to assessment in language learning? | - positive polarity  
- declarative mood  
- no modality  
- … appropriate level… (Judgment: Cap) | ATTITUDE: -  
ENGAGE: -  
GRADUATION: - |
| | | | ATTITUDE: -  
ENGAGE: -  
GRADUATION: - |

[B.1.b] Assessment has long been part of human’s life. *It is due to the fact* that people are assessed in many aspects during their lives. The assessments are mostly done to show their performance in a category. The others are to put them into an appropriate level of a category. McNamara (2000:3) states (acknow) that throughout history, people have been put to the test to prove their capabilities or to establish their credentials. *In order to do that* (justify), people have to fulfill some criteria of the test or assessment. By fulfilling some or all of the criteria, they can be (entertain) categorized into a group of which the assessment is done. [B.1.c] The same is true to language learning. Instructors of a language need to know how far their students have mastered the language or what level of The graduation values deal with quantification (many, some, some or all, etc.), and intensification (mostly, has long been in many aspects are mostly done, fulfill some criteria, some or all of the criteria)
proficiency their students should (entertain) be categorized into. Therefore (concede), the language assessment was developed to fulfill the needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.1.d</th>
<th>Language assessment was first developed based on some principles. But the principles have much changed during this time. In the 1950s, the testing focused on specific language elements such as the phonological, grammatical, and lexical contrasts between two languages. Today, test designers are still challenged in their quest for more authentic, valid instruments that simulate real-world interaction (Brown 2004:8).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1.e</td>
<td>Following the changes of the principles in language assessment, the form of test or assessment in language learning has also changed. Leni Puppin in one of the articles in English Teaching Forum (2007) states that teachers, administrators, and students became dissatisfied because they recognized that there was a mismatch between paper-and-pencil tests that assessed what McNamara (1996:6) calls the ‘abstract demonstration of knowledge,’ and the ‘actual performances of relevant tasks,’ which are commonly known as “performance tests”. From the paper-based assessment into the performance-based assessment, the assessment tries to offer a more authentic way of knowing the learners’ progress in learning a language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elaborating on language assessment in her own words</th>
<th>Recounting the early development of language assessment and comparing it to the current time.</th>
<th>- Phase 3. Providing historical information about language assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Therefore (concede),</td>
<td>claiming with positive polarity, declarative mood with lack of modality</td>
<td>- But… (counter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phase 3. Providing historical information about language assessment</td>
<td>recounting the past and current events</td>
<td>- ... first… (+intens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- But… (counter)</td>
<td>- ... some, much (+quant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ... specific, such as, still. ...(+intens)</td>
<td>- ... also…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ... commonly…</td>
<td>- ... tries to … more (intens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ... one of … (+quant)</td>
<td>- ... claim in monoglossic clause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ... states (acknow)</td>
<td>- … states (acknow)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- … because (justify)</td>
<td>- … they recognized (acknow) that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- … McNamara (1996:6) calls (acknow)</td>
<td>- … are commonly known as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Dissatisfied (-affect) - a mismatch (-app)
| **B.1.f** | One form of the alternative assessment in language learning is done in language competition. Here, in the competition, language learners as participants are encouraged to perform their capabilities in mastering the language. They have to compete each other to show their best performances. There will be some experts of the language as judges to assess the performances and they will choose one participant to be the best of the others. |
| **B.1.g** | In the context of this study, the competition is “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”. It is an English competition with the participants comes from senior and junior high schools around Central Java province. In the competition, they have to show their abilities in developing some news points into well-constructed news and reporting it as if they were the real live-news reporters. |
| **B.1.h** | Some years ago, the competition was held as “English News Reading Contest”. Each participant read a fully news given as if he or she were an anchor of a news program. In 2008, the concept of reading news was changed into reporting news. The concept was changed due to the needs of giving the students more challenge in this era of English language learning development. Therefore, the new criteria of assessment were also developed. It took two years since the new concept was settled to make the new criteria of assessment be fully developed. There was also much changes made during the development in 2009 to 2010. It then becomes the next concern to see whether the criteria have represented the points that should be assessed from the participants. |
1.8 Reasons for Choosing the Topic

[B.1.i] There are some reasons for people to understand about language assessment due to its significance towards their lives. McNamara (2000:4) explains the reasons as follows.

First, language tests play a powerful role in many people’s lives, acting as gateways at important transitional moments in education, in employment, and in moving from one country to another. Secondly, you may be working with language tests in your professional life as a teacher or administrator, teaching to a test, administering tests, or relying on information from tests to make decisions on the placement of students on particular courses. Finally, if you are conducting research in language study you may need to have measures of the language proficiency of your subjects.

[B.1.j] Based on the reasons, it then seems to be very interesting to find out more about language assessment and its applications in the real life conditions.

[B.1.k] One way to do so is by conducting a research on where the principles of language assessment are applied. One of the places is in the language competition. There, the principles of language assessment are applied in the form of some instructions to be done by the participants who will be assessed using some criteria of assessment. By fulfilling the criteria, the scores for the participants will be taken. The one who gets the best score will be the winner of the competition.
In this study, the research is done to analyze the points of assessment or the scoring criteria used in an English competition that is “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”. The competition is held by English Students Association (ESA) from English Department Semarang State University (UNNES). It is chosen to be analyzed since the competition is a regional-level English competition of junior and senior high schools around Central Java. So, the competition involves many participants from various schools around Central Java. Due to this condition, “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010” should have some appropriate criteria to assess its participants so that the one who is chosen to be the winner of the competition is truly the one who has the best capability in performing the instructions among the others. Therefore, it is important to see what scoring criteria used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”. Besides, it is also important to see what strengths and weaknesses of the scoring criteria in assessing the speaking performances performed by the participants.

1.9 Statement of the Problem

Based on the illustration above, there are two questions arise. The questions which are then constructed to focus the study are:
(c) What are the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”?
(d) What are the strengths and weaknesses of the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”?

Stage 3: Stating the problem: ESA marking criteria and its strengths and weaknesses
Phase 1: Presenting the research questions
- Informational questions
- Best capability (+judgment:cap) it is important
- Since, So, due to, so that, (justify)
- Should have (entertain)
- Therefore
- Besides (}
- In this study, ...
- many, various, some, (quant)
- appropriate, truly, also (intensification)
1.10 Objective of the Study

[B.1.n] From the research questions constructed, it is known that there are two main purposes to be achieved in this study. The purposes are:
(a) to identify the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”.
(b) to find out what strengths and weaknesses of the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”.

1.11 Significance of the Study

[B.1.o] By conducting the research in this study, it is hoped that there will be some advantages achieved. Those advantages are expected to have some contributions toward different parties.

[B.1.p] It deals with the significance of the study that can be classified into three parts. They are:
(a) For the judges and the committees
[B.1.q] The study will let the judges and the committees of the competition know the quality of the scoring criteria they used to assess the participants’ performances. Thus, they will know what should be assessed from the participants related to the goals of the competition and the assessment in speaking skill. From this point, it is hoped that the study will also help the committees to develop the better points of assessment so that the quality of the competition will improve.
(b) For science development
[B.1.r] The study will let people know what scoring criteria can be used to assess the performance in...
speaking skill, especially the performance in reporting news. *Besides*, they will also know what criteria *should be* consisted in the assessment of speaking performances.

(c) For the researcher

[B.1.s] This study will improve the researcher’s knowledge, as a teacher candidate, about language assessment *since* it is an *important* aspect in language learning. *By conducting* the research, the researcher will know how the *appropriate* points of assessment *should be developed*, *especially* the one used to assess speaking skill, and what *should be consisted* in the points of assessment.

### 1.12 Outline of the Report

[B.1.t] The research report of this study consists of five chapters. Each chapter in this report contains *several* sub-chapters. The outline for each chapter of the report is explained as follows:

[B.1.u] Chapter I is the introduction. It presents the background of the study, *some* reasons for choosing the topic, the statement of the problem, the objective of the study, the significance of the study, and the outline of the report.

[B.1.v] Chapter II deals with the review of the related literature. It includes *some* information about the previous studies, the review of the theoretical background for this study, and the framework of the present study.

[B.1.w] Chapter III discusses about the methods of investigation. It consists of the research approach, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summarising what she would present in each of the chapter.</th>
<th>Phase 3: Indicating the structure of Sri's dissertation and providing mini-synopses of each subsequent chapter</th>
<th>- The clauses and clause-complexes are bare assertions. The student-writer seems to present the proposition without really engages with the readers.</th>
<th>- Several sub-chapters.</th>
<th>- Some reasons (quant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
roles of the researcher, the object of the study, the source of data, the data collection, the data analysis, and the triangulation.

[B.1.x] Chapter IV presents the results of the analysis and the discussion about the results.

[B.1.y] Chapter V discusses about the conclusions of the study and the suggestions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Communicative Purpose</th>
<th>Stages/phases</th>
<th>Appraisal analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</strong></td>
<td>Reviewing previous study, theoretical background and the object of the study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Preview)</td>
<td>Previewing the chapter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.2.a] This chapter brings out some related literature for the study. It is distinguished in three subchapters. They are: review of the previous studies, review of the theoretical background, and framework of the present study.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Monoglossic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Review of the Previous Studies</td>
<td>Stage 1. Orientation</td>
<td>Positive declarative without the use of modality….</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.2.b] As one of four aspects in language skills, speaking has become a concern for the language researchers to study, especially (sharpen) on how this skill is elicited and assessed (Strategy 1B). Following the issue, a number (quant) of researches have been held. Some (quant) parts of the research and discussion then come to the area of rating scales used in the assessment of the speaking ability.</td>
<td>Stage 2a. Reviewing previous studies</td>
<td>Monoglossic</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.2.c] One example research is done by Kim (2006) about “Issues of Rating Scales in Speaking Performance Assessment”. The research leads to a conclusion that in order to ensure validity and reliability of a speaking performance test, attention needs to be paid to</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>is done by Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy 1C: Surveying research related literature</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>research leads to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>that in order to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ensure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the quality of the speaking performance along with scoring that is based on criteria specific to that particular testing context (Strategy 1C).

[B.2.d] Another study conducted by Nakatsuhara (2007) is written in the article entitled “Developing a Rating Scale to Assess English Speaking Skills of Japanese Upper-secondary Students”. The research concludes that the developed rating scale can be a proper indicator of students’ speaking achievement with high reliability and the scale should serve as a good working model (Strategy 1C).

[B.2.e] The latest learned study on the issue of rating scale to assess speaking ability is about the analysis of the scoring indicators of speaking assessment conducted by Anggarani (2010). She works on “the Analysis of the Scoring Indicators of Panel Evaluation Used in Speech Contest English Students Association (ESA) Week 2009 in UNNES Given by the Judges”. Her study explores what scoring indicators used in ESA WEEK Speech Contest 2009, the strengths, and the weaknesses of the scoring indicators comparing to the FSI rating scale. The result of the analysis shows that the scoring indicators cover the area of content, language, organization, performance, appearance, and time. These scoring criteria have some strengths and weaknesses. The strengths include the simplicity of the scoring indicators and the absence of ‘accent’ category which makes the participants do not have to face the difficulties upon the category as in the FSI rating scale. Besides that, there are also some weaknesses in the scoring indicators. First, the scoring indicators’ appearance is less in detail than the FSI rating scale. Next, the scope of each category is too broad or general. Finally, the participants will face a difficulty in considering the ‘time’ category since every unpunctuality will be considered as the score reduction (Strategy 1C).

[B.2.f] The result of Anggarani’s study is highly considered in this study since the present study tries to make a similar analysis but in different perception and deals with different object of study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment on one relevant study</th>
<th>Phase 2.</th>
<th>- attention needs to be paid to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| [B.2.e] The latest learned study on the issue of rating scale to assess speaking ability is about the analysis of the scoring indicators of speaking assessment conducted by Anggarani (2010). She works on “the Analysis of the Scoring Indicators of Panel Evaluation Used in Speech Contest English Students Association (ESA) Week 2009 in UNNES Given by the Judges”. Her study explores what scoring indicators used in ESA WEEK Speech Contest 2009, the strengths, and the weaknesses of the scoring indicators comparing to the FSI rating scale. The result of the analysis shows that the scoring indicators cover the area of content, language, organization, performance, appearance, and time. These scoring criteria have some strengths and weaknesses. The strengths include the simplicity of the scoring indicators and the absence of ‘accent’ category which makes the participants do not have to face the difficulties upon the category as in the FSI rating scale. Besides that, there are also some weaknesses in the scoring indicators. First, the scoring indicators’ appearance is less in detail than the FSI rating scale. Next, the scope of each category is too broad or general. Finally, the participants will face a difficulty in considering the ‘time’ category since every unpunctuality will be considered as the score reduction (Strategy 1C).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary/ description of another study</th>
<th>- a proper indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- high reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a good working model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Summary of another study |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| - She works on (acknow) |
| - Her study explores (acknow) |
| - shows that (endorse) |
| - do not have to (enter) |
| - Besides that, will face (enter) a |
| - since (justify) will be considered as |

| The latest learned |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| - have some |
| - there are also some |
| - First, |
| - less in detail than |
| - Next, |
| - is too broad or general |
| - Finally, |
| - every unpunctuality |

- Phase 2.
2.3 Review of the Theoretical Background

2.2.1. General Concept of Language Testing and Assessment

[B.2.g] Since a long time ago, assessment has become one part of human’s life (Strategy 1B). A person is assessed in many aspects, such as education (clever or fool), law (innocent or guilty), society (good or bad), etc. The assessments are done by people around him. This will result to the people’s point of view about him.

[B.2.h] In language learning, people need to know how far learners have achieved the lessons or what level of language proficiency they should be put into. Therefore, it is also important to take an assessment as one part of language learning (Strategy 1A).

[B.2.i] In the real practice of language teaching and learning, there is a little confusion between the two terms, test and assessment. Brown (2004:4) clears the confusion through his following statement about test and assessment (Strategy 1A).

Tests are prepared administrative procedures that occur at identifiable times in a curriculum when learners muster all their faculties to offer peak performance, knowing that their responses are being measured and evaluated. Assessment, on the other hand, is an ongoing process that encompasses a much wider domain. … Tests, then, are a subset of assessment; they are certainly not the only form of assessment that teacher can make.

2.2.1.1. A Brief History of Language Testing and Assessment

[B.2.j] As we have already known, there are four aspects of language skills that should be elicited from the students in the process of language learning (Strategy 1B). They are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Besides those skills, there are still other parts of language competencies that should also be assessed, such as vocabulary, grammatical structure, discourse structure and many others. The history shows the development of the assessment system of these component parts of language (Strategy 1A).

[B.2.k] The early work on the language testing and assessment saw the overall language competency as an integrated part from separate components. Language tests and assessments developed at that time should be able to elicit those components of language.
(Strategy 2B). It was when the discrete-point tests were applied in the 1970s and early 1980s (Brown 2004:8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy 2A</th>
<th>Strategy 2B</th>
<th>Strategy 2C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>counter-claiming</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Strategy 2A] On the contrary of (counter) the discrete-point tests, another approach which was introduced that time emerged the concept of integrative testing methods. The approach was based on the assumption that language is a unified set of interacting abilities that cannot be tested separately (Oller 1979 in Brown 2004:8) (acknow)

(Strategy 2A). Brown also (intens) explained (acknow) that proponents of integrative test methods centered their arguments on what became known as the unitary trait hypothesis. It contended that there is a general factor of language proficiency such that all the discrete points do not add up to that whole.

[Strategy 2B] As it had been admittedly wrong in 1983 (Brown 2004:9), the unitary trait hypothesis was then changed by communicative language testing in the mid-1980s. The method proposed more on communicative performance. It also more focused on the real-world tasks. Besides, as Brown (2004:9) described, the assessment field of communicative language testing became more and more concerned with the authenticity of tasks and the genuineness of texts (Strategy 2C).

[Strategy 2C] asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed

- | - | -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy 2B</th>
<th>Strategy 2C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Strategy 2B] Another new concept in language testing and assessment, besides communicative language testing, was also introduced. It was performance-based assessment. This method required students to perform actual or simulated real-world tasks instead of offering them paper-and-pencil selective response tasks. However, upon all of these works to find the appropriate concept of language testing and assessment, there will always quests for more authentic Task (Strategy 2B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy 2C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Strategy 2B] In testing second language speaking, Fulcher (2003:1 – 2) explained some crucial moments of its development. It began in the early testing system of second language speaking which involved only the pencil and paper tests. This was because of the argument that the testing of speaking could be subjective and thus unreliable since there were many uncontrollable factors could influence the judgment process upon the test-takers (Strategy 2C).
The testing of second language speaking then became a focus of interest since the Second World War. At that time, there was a pressure from the United States Administration to register the language capabilities of diplomatic and military personnel, and prepare the country for future conflict. This led to the first large-scale speaking test development program at the Foreign Service Institute. In the 1970s, the FSI system for testing second language speaking began to be adopted by many universities and states. The development of the testing second language speaking kept continuing since then (Strategy 2C).

### 2.2.1.2. Principles of Language Testing and Assessment

In order to know whether a test and/or an assessment is effective for its test-takers or not, Brown (2004:19 – 30) identifies five principles of language testing and assessment. These principles will help the test-developer to measure the effectiveness of the test in eliciting test-takers’ abilities. Below is Brown’s (2004:19 – 30) description about the principles: practicality, reliability, validity, authenticity, and washback.

#### c) Practicality

Practicality means that a test: (1) is not excessively expensive, (2) stays within appropriate time constraints, (3) is relatively easy to administer, (4) has a scoring/evaluation procedure that is specific and time-efficient.

#### d) Reliability

Reliability means the consistency and dependability of a test. If the test is given to a group of students today, the result will not be very different with the test result two days ago. The reliability of a test is its consistency: tape measure that stays the same length all the time as opposed to a piece of elastic. Same results should be obtained wherever the tape measure is used (Power).

In the practice of language testing, there are some factors infer the reliability of the test. The factors are student-related reliability, rater-reliability, test administration reliability, test reliability.

**b.1) Student-Related Reliability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1. Establishing general territory of her research by</th>
<th>Strategy 1A surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims</th>
<th>not excessively expensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 2C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Unclear scoring criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>incorrectly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Most important</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>This led to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In order to know</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brown (2004:19 – 30) identifies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brown’s (2004:19 – 30) description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If (enter) the test should be obtained not in a good condition because of that can influence possibly for lack of attention to or even preconceived biases. Besides inter-rater reliability because of or simple carelessness. have possibilities to cause can cause If a test is will not be very different there are some factors students sometimes various causes such as All of them some causes two or more scorers there is also are some factors are all belong to Sometimes the nature of too long hastily respond In short, the test accurately reflects we directly examine as natural as possible Some thematic organization such as through</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One or two students sometimes are not in a good condition when they are taking tests. This can happen because of various causes such as fatigue, problem with families, do not sleep well, illness, etc. All of them are some causes that can influence the result of the tests when the students are taking them.

**b.2) Rater Reliability**

Inter-rater reliability occurs when two or more scorers yield inconsistent scores of the same test, possibly for lack of attention to scoring criteria, inexperience, inattention, or even preconceived biases.

Besides inter-rater reliability, there is also intra-rater reliability. Intra-rater reliability is a common occurrence for classroom teachers because of unclear scoring criteria, fatigue, bias toward particular ‘good’ and ‘bad’ students, or simple carelessness.

**b.3) Test Administration Reliability**

Noise, photocopying variations, the amount of light in different parts of the room, variations in temperature, the conditions of desks and chairs are some factors that have possibilities to cause unreliability toward the test. These factors are all belong to the test administration factors.

**b.4) Test Reliability**

Sometimes the nature of the test itself can cause measurement errors. If a test is too long, test-takers may become fatigued by the time they reach the later items and hastily respond incorrectly. Time limitation and poorly written test items can be the cause of unreliability.

In short, there are three aspects of reliability: (1) Circumstances in which the test is taken, (2) The way in which it is marked, (3) The uniformity of assessment it makes. (Power)

**e) Validity**

When a test measures what it is intended to measure and nothing else, it is valid. Validity is the extent to which a test measures what it is intended to measure. Most important kinds of validity are CONTENT and FACE VALIDITY. Content Validity can be achieved when the test accurately reflects the syllabus on which it is based and Face Validity occurs when the test looks a good one. (Power)
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f) **Authenticity**  
[B.2.aa] Assessment is authentic when we directly examine student performance on worthy intellectual tasks (Wiggins 1990). According to Brown (2004:28), authenticity in a test *may be presented* in the following ways: (1) The language in the test is as natural as possible; (2) Items are contextualized rather than isolated; (3) Topics are meaningful (relevant, interesting) for the learner; (4) Some thematic organization to items is provided, such as through a story line or episode; (5) Tasks represent, *or closely approximate*, real-world tasks.

g) **Washback**  
[B.2.ab] Washback or also called backwash deals with the effect of the test on teaching prior to its administration (Solnushka 2003). In large scale assessment, washback *generally* refers to the effects the tests have on instruction in terms of how students prepare for the test (Brown 2004:28).

2.2.2. **Overview of English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010**

[B.2.ac] *Since* this study concerns on the analysis of the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010*, *it is important to know* what ESA WEEK is. It will be described in three sections below (Strategy 1B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2c: Reviewing ESA WEEK 2010 Phase 1. Establishing general territory of her research by Strategy 1B: claiming centrality</th>
<th>Strategy 1B: claiming centrality</th>
<th><em>it is important to know</em></th>
<th><em>Since this study concerns</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.2.2.1. **ESA WEEK 2010**

[B.2.ad] ESA WEEK 2010 was a competition for university and high schools’ students around Central Java. There were *some* categories held in the competition, such as Speech Contest, English News Report Contest, and Story Retelling Contest. The competition was held in two days, May 29 and May 30, 2010. On May 29, 2010, there were Speech Contest for university and senior high school level and English News Report Contest for senior high school level. On May 30, 2010, there were Story Retelling Contest for junior high school.
**2.2.2. **English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010

[B.2.af] As one category of competition, there was "English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010" (Strategy 1B). It was held in two days. One day for one level. Saturday, May 29, 2010 was for Senior High School level and Sunday, May 30, 2010 was for Junior High School level.

[B.2.ag] In the competition, the participants **should develop** some news points given by the committee (the news points can be seen in Appendix 6) into well-constructed news and report it in three minutes. They were also given three minutes to prepare before they reported the news in front of the camera. Their pictures would be showed on TV and the judges would assess them by seeing their performance on TV (the room setting could be seen in Appendix 7).

[B.2.ah] The difference on level of difficulties between junior high school and senior high school was on the news points given. For junior high school level, the news points were given on the technical meeting day. It was a week before the competition day. Meanwhile, for senior high school level, the participants were only given the titles of the news on the technical meeting day and the supporting news points were given on the competition day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy 2C</th>
<th>asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**[B.2.ai]** There were three judges in the competition. They were all the experts on their field of English language teaching and learning. There was also a briefing for the judges about the judgment process of the participants. In the competition, the participants should show their performance on reporting and developing the news and they would be seen by those judges. Here, their appearance, their capabilities in arranging news, delivering news in good pronunciation and intonation, and many other aspects were assessed. All participants had to show their best in order to win.

**[B.2.aj]** From this point of view, *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010* can be seen as one form of the speaking performance assessment. It because the participants should perform their abilities in delivering the news they have arranged in their mind. Their performance will be shot by a camera and the judges will assess their skills in reporting the news points given in the form of well-constructed news.

**[B.2.ak]** At this time, the role of the points of assessment to assess participants’ performance in the competition is very important. Therefore, it has to be understood well what points of assessment used in the competition, and what strengths and weaknesses the points of assessment have so that the points of assessment can be used and developed more appropriately (Strategy 1A). For these reasons, the points of assessment used in this competition is taken for this Study (Strategy 2C).

### 2.2.2.3. Points of Assessment Used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010

**[B.2.al]** The points of assessment is a term used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010*. It refers to the scoring indicators or scoring criteria used to assess the participants’
performance in the competition. There are some category included in the points of assessment, such as: (1) Pronunciation; (2) Performance; (3) Fluency; (4) Elaboration; and (5) Accuracy.

- Each point doesn’t have the same range of score. Performance and elaboration have higher range of score around 60 – 90 than pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy around 50 – 80. However, each point is divided into the same categories: poor, average, and good in each of which has its own description. This points of assessment is a newly developed concept from the old concept of score range used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2009. The complete form of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 can be seen in Appendix 1.

- The form of the previous scoring indicators is much simpler because there are no level descriptors for each category (Strategy 1A). Therefore, the committee decides to develop the better scoring indicators after having some evaluation on the previous competition. The development of the scoring indicators is guided by the supervisor of the competition (Strategy 2D).

- Since this study concerns in the analysis of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010, it is important to deal with the issue of rating scale and the approaches to its development. Four approaches to scale development according to Fulcher (2003) are going to be reviewed here (Strategy 1A).

2.2.3. Overview of Rating-Scale Design

- As it has been explained early in this chapter about the history of language testing and assessment, judgment process of the participants’ performance especially in speaking performance can be a subjective process for the judges or raters (Strategy 1B). Thus, there has to be a set of rules becoming a guideline for some raters in making the judgments. The set of rules is later known as the rating scale or also called as scoring criteria or scoring indicators.

- Stage 2c: Reviewing Rating-Scale Design
  - Phase 1: Establishing general territory of her research by
    - Strategy 1B: claiming centrality

- Strategy 1A: surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims

- Since this study concerns in the analysis of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010, it is important to deal with the issue of rating scale and the approaches to its development. Four approaches to scale development according to Fulcher (2003) are going to be reviewed here (Strategy 1A).
2.2.3.1. Rating Scale for Testing Speaking Skill

Davies et al. (1999) describes the definition of rating scale as quoted by Fulcher (2003:88 – 89) below.

A scale for the description of language proficiency consisting of a series of constructed levels against which a language learner’s performance is judged. Like a test, a proficiency (rating) scale provides an operational definition of a linguistic construct such as proficiency. Typically such scales range from zero mastery through to an end-point representing the well-educated native speaker. The levels or bands are commonly characterized in terms of what subjects can do with the language (tasks and functions which can be performed) and their mastery of linguistic features (such as vocabulary, syntax, fluency and cohesion) … Scales are description of groups of typically occurring behaviors; they are not in themselves test instruments and need to be used in conjunction with tests appropriate to the population and test purpose. Raters or judges are normally trained in the use of proficiency scales so as to ensure the measure’s reliability.

From the definition of rating scale, it can be seen that there are some aspects involve in a rating scale. Those aspects are: (1) levels of proficiency against a language learner’s performance; (2) elements or features and tasks which can be performed; (3) tests accompanied the appropriate rating scale; and (4) trained raters or judges to use the rating scale as it is intended to be.

These aspects are in line with what McNamara (2000:36 – 37) identifies as set methods for yielding the judgment in question. These methods, according to McNamara, typically have three main aspects. First, there is agreement about the conditions (including the length of time) under which the person’s performance or behavior is elicited, and/or is attended to by the rater. Second, certain features of the performance are agreed to be critical; the criteria for judging these will be determined and agreed. Third, raters who have been trained to an agreed understanding of the criteria characterize a performance by allocating a grade or rating.

Observing these aspects involved in a rating scale, it can be identified the uses of the rating scale. Fulcher (2003:89)
assumes that the rating scale is used to (1) score speech samples, and (2) guide test developers in the selection of tasks for tests. Besides those two uses of rating scale, Alderson (1991b) in Fulcher (2003:89) has suggested that there are other uses for scales:

1. **User-Oriented Scales**: used to report information about typical or likely behaviors of a test taker at a given level.
2. **Assessor-Oriented Scales**: designed to guide the rating process, focusing on the quality of the performance expected.
3. **Constructor-Oriented Scales**: produced to help the test constructor select tasks for inclusion in the test.

Different uses of the rating scale results many different types of rating scale. These types of rating scale can be distinguished into two. They are holistic and analytic rating scale. McNamara (2000:43) defines the holistic rating as a single impression of the impact of the performance as a whole. Meanwhile, Cooper (1977) in Fulcher (2003:89) says the holistic assessment is:

Any procedure which stops short of enumerating linguistic, rhetorical, or informational features of a piece of writing. Some holistic procedures may specify a number of particular features and even require that each feature be scored separately, but the reader is never required to stop and count or tally incidents of the feature.

The analytic scoring is defined as an alternative approach involves getting raters to provide separate assessment for each of a number of aspects of performance (McNamara 2000:43).

Furthermore, Fulcher (2003:89 – 90) stated that for Hamp-Lyons (1991) holistic assessment can be broken down into:

1. **Holistic Scoring**: A single score is given to each speech sample either impressionistically, or guided by a rating scale. This single score is designed to encapsulate all the features of the sample, representing ‘overall quality’. This type of scoring is problematic because it does not take into account the constructs that make up speaking, but just ‘speaking’. And if speaking is made up of constructs, ‘speaking’ is more like a theory than a construct. A single score may not do justice to the complexity of speaking.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>[B.2.ax] Primary-trait scoring: This approach assumes that one can only judge a speech sample in its context, and so rating criteria should be developed for each individual task. This would be the natural approach to scoring that would accompany the ‘new behaviorism’ associated with the variationist position in task research which is concluded that inferences drawn from scores may only be generalized to identical tasks in other tests or the real-world (Chappelle 1998, 1999a in Fulcher 2003:62).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>[B.2.ay] Multiple trait scoring: Providing multiple scores for each speech sample, with each score representative of some feature of the performance, or construct underlying the performance. In the former case the multiple traits are task specific, as in primary-trait scoring. In the latter, by relating scores directly to constructs rather than tasks, the scores may be generalized across a range of task types. While it is clearly impossible to score each and every construct in even a simple definition of ‘speaking’, multiple trait scoring does offer the possibility that the scores are sensitive to more constructs, with the added advantage that diagnostic information is also available for those score users who require it. The main disadvantage of multiple-trait scoring is that frequently raters cannot make the distinctions required to assign three or four separate grades for one speech sample. The tendency to give the same grade across categories, the ‘halo effect’ has come to be known as ‘cross-contamination’ (Alderson 1981 in Fulcher 2003:90) (Strategy 1A).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[B.2.az] Every different type of rating scale has its own purpose in measuring the learners’ performance. Thus, it is important to know what type of rating scale used and why a particular type of rating scale is chosen to measure a particular task in speaking test (Strategy 2D).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.2.3.2. Four Approaches to Rating-Scale Design for Testing Speaking Skill

[B.2.ba] The four approaches to rating-scale design used in this study are the approaches described by Glenn Fulcher (2003). The approaches are chosen since they cover all possible methods in the development of rating scale. Instead of choosing one approach to be compared to the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010, those four approaches are chosen in order to give more and deeper information in the process of analysis of the points of assessment.

[B.2.bb] The four approaches are derived from two basic approaches to rating-scale development. They are intuitive methods and empirical methods. Each of these two basic approaches can be further divided into three sub-categories below (Fulcher 2003:92).

(1) Intuitive methods
   (a) Expert judgment. An experienced teacher or language tester writes a rating scale in relation to existing rating scales, a teaching syllabus, or a needs analysis. Informants may be used to obtain feedback on the usefulness of the scale.
   (b) Committee. As for expert judgments, but with a small group of experts who discuss and agree on the wording of the descriptors and the levels of the scale.
   (c) Experiential. Perhaps starting with expert judgment or committee design, the rating scale evolves and is refined by those who use it, so that...
over a period of time the users intuitively ‘understand’ the meaning of the levels in relation to sample performances. This is by far the most common intuitive method of scale development.

(2) Empirical methods
(a) Data-based or data-driven scale development. This approach requires the analysis of performance on tasks, and the description of key features of performance that can be observed to make inferences to the construct.
(b) Empirically derived, binary-choice, boundary definition scales. Expert judges are asked to take speech or writing samples and divide them into better or poorer performances. The reason for the categorization is recorded, and used to write a sequence of yes/no questions that lead the rater to the score.
(c) Scaling descriptors. In this approach many band descriptors are collected in isolation from a scale, and experts are asked to rank them in order of ‘difficulty’. They are then sequenced to create the scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[B.2.bc] These approaches are then described in four sections. The intuitive methods and the sub-categories are included as one approach while the other three sub-categories in empirical methods are described independently as three different approaches. Further explanation about the four approaches to rating-scale design is included below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 1A</strong> surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- | - | - | -
## a) The FSI Family Tradition: Intuitive and Experiential Scale Development

[B.2.bd] The FSI (Foreign Service Institute) scale is an example of rating scale using the intuitive methods in its development. It has been widely used in the development of curriculum as well as in assessment context. Besides, it also becomes the model for the design of many other rating scales that are still in use today, such as ILR (Interagency Language Roundtable), ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages), ETS (Educational Testing Service), etc (Fulcher 2003:93). These scales are then known as the scales of the FSI family. The scales are scored holistically. The system bases its development of scale descriptors upon the concept of the native speaker and makes the ultimate standard of its proficiency level as the proficiency of the educated native speaker. Meanwhile, the definitions of other levels, as described by Wilds (1975) in Fulcher (2003:93), are hung upon this one peg through the principle of internal consistency. To see the form of the FSI rating scale as an example of the scale in the FSI family, the sample is provided in Appendix 2.

[B.2.be] This intuitive approach of scale development has of course its strength and weakness. Since this rating-scale development is based on the intuition and experience of the designers, it leads to what Fulcher (2003:96) mentioned as 'a certain amount of vagueness and generality in the descriptors used to define bands or levels'. Wilds (1979) and Bachman (1990) in Fulcher (2003:96) explains that such vagueness is sometimes seen as a
strength on the grounds that it can be used in any testing situation. The weakness refers to the lack of clarity caused by the vague terminology of the scale descriptors. After all, the intuitive approach to the design of holistic rating scales is still the most common and the rating scales of the FSI family are still widely used even today (Fulcher 2003:97).

b) Data-Based Scale Development

[B.2.bf] It is a different approach of rating-scale development. The band or level descriptors are developed through an empirically verifiable procedure. The scale developers make an observation of learners’ behaviors and quantify the results. The information obtained from the observation, is used in the construction of rating scales. Therefore, this approach is called the ‘data-based’ or ‘data-driven’ approach since the rating-scale is developed based on the data derived from the observation which reflect the actual linguistic behavior of learners. The example of rating scale belongs to this category is the rating scale developed by Fulcher. The form of the rating scale is provided in Appendix 3.

[B.2.bg] Fulcher (2003:104) also explains further that the scale developed using this approach is different in content from those in the FSI family of tests, as it rests on descriptions and explanations of discourse features from actual test performance. The level of descriptive detail is higher and, although still present to some extent, the use of expressions that indicate bands to be internally linked in a ‘more than-less than’ relationship is considerably reduced.

c) Empirically Derived, Binary-Choice, Boundary Definition Scales (EBBs)
Fulcher (2003:104) explains that the
development procedure of EBB is to rank-order speech or
writing samples, score them and then identify features that
were decisive in allocating the samples to particular bands
or score ranges. In more details, the steps in the design
procedure for EBB are described by Upshur and Turner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Select performances to be rated, so that the range of performances covers the ability range that is to be tested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The individuals from a team of experts divide the performances into equal numbers of ‘better’ and ‘poorer’ performance impressionistically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The team of experts discuss why they placed the samples into the two piles, reconciling any differences they may have. As a team they are asked to write a single question, the answer to which would result in a sample being placed in the ‘better’ or ‘poorer’ group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The individual members of the team rank order the ‘better’ samples and score them as ‘4’, ‘5’ and ‘6’ impressionistically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The team of experts discuss their rankings and reconcile any differences. The team then write criterial questions to distinguish level 6 performances from level 4 and 5 performances, and then level 5 performances from level 4 performances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Steps 4 and 5 are repeated for the ‘poorer’ performances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[B.2.bi] The example steps of this approach are shown in figure 1 and 2 below. The figures are taken from Upshur and Turner (1995). The figures show the steps for the development of scales to assess the grammatical accuracy and communicative effectiveness of a story-retell task.

Figure 1. EBB for Communicative Effectiveness

Figure 2. EBB for Grammatical Accuracy

[B.2.bj] The EBB process clearly has a number of advantages. The first is that it is simple, and can be used to generate rating scales by teachers for locally produced speaking and writing tests. The second is that it is easy to use, and probably results in an increase in reliable scoring when used by teachers who have been on the team that

Strategy 1A
surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims
developed the rating scale. Thirdly, as a primary trait scale, each scale is linked to a specific task. Unfortunately, this specificity also becomes the main weakness of the approach since the score only relates to the specific task and cannot be generalized to any other test task (Fulcher 2003:106 – 107).

d) Scaling Descriptors

[B.2.bk] In this approach scale developers collect large numbers of ‘stand-alone descriptors’ from as many different scales as possible, and re-sequence descriptors that can be calibrated onto new scales. The result of this process is claimed to be a linear, equal interval, proficiency scale, based on a theory of measurement. The example scale using this approach to recombine its scale descriptors is the fluency scale of the Common European Framework. It is provided in Appendix 4. Since the scale is meant to be used to assess learners of various first languages, learning a variety of second languages, the result produced with the scale therefore has to be consistent and comparable across all of these variables. It does, however, bring one disadvantage. Namely that the method is essentially a-theoretical in nature. It is not based upon ‘empirically validated descriptions of language proficiency’ or a model of the language learning process. It is, rather, an attempt to provide a working framework that is needed within a particular context, in the absence of a theoretical model upon which to base the framework (Fulcher 2003:107 – 112).

2.4 Framework of the Present Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3: Conclusion</th>
<th>Strategy 1A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summarising the discussion in the chapter</td>
<td>surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Occupying the research niche</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abstracting or synthesizing knowledge claims to establish a theoretical position or a theoretical framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study works on the analysis of points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010*. It attempts to find out what points of assessment used in the competition and also its strengths and weaknesses.

As the framework of this study, the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010* is analyzed using four approaches of rating-scale design by Glenn Fulcher (2003). From the four approaches, one closest approach to the points of assessment design is elicited. Since each of four approaches has its own rating-scale examples, one rating-scale example of the closest approach to the points of assessment is compared with the points of assessment. It aims to find out the strengths and the weaknesses of the points of assessment used in the competition.

Four approaches of rating-scale design are used in this study since it can make the process of analysis more objective. More and deeper information about the points of assessment will be gained, if it is seen from many different sides. Therefore, the four approaches of rating-scale design are used in this study.
### CHAPTER III METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

[B3.a] This chapter discusses about the methods of investigation used in this study. It covers the investigation approach, the roles of the researcher, the object of the study, the source of data, the data collection, the data analysis, and the triangulation.

#### 3.1 Research Approach

[B3.b] The study used a qualitative approach in its process of investigation. The approach was chosen since the purpose of the study was to analyze the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010” and to decide the strengths and the weaknesses of the points of assessment by comparing it to another scoring criteria used to assess speaking skill. This process of investigation could not be done in statistical procedures since it needed some descriptions instead of numbers to confirm the research findings. Thus, the qualitative approach was considered to be the most appropriate approach in this study. It was based on what Strauss and Corbin in Hoepfl (1997) stated about qualitative research. They defined qualitative research in broadly sense as any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Communicative Purpose</th>
<th>Stages/ phases</th>
<th>Appraisal analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[B3.a] This chapter discusses about the methods of investigation used in this study. It covers the investigation approach, the roles of the researcher, the object of the study, the source of data, the data collection, the data analysis, and the triangulation.</td>
<td>Outlining the boundaries of the chapter</td>
<td>Stage 1: Opening Outlining the boundaries of the chapter</td>
<td>Monoglossic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B3.b] The study used a qualitative approach in its process of investigation. The approach was chosen since the purpose of the study was to analyze the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010” and to decide the strengths and the weaknesses of the points of assessment by comparing it to another scoring criteria used to assess speaking skill. This process of investigation could not be done in statistical procedures since it needed some descriptions instead of numbers to confirm the research findings. Thus, the qualitative approach was considered to be the most appropriate approach in this study. It was based on what Strauss and Corbin in Hoepfl (1997) stated about qualitative research. They defined qualitative research in broadly sense as any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification.</td>
<td>Explaining and justifying in brief the chosen approach for the research (no clear claim is made to the current research)</td>
<td>Stage 2: Justifying the approach for the research</td>
<td>First sentence is monoglossic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Roles of the Researcher

[B3.c] Sharan B. Merriam (2002) described in her article entitled “Introduction to Qualitative Research” that one characteristic of the qualitative research is the role of the researcher as the primary instrument for data collection and data analysis. According to this point of view, the researcher then took her role in this qualitative study as the primary instrument who made an analysis on the object of the study in order to get the data. Here, the researcher became the analyst of the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010” who did not involve in its process of development. Yet, the committees were aware of the researcher’s study on the analysis of the points of assessment they have developed.

3.3 Object of the Study

[B3.d] The object of the study was the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010” held by English Students Association from English Department State University of Semarang. The points of assessment is a term used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”. It refers to the scoring indicators or scoring criteria used to assess the participants’ performance in the competition. This object was chosen since it was considered to be important for an English competition, especially the one which involves participants around a regional area, to have appropriate scoring criteria to assess its participants’ capabilities. Besides, there had been much changes made in the scoring
criteria used in English News Report Contest within a year (from 2009 to 2010). So, it seemed to be very interesting to look further on the scoring criteria used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010” since this contest was a regional-level English competition whose participants came from around Central Java and to see the strengths and the weaknesses of the scoring system.

3.4 Source of Data  
[B3.e] The data were in type of qualitative data. The data here were the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010” and the scoring criteria used to assess participants’ performance in speaking skill. They were taken from any sources of materials, such as books, journals, articles, and etc. These data were collected to support the process of analysis of the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”.

3.5 Data Collection  
[B3.f] In order to collect the data, the library research method was applied. Any information related to the object of the study and the scoring criteria of the speaking performance assessment was collected from the sources provided in the library, such as books, journals, articles, etc. Besides, internet was also considered to be the other source of information. The information collected was then selected and used to support the analysis of the points.
of assessment in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”.

3.6 Data Analysis

[B3.g] The process of the analysis began when the information from the library research had been sufficiently collected. The information was then selected based on its relevancy with the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”. Next, this object of the study was analyzed by using four approaches to rating-scale design reviewed from Fulcher (2003) (acknow). One closest approach to the points of assessment design was elicited. Since (justify) each of four approaches had its own rating-scale or scoring criteria examples, one rating-scale example of the closest approach to the points of assessment was compared with the points of assessment. It aimed to find out the strengths and the weaknesses of the points of assessment used in the competition. This process also involved the selected information from the library research. The result of the analysis was finally (intens) interpreted in the form of descriptions.

3.7 Triangulation

[B3.h] Triangulation refers to the use of more than one approach to the investigation of a research question in order to enhance confidence in the ensuing findings (Bryman) (acknow). There are several types of triangulation. Denzin (1970) in Bryman distinguished (acknow) four forms of triangulation. They are data triangulation, investigator triangulation, theoretical
triangulation, and methodological triangulation. In the context of this study, the method chosen was the theoretical triangulation. Instead of (counter) only (intens) comparing the points of assessment with one approach to rating-scale design, this study used four approaches to analyze the points of assessment. The four approaches used in this study were the approaches to rating-scale design proposed by Glenn Fulcher (2003) (acknow). The approaches were chosen since (justify) they cover all (quant) possible (enter) methods in the development of rating scale or scoring criteria, especially (intens) the scoring criteria used to assess speaking performance. Therefore (concede), by using these concepts of triangulation, it was hoped that more (intens) information would be gained and more objective process of analysis would be achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Communicative Purpose</th>
<th>Stages/Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER IV RESULT AND DISCUSSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B.4.a] There are two main information presented in this chapter: the result of the analysis of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 and the discussion of the result of the analysis.</td>
<td>Outlining briefly the boundaries of the chapter</td>
<td>Stage 1: Genre orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1 Results of the Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.1. The Points of Assessment English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010</strong></td>
<td>Displaying, analysing and discussing the</td>
<td>Stage 2: Answering the first question:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#### [B.4.b] First analysis was done to look further on the points of assessment used in “English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010”. As (???) it was seen from the form of the points of assessment in Appendix 1, there were five points of assessment included. They were performance, elaboration, pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>findings of the research.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1: Explaining the points of assessment as the subject matter of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First paragraph is monoglossic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### [B.4.c] Each point of assessment consisted of one or several components or criteria that should be assessed from the participants. Performance consisted of facial expression, gesture, eye contact, stage exploration, and costume. Creativity, communicative elaboration, and grammatical structure were included in elaboration. Pronunciation included pronunciation, words intonation, and words stress. Fluency and punctuation belonged to fluency. Accuracy was the accuracy of the news points reported based on the news points given.

| Performance consisted of facial expression, gesture, eye contact, stage exploration, and costume. |
| Creativity, communicative elaboration, and grammatical structure were included in elaboration. Pronunciation included pronunciation, words intonation, and words stress. Fluency and punctuation belonged to fluency. Accuracy was the accuracy of the news points reported based on the news points given. |
| The range of score was also given around ten in every score level. But there were two points of assessment that were given a higher range of scores. They were performance and elaboration. Those two points of assessment were given ten scores higher in their ranges than the other three points. By considering the task given in the competition, it was assumed (enter) that the objective of the assessment concerned more on these two points: the way the participants performed in front of the camera as the news |
reporter and how well the participants elaborated the news given; but still by also paying attention to other components of assessment, such as pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy.

[B.4.f] The scoring system of the participant’s performance made the judges give a score for each point of assessment. Later, the score from each point was summed up into one total score. This total score then became the participant’s score.

4.1.2. The Points of Assessment and Four Approaches to Rating – Scale Design

[B.4.g] As it had been discussed in chapter II, there were several uses of rating scales in speaking tests. They were: (1) user-oriented scales; (2) assessor-oriented scales; and (3) constructor-oriented scales. Besides that, it had also been explained about the types of rating scales in terms of their scoring systems. There were holistic rating scales and analytic rating scales. The holistic assessment could then be broken down into three: (1) holistic scoring; (2) primary-trait scoring; and (3) multiple-trait scoring.

[B.4.h] Then, there was still actually one thing besides the orientation and the scoring system provided by the rating scales. It was the focus of the rating scales. There were two main focuses purposed by rating scales; they were ‘real-world’ and ‘construct’ (Fulcher, 2003:91). The rating scales which had real-world focus were designed on the assumption that it was possible (enter) to generalize from test scores to real-world speaking situations that may not be modeled in the test tasks. Meanwhile, the rating scales which focused on constructs were designed to score specific constructs included in the rating scales.

Phase 2: Comparing the points of assessment to other similar types of assessment.

Explaining the uses, types, and focus of rating scales in speaking tests, and the framework for describing the rating scale.
Those three big categories of orientation, scoring, and focus became a framework to describe a rating scale. These categories of framework for describing rating scales were summarized in a table that could be seen in Appendix 5. In the context of this study, the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010* were analyzed based on those categories of four approaches to rating – scale design identified from the work of Fulcher (2003). The result of the analysis is explained as follows.

### 4.1.2.1. The FSI (Foreign Service Institute) Family Tradition

The FSI rating scale had become the model for the design of many other scales such as ACTFL, ETS, and ILR. Those scales were then belonged to the FSI family scales. The FSI family scales had some characteristics of their scales development.

One of the characteristics was that the FSI family scales were developed as both assessor- and user-oriented. Thus, the scales were *not only* to guide the rating process done by the raters, *but also* to provide or report information about typical or likely behaviors of a test-taker at a given level. Another characteristic of the scales was that the scales were scored holistically. They gave an overall score of a speaking performance instead of counting or tallying incidents of each feature. The other characteristic was that they had real-world focus. Thus, the scores provided by the scales could be used as the assumption of the test-takers’ language abilities in the real-world speaking situations. The last characteristic of the scales was that they

| Sub-Phase 1: Explaining the FSA family scales and comparing the FSI family scales to the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010* (differences) |  |  |  |  |
used intuitive method in their process of scales development. According to Fulcher (2003:92 – 97), intuitive scale had depended upon the concept of the native speaker for the definition of the top band. In other words, the ultimate standard of the scale was the proficiency of the educated native speaker. Meanwhile, the descriptions of other level of the scales developed gradually from this highest standard that could be achieved to the lowest level. Ingram (1985a:4) in Fulcher (2003:96) explained (acknow) that the progression of behavioral descriptions attempted to reflect the way in which a second language developed from zero to native-like.

[B.4.1] Compared to the FSI family scales, the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 were rather different in their orientation. The FSI family scales were both assessor- and user-oriented. Meanwhile, the points of assessment were identified as only be assessor-oriented. Therefore, the points of assessment could only be used to guide the judges in giving scores toward the participants’ performances.

[B.4.m] Next, the analysis saw the scoring system used by the points of assessment and the FSI family scales. Rather different than the FSI family tradition of scale development which used holistic scoring, the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 gave scores for each point of the assessment. The scores obtained from five points were then summed up into one total score. Therefore, the scoring system used was categorized into multiple-trait scoring system because it
provided multiple scores for each performance with each score came from one point of assessment.

[B.4.n] The difference was also found in the focus of the scales. The scales in the FSI family focused on real-world. Meanwhile, the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010* focused on the constructs or features of the performance, especially the constructs developed the points of assessment for news reporting task.

[B.4.o] At last, the analysis of the points of assessment found that the points of assessment were not depended upon the native speaker proficiency as the ultimate level of the assessment. The level explanations in the points of assessment were distinguished in three levels for each category. They were poor, average, and good. Those levels were developed gradually by considering the increase of the components of assessment in each point, but did not put the proficiency of a native speaker related to the components as the top level that can be achieved.

### 4.1.2.2. Data – Based Scale Development

[B.4.p] Another approach to rating scale development was data-based scale development. This approach used the speech sample that had been transcribed to be analyzed so that the learners’ behaviors could be quantified. The example of the scale using this approach was the scale developed by Fulcher that could be seen in Appendix 3. As one approach to rating-scale design, there were some characteristics of its scales development identified. Those characteristics were having assessor-oriented, requiring holistic or multiple-trait scoring, and
having constructs focus. Besides, the last characteristic identified showed that the scales were developed based on the learners’ behaviors in doing the speaking tasks.

[B.4.q] There were some similarities found from the comparison between the characteristics of the approach and the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010*. The first similarity was found on their scoring system. The scales developed through the data-based scale development approach required the holistic or multiple-trait scoring. So, it was assumed that not only holistic scoring, there were some scales also developed by requiring multiple-trait scoring. It was the same with the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010*. Not to the scales which required the holistic scoring, the points of assessment were similar to the scales which required multiple-trait scoring since the points of assessment were also categorized as having multiple-trait scoring system.

[B.4.r] Another similarity was on the orientation of the scales. Both the scales developed through the approach and the points of assessment were assessor-oriented. Thus, they were oriented to guide the raters (or the judges) in their rating process of the speaking performances.

[B.4.s] Besides those two similarities of orientation and scoring system, the focus of scales between the points of assessment and the scales developed through the data-based scale development approach was also the same. They focused on constructs. The points of assessment focused on the constructs underlying the participants’ performance in reporting news.
[B.4.t] Not only had the similarities, the approach of data-based scale development and the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 also had a difference. The difference was found in the last characteristic identified from the approach. As it had been explained, the scales of the approach were developed based on the learners’ behaviors in doing the speaking tasks. It was different with the points of assessment since they were assumed to be developed by considering the increase of the components of assessment in each point which was then separated in three score categories of poor, average, and good.

4.1.2.3. **Empirically Derived, Binary – Choice, Boundary Definition Scales (EBBs)**

[B.4.u] Empirically derived, binary-choice, boundary definition was the other approach to rating-scale design. The development procedure was to rank-order speech or writing samples, score them and then identify features that were decisive in allocating the samples to particular bands or score ranges. Similar to the two previous approaches to rating-scale design, some characteristics were attempted to be identified in order to be compared to the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010. Some characteristics managed to be identified from EBB approach such as being assessor-oriented, using primary-trait scoring, and having real-world focus. Besides that, the EBB scales development relied on expert judgment by sequencing the sample performances and making series of binary (yes/no) choices about features of performances that defined the boundaries between score
levels in order that the sample performances could be scored. The other characteristic identified also included the perception of differences rather than similarities that based the ratings developed through this approach. Once the characteristics had been identified, then the analysis of the points of the assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010* according to the EBB approach was made.

[B.4.v] According to the EBB approach, the scales developed were assessor-oriented. It was the same with the points of assessment. Therefore, helping the raters to do the rating process was the orientation of those scales.

[B.4.w] The analysis then moved to another characteristic of the EBB approach. It was the scoring used by the scales developed through the approach. EBB scales were developed using primary-trait scoring. It was different with the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010*. The points of assessment used multiple-trait scoring. Therefore, rather than only assessed one speech sample in its context of a specific task, the points of assessment provided multiple scores for each speech sample.

[B.4.x] The other characteristic of the EBB approach explained that EBB scales had real-world focus. It was also different with the focus of the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010*. The points of assessment focused on the constructs underlying the task.

[B.4.y] Next, the characteristic of the EBB scales development also showed that the scales were developed by
relying on expert judgment in making series of binary questions about features of performance. It was also explained that instead of having a descriptor that attempted to define ‘midpoint’ of a band, it described the boundaries between categories. It was assumed to be derived from the way the scales developed through this approach (see figure 1 and 2 in chapter II). It was different from the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010*. The points of assessment still attempted to define the ‘midpoint’ of a band; how typical behaviors of a band could be described. Besides, the points of assessment were also not divided into even numbers of levels as the binary system of scale development would probably work on the scales produced. Instead, the points of assessment were divided into odd numbers of levels that was three: good, average, and poor.

[B.4.z] The last characteristic identified from the EBB approach to rating-scale design was that the approach based the ratings upon the perception of differences rather than similarities. It was closely related to the previous characteristic that the scales developed through the EBB approach would describe the boundaries between categories in their level descriptors. Meanwhile, the points of assessment tried to see the similarities of the development from the components of assessment. Thus, it was different between the points of assessment principle and the characteristic of EBB scales approach.

4.1.2.4. Scaling Descriptors

[B.4.aa] The next and also the last approach to rating-scale design was the scaling descriptors. It was
associated primarily with the work of North in the context of developing a Common European Framework for reporting language competency (Fulcher, 2003:107). Rating scales, in this approach, were developed by collecting large numbers of ‘stand-alone descriptors’ from as many different scales as possible, and re-sequence descriptors that could be calibrated onto new scales. Based on some identification to this approach, there were some characteristics found. Those characteristics showed that the scales developed through this approach were user- and assessor-oriented, involved holistic scoring, had real-world focus, and the final descriptors were framed as ‘can do’ statements.

| [B.4.ab] The identified characteristics of the approach of scaling descriptors were then compared to the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010*, and analyzed. The first analysis saw the orientation of both the approach to rating-scale design and the points of assessment. It was found that the orientations of both of them were different. It was because the scales developed through the approach of scaling descriptors were user- and assessor-oriented, while the points of assessment were only assessor-oriented. |
|--------|--------|--------|

| [B.4.ac] The second characteristic involved holistic scoring as the scoring system used by the scales of this approach. It was rather different with the scoring system used by the points of assessment which was multiple-trait scoring system. Although both scoring systems were included into holistic assessment, but the scores given to the participants’ performance were different. While the scales of scaling descriptors gave only one single score for each |
performance, the points of assessment basically gave multiple scores for each participant’s performance and each score represented one point of assessment.

[B.4.ad] The next analysis attempted to identify the focus of the points of assessment and the approach. The scales of scaling descriptors had real-world focus which was different with the focus of the points of assessment. The points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 had constructs focus. The scores obtained from the scales developed through the approach of scaling descriptors could be used to make an assumption of the learner’s proficiency in real-world speaking situations. Meanwhile, the scores obtained from the points of assessment only represented the constructs or the components of the assessment that should be scored from the participants in order to see the participants’ abilities in performing the components of assessment.

[B.4.ae] The last characteristic of the approach identified was that the final descriptors of the scales were framed as ‘can do’ statements. It was also different with the level explanations of the scales in the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010. The level explanations were not framed as ‘can do’ statements, but it was written in the form of the performance showed by the participants related to the components of the assessment.

4.1.3. The Closest Approach to the Points of Assessment

[B.4.af] After making the analysis of the points of assessment according to four approaches to rating-scale design, the next was the time to elicit which approach was the closest approach to the rating design of points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010.
By looking at the comparison of the points of assessment and several characteristics identified from each of four approaches to rating-scale design, it could be concluded that the closest approach to the rating-scale design of the points of assessment was the data-based scale development approach. It was based on some similarities found in the comparison of the approach and the points of assessment. Those similarities were found in some aspects such as the orientation of the scales, the scoring system, and the focus. The first similarity was found in the orientation of the points of assessment and the approach. The data-based approach developed its scales to become assessor-oriented. It was similar to the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010. By observing the level explanations of the scales, it was known that the scale was also assessor-oriented. The next similarity of the two was on the scoring system. The scales developed through data-based approach required holistic or multiple-trait scoring. So, the scales could be developed either using holistic scoring or multiple-trait scoring. The points of assessment took the form of multiple-trait scoring since it gave several or multiple scores for each speech sample of the participant performance. Finally, the last similarity that could be identified from the data-based approach and the points of assessment was in their focus of scales. The scales developed through data-based approach had construct focus
and it was the same with the focus of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010. From the observation, it could be seen that the points of assessment had construct focus. It was because the points of assessment focused on and scored the features of the performance or components of the assessment.

[B.4.ah] Those similarities found between the data-based approach and the points of assessment were the biggest number of similarities found in the comparison to the similarities between the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 and the other approaches to rating-scale design.

4.1.4. The Strengths and the Weaknesses of the Points of Assessment

[B.4.ai] After making the inference of the approach to the rating-scale design of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010, the next step was to compare one example scale of the closest approach to rating-scale design of the points of assessment and the points of assessment itself. Here, the closest approach to the rating-scale design of the points of assessment was the data-based scale development approach. One example scale from this approach was the fluency rating scale (see Appendix 3). Based on the result of the analysis, there were some strengths and weaknesses found in the points of assessment after being compared to the fluency rating scale.

[B.4.aj] The strength of the points of assessment was first shown on the use of the scale that focused on the
specific task; news reporting task. Compared to the fluency rating scale, the fluency rating scale was too broad to be used on the specific task of news reporting though it still could be used in a wider test of speaking performance. Therefore, the use of the points of assessment was considered to be appropriate in this context. The next strength was on the components of assessment covered in the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010*. The points of assessment covered larger features of assessment, but still it was specific to the task related to its function in assessing participants’ performance in the competition. The fluency rating scale, since it functioned to give score upon the speech sample of learners in a test, it focused only on the production of the speech while other aspects outside of the speech, such as gestures and facial expression which were highly considered in the points of assessment, was not included in the scale. The last strength of the points of assessment was its appearance. The appearance of the points of assessment was considered to be good since it made the assessors or the judges easy to use the scale. It was important for a scale to be easy to use because the difficulty in using the scale to assess the performance would lead to the highly intensive rater training which would be highly in cost. The fluency rating scale, though it might easy to use, but the long descriptors described in one band would make the assessors took a longer time to comprehend the scale.

[B.4.4k] Besides the strengths, the points of assessment had also some weaknesses. The use of the points of assessment in only a specific task of reporting news led
to the score that could not be generalized to make an assumption to other task of speaking. So, the scores obtained by the participants did not show the participants overall proficiency in speaking. It was rather different than the fluency rating scale. The scale was more general in assessing learners’ abilities in speaking. The appearance of the scale from the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010* could also be the weakness of the scales since it could not give deeper information about the participants’ abilities. They only described the features in simple descriptions and did not elaborate them more.

### 4.2 Discussion

[B.4.al] From the result of the analysis of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010, it was known that the points of assessment covered five categories to assess the participants’ performances in news reporting. They were performance, elaboration, pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy.

[B.4.am] Those five points of assessment, which were arranged into one scale, were analyzed using some categories of framework for describing rating scales from four approaches to rating-scale design proposed by Fulcher (2003) and the result showed that the data-based scale development approach as the closest approach to the points of assessment.

[B.4.an] Next, by comparing to the example scale of data-based scale development, it was found out that there are some strengths and weaknesses of the points of assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 4: Closing</th>
<th>Phase 1. Discussing the findings (briefly)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

[B.5.a] Chapter five presents some points that are classified into two subchapters. First, conclusions will discuss the summary of this study and the research findings. Meanwhile, the next subchapter will present some suggestions for the readers related to the use of this study.

5.3 Conclusions
[B.5.b] This study worked on the analysis of the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010. It identified what points of assessment used to assess participants’ performance in the competition. It figured out that the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010 included performance, elaboration, pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy.

[B.5.c] Those points of assessment were then compared to four approaches to rating-scale design proposed by Glenn Fulcher (2003). One closest approach to the points of assessment was elicited. It was found out that the data-based scale development was the closest approach to the points of assessment used in English News Report Contest ESA WEEK 2010. The rating-scale example of the data-based scale development approach was compared to the points of assessment to see the strengths and the weaknesses of the points of assessment. Based on the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Communicative Purpose</th>
<th>Stages/phase</th>
<th>Appraisal analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 1: Opening Phase 1: Briefly outlining the two main discussion of the chapter</td>
<td>ATTITUDE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
result of the analysis, it was known that the strengths of
the points of assessment used in *English News Report
Contest ESA WEEK 2010* covered the use of the scale that
focused on the specific task – news reporting task; the
larger features of assessment included in the scale; and its
appearance. Meanwhile, the weaknesses of the points of
assessment used in *English News Report Contest ESA
WEEK 2010* included the scores that could not be
generalized to be an assumption of participant’s overall
proficiency in speaking; and the inability of the scale to
provide deeper information about the participant’s abilities
in doing the task given.

### 5.4 Suggestions

[B.5.d] Learning from the whole process of this
study, there are some suggestions that can be given to the
readers related to the use of this study as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3. Presenting the suggestions from the study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1. Stating the implications of the study</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) For the judges of the competition
[B.5.e] It is suggested for the judges of the
competition to enrich their information about the
rating scale they are going to use in assessing
participants’ performances in the competition,
especially the points of assessment included in the
rating scale. Therefore, fair judgments about the
participants’ performances can be achieved.

(b) For the committees of the competition
[B.5.f] It is suggested that in the process of
developing a rating scale for the competition, the
committees should consider the appropriate points of
assessment used to assess the participants’
performances. It is important since it will help them to minimize the possibility of misinterpretation about the objective of the task and what is scored from the participant's performance. In other words, the committees are supposed to know why particular points of assessment are chosen to assess the performances.

[B.5.g] Besides that, it is also known that the closest approach to rating scale design for the points of assessment is the data-based scale development. Therefore, it is suggested for the committees to use this approach in their next development of the rating scale.

(c) For English Department students
[B.5.h] It is suggested for English Department students to improve their knowledge about the development of a rating scale. This knowledge can be very useful for them especially when they have to develop their own rating scale to assess the students’ abilities in their practice of teaching.

[B.5.i] Besides, the development of the rating-scales or the scoring rubrics is also suggested to be the next research topic for the English Department students as the next researchers since the ability of developing appropriate rating-scale to assess one task is crucial and it can be very useful if this knowledge is then shared to others, especially to English teachers.

(d) For English teachers
The similar task of reporting news and the points of assessment used to assess the performance are suggested to be an alternative assessment in speaking that can be adopted in schools.

At last, it is hoped that this study can be used to improve the knowledge about language assessment, especially the assessment in speaking.

Holly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[B.5.j]</th>
<th>[B.5.k]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The similar task of reporting news and the points of assessment used to assess the performance are suggested to be an alternative assessment in speaking that can be adopted in schools.</td>
<td>At last, it is hoped that this study can be used to improve the knowledge about language assessment, especially the assessment in speaking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 4. Closing