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The literacy demands of assessment practices in post-compulsory schooling

Claire M. Wyatt-Smith and J. Joy Cumming

This article is the third in a series of three articles (see Literacy Learning: Secondary Thoughts 7.1 and 7.2) based on the two-year national study titled The Literacy-Curriculum Interface: The Literacy Demands of the Curriculum in Post-compulsory Schooling (Cumming, Wyatt-Smith, Ryan & Doig, 1998), funded by the Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs. Though it can be read as a stand-alone text, it is best contextualised in relation to the two earlier articles.

Introduction

This decade has been marked by heightened awareness of the significance of literacy for success in education at all levels and for social and work purposes. The federal government policy monograph, Literacy for All (DEETYA, 1998), highlights this awareness, and in what follows, we assume that, at this time, the significance of literacy in education is well known to and accepted by all. The successful completion of post-compulsory assessment clearly involves student use of highly developed literacies. However, little systematic information is currently available about the literacy demands of different assessment regimes and practices, and about the range of teaching practices adopted to enable students to meet such demands. Drawing on the Literacy-Curriculum Interface study, referred to above, this article takes as its particular focus the impact of assessment and certification regimes in the post-compulsory schooling sector, and the literacy demands made on students as they work to complete the assessment requirements of those regimes.

A preliminary consideration in constructing the sample of documents and participants in the Literacy-Curriculum Interface study was the belief that assessment and certification in the post-compulsory years are regarded in the main as high stakes, and, inevitably, they have a significant impact upon curriculum and learning in those years. New South Wales, with a combination of external examinations and school-based assessment for the Higher School Certificate (HSC), and Queensland, with a predominantly school-based system of assessment, including the use of cumulative assessment during the post-compulsory years of study, represent the extremes of the continuum of internal and external balances in assessment systems operating in Australia at present. All other states have systems of assessment and certification in senior schooling with varying weightings of internal and external assessment. The selection of these two states as sites for the study allowed explicit attention to be paid to the effects of post-compulsory assessment systems on the literacy demands of the curriculum. Accordingly, in each of the three main phases of the study, data from New South Wales and Queensland were collected and analysed.

For readers unfamiliar with the Literacy-Curriculum Interface study, we should mention at

1 The post-compulsory curriculum is defined in Australia as occurring in the last two years of secondary schooling, Years 11 and 12.
2 For details about design and methodology, readers are advised to see the Final Report of the study titled The Literacy-Curriculum Interface: The Literacy Demands of the Curriculum in Post-compulsory schooling. An Executive Summary with the same title has also been produced. For additional information about publications associated with the project, please contact Ms Stephanie Gunn, National Literacy Research Projects, Centre for Literacy Education Research, Griffith University, Nathan, Qld 4111. Phone: 07 3875 5705, Fax: 07 3875 5686, Email: S.Gunn@mailbox.gu.edu.au
the outset that our interest lay in examining the literacy demands of different streams of senior schooling (Years 11 and 12), exploring how they presented barriers to student success. Drawing on the Ainley et al. (1994) categorisation of the range and combinations of curriculum offerings found in these years, we included three broad streams of study: arts/humanities studies; mathematics/science studies; and courses with a vocational/technical orientation. Throughout, our focus was on the literacy demands as evidenced in the official and enacted curriculum. The official accounts were derived from published curriculum and policy documents, including syllabi, school work plans, assignment specifications, sample test papers, school prospectuses and handbooks providing information about the schools' curriculum offerings, while the enacted curriculum was captured on video used to record authentic periods of students' in-class experiences. The video data were then analysed for what they revealed about the literacy demands encountered by focus students as they participated in classroom activities across episodes of approximately three days each. The concept of student-cam was central to the recording and analysis of the large body of authentic data generated in the study and readers interested in this and other aspects of design and methodology are advised to see the relevant publication outcomes, supplied at the end of the article.

The discussion that follows is organised around a set of key issues relating to the literacy demands of assessment, the focus being primarily on assessment that teachers engage in as part of their classroom practice in senior schooling. It should be noted that the study did not investigate the literacy demands that students encounter as they sit final examinations, either as part of the HSC in New South Wales or as school-scheduled examinations in Queensland. The discussion does, however, include comment on classroom rehearsals for such examinations. In the final section of the article, attention turns to teacher reactions to the findings of the study.

The locus of control for teaching practice and assessment

The study showed that the post-compulsory curriculum is characterised by high-level literacy demands across all three streams of study, including the traditional academic subjects and technical and vocational subjects. The findings have also shown consistently that the locus of control of the pacing of curriculum resides outside of the student. The study made clear that in the main, students have little, if any, influence over the nature of class activities and tasks to be completed, the direction that activities take, and the time allowed for completion. This is not to suggest that the teacher exercises exclusive control over these matters. In the classroom it was evident that the teacher enacts the curriculum within the constraints of system authorities, certification expectations, syllabus guidelines, and system- and school-imposed assessment and reporting requirements. In this regard, curriculum pacing is also outside of the teacher’s locus of control. Taken together, these constraints make heavy demands on teachers to progress through the mandated curriculum, expecting students to make progression at a uniform rate. A related expectation evident in the studied classrooms was that students were expected to ‘cue’ themselves into the thinking-reading-writing-speaking-listening-viewing demands of the classroom, and combine the modes without explicit instruction in how to manage such combinations and ‘switch’ among them, as classroom activity required. The study indicated that students’ abilities to manage classroom pacing by ‘cue-ing’ and ‘switching’ were critical factors affecting students’ incremental learning as well as their successful completion of assigned tasks.

A related observation was that the pressure to fast-track through curriculum delivery seemed to restrict, even severely, opportunities for students to explore the multiple meanings that they were making of what they heard, did and saw in the classroom. There are at least two main
reasons for this. The first reason concerns the sheer volume of content that teachers are expected to cover and students be assessed on, all in relatively short time lines; the second is an apparent lack of pedagogical emphasis (and therefore value) given to knowledge integration, both within and across discipline areas.

The limited provision of opportunities for students to reflect on and integrate their learning stems, at least in part, from the fact that the post-compulsory curriculum is 'chunked' into discrete subject areas. A result of the chunking is that teachers and students show little sense of coherent relationships among curriculum offerings and curriculum literacies as a whole within school. Knowledge integration across the curriculum did not seem a learning or assessment priority, with little time being given to assessing the depth of students' understanding. Similarly, how students drew on background knowledge to understand and integrate in school and outside school literacy activities seemed outside the learning and assessment agenda.

Monitoring student understandings

The study showed how a key role of day-to-day teacher assessment is to check for how all students are managing the pacing and cognitive demands of curriculum delivery, as well as the meta-language of the subject. Formative assessment, then, is concerned with monitoring student understandings of specific terminology, checking fluency, and assisting students in the ways of gaining such fluency. Clearly, students can and should be actively engaged in this process, especially when the teacher deliberately seeks advice about how knowledge integration, higher-order thinking and meaning making are occurring for individuals and groups of students. Early in a course of study, for example, teachers could check the appropriateness of any assumptions that they may have about students' prior or existing curricular knowledge and skills in order to determine student readiness to progress. Additionally, throughout the course, teachers could set in-class assessments for formative or diagnostic purposes, checking on how students are coping with reading, writing, and speaking demands of the current subject. Specific assessment considerations could include the extent to which students demonstrate increasing control of:

- subject terminology and specific vocabulary
- symbolic codes and other representational forms
- relationships between common, everyday language and subject-specific terminology
- the language of the processes of the subject, such as scientific or mathematical processes
- the match between the language of instruction and the language of formal assessment requirements
- the literacies of the classroom and the social interactions within which curricular learning is to occur.

The study showed clearly that curricular learning may be facilitated by explicit use of the meta-language of the subject, with literacy demands decreasing in relation to student control of required subject-specific language. Students benefit from teachers’ consistent use of and explicit instruction in the appropriate language of the subject. This includes talk about how written, spoken and visual texts work, including the specific technical vocabulary about meaning structures and text structures (semantics/genre), about how sentences work (syntax/grammar), and how ideologies and discourses work in spoken, written and visual language. Such approaches are particularly beneficial when the nature and purpose of the instruction is made clear in a way that motivates students, helps to construct the nature of the subject and facilitates linkages with other activities. In effect, as students learn the language of the classroom, they become inducted into discipline knowledge, thereby learning the language of assessment tasks.
Opportunities for questioning and critical thinking

The study findings showed that student engagement was highest, and curriculum literacies most assisting and least overwhelming, when students were given opportunities to generate authentic questions, and to explore issues with the teacher through dialogue. Emerging from the video data was a clear picture of how students benefit from planned opportunities to engage in substantive conversations, posing questions to one another and the teacher. Also clear was the usefulness of teacher questions that do not have preconceived notions of ‘correct’ answers. Authentic questions play a key role in teacher-student dialogue about what is taken to count as discipline knowledge and the nature and meanings of language itself. They are also vital in developing students’ critical language awareness.

Readers may be surprised to learn that the study provided little evidence of classroom opportunities for developing students’ critical language awareness. On the contrary, the research findings indicated that despite the apparent diversity of student experiences, in many cases, teaching followed traditional and transmissive formats. In such a pedagogy of compliance, there were few opportunities for students to engage in critical thinking. This occurred across curricular offerings and for teachers from school and vocational or work backgrounds. The powerful though unstated expectations seemed to be that in their class learning and assessments, students would be compliant, providing only the ‘appropriate’ critical response to issues of critique, evaluation and even moral stance. It is worth emphasising that the absence of opportunities for students to engage with and develop critical thinking skills occurred across curricular offerings, especially in English where freedom of thought and critique may be presupposed to be strongest.

Assessment talk and paraphernalia

Another striking finding was the prominence of talk about assessment requirements and the sheer amount of print and other written ‘assessment paraphernalia’ across the curriculum, including that used for assessable assignments and examination preparation. An important role for the teacher then is to navigate through what would otherwise be alien textual worlds: to interpret and make familiar the words used to convey assessment expectations. Moreover, the teacher’s role is to induct students into a workable knowledge of those expectations so that they can use such knowledge to self-assess and monitor learning over time.

Also strong was the finding that in both assessment systems, much classroom practice was directed to rehearsal for examinations, exam preparation, and assessable assignments, especially those that contributed to final grading on course completion. Referring to video-taped data of Year 12 English classes, Gerot (in Cumming & Wyatt-Smith, eds., in press) reported that ‘one of the most striking features of the English classes viewed (via video and print materials) was the extent to which curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation alike were driven from top to bottom by the impending Higher School Certificate (HSC) exam’. She then went on claim that ‘it is no exaggeration to claim that the English lessons viewed ... were rehearsals for the HSC’. Her recommendation was that time be ‘re-allocated such that students actually rehearse writing, under supervision ... This should follow the teacher’s demonstration; without explicit direction it remains just another test of what students can already do, more or less well, not an attempt to teach students what they need to know’. Elsewhere Gerot makes the important distinction between rehearsing writing to learn and rehearsing writing for examinations.

Referring to the Queensland context, Davies (in Cumming & Wyatt-Smith, eds., in press) reported how Year 12 students in a Health and Physical Education lesson ‘read the classroom discussion as relevant to the exam question, even though the explicit instructions [as given in class were] to research in a broader way’. According to Davies, ‘this suggests the kind of “cue consciousness” associated with success in exams’. Once again referring to Queensland, Wyatt-
Smith (in Cumming & Wyatt-Smith, eds., in press) highlighted the teacher’s efforts in an English class to evoke assessment cue consciousness in the learner, with what appeared to be little, if any, positive effect on the student’s readiness for and engagement with the assessment task. Similarly, in a New South Wales context, Winograd (in Cumming & Wyatt-Smith, eds., in press) reported how ‘the teacher tries to motivate the students to write longer answers to their literature exercises by saying that all of this is practice of answering questions on the examination’. He then went on to draw two conclusions: first, that ‘the message is that the purpose of school is getting prepared for more school’; and second, that ‘while it may be true, it certainly lowers our chances of making schools a place that is explicitly linked to the outside world’.

A consistent finding of the study was that student motivation seemed to be triggered and maintained by opportunities to ‘do’ activities, discussed later, and ask authentic questions rather than by teacher talk about assessment routines, and requirements. This is not to suggest that students should not be informed about assessment. It is, however, to assert that the primary work of much of the observed assessment talk across the curricular offering was to maintain the authority structures of the classroom. When this occurred, the talk had little observable value in furthering students’ discipline knowledge, skills and cognitive processes. The talk, therefore, even though focussed publicly on assessment matters, did little to enhance students’ prospects of assessment success.

**Assessment purposes and expectations**

The study highlighted how we need to ensure that guidelines for assessment requirements are explicit and written in student-friendly terms while maintaining the meta-language of the subject. However, the provision of guidelines is, of itself, a necessary though not sufficient condition for securing student understanding of expectations or improvement in performance. A sample, authentic statement of criteria and standards developed by teachers in one of the participating schools in the study and used to assess an analytical exposition in Senior English is provided as Appendix A (based on the Queensland Senior English Syllabus, 1987). Readers will note how the statement has been developed for broad-ranging application to the various types of writing that students undertake in Senior English. That is to say, they are supplied to students as the official criteria to be used for assessing performance in analytical expositions, and creative writing opportunities which, according to the school work program, included letters, newspaper articles, journals/diaries, epilogues and other book chapters.

Such vague formulations of criteria and standards do not make clear how teachers read and assess student writing (Wyatt-Smith, 1995, 1999). The concern here, however, is less with the usefulness of criteria specifications as an accountability tool, than with what they reveal (and keep hidden) about the expected characteristics of a quality performance. Insofar as these criteria are not sharply focused on the demands of a single task, they fall well short of providing students with useful assessment information. Essentially, such criteria need to be ‘talked up’ in the classroom to ensure that students could interpret and apply the words used to capture the criteria in the manner expected by the teacher.

This is not a criticism of the requirement that Year 11 and 12 teachers in Queensland, across all curricular offerings, are to supply students with criteria and standards statements before they commence work on an assessable task. It is to support the above point that the provision of assessment guidelines does not guarantee relevant or explicit information about assessment requirements. It is also to point to how teacher expertise in writing such statements can and does develop over time, as evidenced by the elaborated statement, once again for assessing analytical exposition, provided in Appendix B (based on the Queensland Extended Trial Pilot Senior English Syllabus, 1999).
In New South Wales, students were also supplied with guidelines for assessment. These were often replications of previous examinations, or documentation for a specific curriculum area. In both state contexts, the interpretation of assessment expectations form a component of curriculum literacies for which students need planned and systematic teacher instruction. Without teacher assistance in developing this aspect of curriculum literacies, the guidelines offered to inform students about assessment appear daunting, even overwhelming. While the different assessment systems heavily influenced the discourses of teaching, the common finding in both states was the degree to which expectations needed to be made more accessible.

The role and nature of the curriculum literacies that are in-built in assessment activities, and which impact upon the students' performances, should be made explicit. It is not appropriate to assess components of curriculum literacies for which explicit instruction has not occurred. A transfer of the curriculum literacies from other areas of study should not be assumed and is not likely to be appropriate. Assessment designers need to be more fully aware of the kinds of integrated literacies that any set assessment task or activity requires. They also need to attend to how literacy demands of assessments determine the time needed to complete tasks successfully and the uses to be made of available resources, both human and material, in task completion.

Textbooks

When considering how students cope with assessment, it is also helpful to examine how we expect students to use textbooks and other resources, checking to ensure that students can access these materials meaningfully and that the materials are appropriate for the context. The study showed that use of textbooks for purposes other than completion of exercises, and reading of textbook materials in class, were not consistently a high priority. In many cases, students were expected to read textbook and other materials away from the classroom. This assumed that students had the literacies to read these materials appropriately and independently. Teachers need to determine whether students are able to access such materials and then provide appropriate instruction so that students can read curriculum-specific materials for curricular meaning. If students are expected to access these resources independently, then it is more incumbent on the teacher to ensure that this can occur for all students. The second issue noted was that teachers make use of 'authentic' materials in classrooms, such as government brochures and newspaper articles. The literacy demands of these materials are often high, described as being at an educated adult level, while the contextual relevance of the materials is not always made apparent to students.

Social support

The study found that social support for the learner was vital for effective learning and successful completion of tasks, including those set for assessment. Such support took many forms and included teacher modelling of the performances expected of students, guidance on time management, and planned opportunities for collaborative learning, including 'doing'. We emphasise that a focus on 'doing' does not mean only practical or 'hands-on' experiences where expectations of literate involvement are reduced to minimal standards. A focus on doing means that the purpose of the learning activity is clearly focused for the student to the extent that he or she actively engages with the activity and can thereby collaborate with the teacher to construct the learning through literacies.

The video data showed how a teacher focus on social support and activities of 'doing', individually and collaboratively, generated higher levels of academic engagement, and provided a learning context conducive to substantive conversation. We also wish to emphasise that
‘doing’—say, as it occurred in classes in Creative Textiles, Food Technology, Marine Studies or Agricultural Studies—did not occur in an absence of curriculum literacies. As teacher and student collaborated, for example, on silk screen dying, food preparation, snorkelling, or fence building, the teacher demonstrated, through combined talk and doing, the curriculum literacies of the area of study. It was in these types of collaborations that the scaffolding of learning was shown to be highly effective, and student motivation seemed to be highest.

Teachers’ comments and observation indicated that students who choose to undertake school-developed or vocational modules with a high practical and ‘hands-on’ component self-report literacy difficulties in reading and writing. For these students the teachers also reported avoiding making such literacy demands on students, and, similarly, tend to avoid explicit instruction in these modes of literacy. However, the research study has shown that such ‘hands-on’ studies do have high literacy demands in terms of listening, speaking, and viewing, particularly of symbolic representations and in-class demonstrations. Students in the study appeared to cope with these literacy demands when they were explicitly and systematically addressed through classroom talk and writing, including the modelling of writing processes and strategies.

The study also highlighted the benefits of feedback that is timely, responsive, and constructive, and that models good literacy practice, especially when feedback is written. The teacher, however, need not be the sole source of feedback, and the study showed instances where students themselves provided quality feedback in one-to-one and small-group learning situations. The point is that students need to be inducted into ways of monitoring their own performance and performances of others against explicit expectations. In short, they need to develop the critical knowledge and cognitive processes that will enable them to do this. The teachers’ role is vital in modelling how improvement strategies are applied and judgements of quality arrived at.

What teachers had to say: literacy in policy and practice

Many teachers showed considerable interest in the policy and practice findings generated by the study. It is of note that most of the comments on this section of the findings came from teachers in New South Wales. This may be explained by the system of external assessment which operates in that state. Teachers reported that the HSC is controlled by the Board of Studies without teacher input, which may serve to widen the distance nominally felt amongst teachers between themselves and those that operate at system level. While some similar comments were made by Queensland teachers about the control exerted by the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, there was a greater level of concern expressed by the teachers from New South Wales. Many teachers from the latter state considered that the language used in syllabus documents was an issue which syllabus writers needed to address. Several comments were made by teachers on this point. These included statements such as:

*Syllabuses are not written in the language that teachers use.*

*Art syllabuses should be less esoteric and more specific and realistic in their structure, aims, objectives etc.*

*Poorly worded and set out syllabuses—please get them to change.*

*Syllabus documents are written in a language not used by teachers—need to seek out what the syllabus requirements are so that you can draw on what is needed. Essential for passing the HSC exam.*
Collectively these comments reflected the view that the language of syllabus documents did little to further teacher and student understandings of subject requirements, including those related to assessment. The lack of theory available in syllabuses in general was also considered to be a major drawback by some of the teachers. These issues were expressed as follows:

Syllabuses are not written in the language that teachers USE [sic] in the classroom. Often short on theory. Better knowledge or familiarity with information on the theoretical model would better inform teaching and learning.

Another aspect of the teaching-learning relationship findings presented to teachers involved the importance of effective modelling and feedback in the senior classroom. The key finding was:

Explicit modelling and timely and appropriate feedback are essential in maintaining student engagement.

Many teachers responded positively to this suggestion, and endorsed the finding with reference to their own knowledge and understanding. Once again, a number of English teachers recognised that the subject often did not allow for immediate feedback opportunities and reported that this was something that could be addressed. According to one teacher:

Automatic feedback is important in motivating/engaging students. In English, tasks tend to be much longer term so knowing this is useful in changing how we can motivate/encourage/engage students.

This comment suggests that the length of time between action and feedback in English may affect student motivation. Another teacher of English, however, saw the problem as ensuing from system level demands. She stated:

Automatic feedback—we often find time constraints and demands make this difficult—we need to be reminded every now and again.

In this comment the teacher acknowledged that timely feedback is important, while pointing to how the delivery of feedback is affected by time constraints and other demands, some of which are inevitably linked to assessment requirements.

Many of the other teachers who provided response to the study’s findings identified themselves as being from subjects where modelling and feedback were already an established aspect of teaching and learning. Art teachers in both Queensland and New South Wales noted the importance of modelling and feedback in the effective teaching of art, with the teacher in New South Wales stating that:

Initial learning and understanding through teacher demonstration is particularly relevant to the practical component.

With this comment the teacher made it clear that modelling and demonstration are the principal ways in which students are inducted into an artistic activity. Modelling was also seen as being important in the teaching of Health and Physical Education (HPE), with a teacher of this subject in New South Wales stating that:

Modelling is very important for HPE, for example, demonstrating how to move, kick, throw, etc.
In this comment the teacher highlighted the ancillary role of language in instruction. The point is that when teaching a physical activity, modelling is not simply to show students how to perform it, but feedback is provided to students, presumably orally and physically, so that they have a clear understanding of what they are being required to do. This endorses the ancillary but important role of language in such educational settings.

Findings regarding questioning were of interest to language other than English (LOTE) teachers. The need for teachers to use authentic questions, where they don’t know the answers themselves, also attracted comments. Generally speaking, teachers seemed receptive to the proposition that they did not have to be the font of all knowledge in the classroom but could join with students as partners in the learning process.

Similarly, a number of teachers indicated that they would direct more attention in future to the use of multiple explanations and to restating and rephrasing important points to ensure student understanding. Teachers reacted favourably to suggestions that more consideration of student understanding and prior experiences in planning lessons, with one teacher stating that teachers could ‘use the students’ background understanding of material being dealt with as a way of advancing their learning’.

Conclusion

In our roles as curriculum designers, teachers and assessors, a vital challenge is to ensure realistic, relevant and attainable assessment goals. Meeting this challenge involves re-examining the coherence possibilities across discipline knowledges and their related literacies. We need to ask questions about how students make sense of what they are learning and doing in the range of curricular offerings they undertake. Also, we must make explicit provision for students to engage in activities that have relevance to and connectedness with the world beyond the classroom. In so doing, we can make effective use of students’ cultural knowledge, showing how they play a part in school practices, including in class assessments. Clearly, it is time to address the degree to which teachers feel comfortable with different learning and assessment environments and the changing demands of schooling. Finally, in the course of these necessary professional discussions, it is time to address how transmissive forms of education, with their accompanying assessment practices and reward systems, reinforce unhelpful epistemologies that knowledge exists intact outside of cultural and theoretical contexts. Essentially, the challenge is to bring into focus cognitive, social and linguistic considerations as they relate to and impact on student performances across assessment contexts.
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## APPENDIX A: Criteria and Standards Specifications

### SENIOR WRITTEN ENGLISH CRITERIA SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Factors</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genre</strong></td>
<td>Very high degree of control over all genre features.</td>
<td>High degree of control over most genre features.</td>
<td>Satisfactory degree of control over major genre features.</td>
<td>Poor degree of control over major genre features.</td>
<td>Very poor degree of control over major genre features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Content covered in considerable depth and breadth. Notable insight and/or creativity.</td>
<td>Content covered in depth and breadth. Some insight and creativity.</td>
<td>Major content covered in adequate detail. Occasional depth of thought.</td>
<td>Ideas inaccurate and/or repetitious, and/or irrelevant. Lacks adequate detail to sufficiently explain/develop a response. Too short in length.</td>
<td>Very little content. Repetitious and irrelevant. Lacks direction and development. Far too short in length.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: Criteria and Standards Specifications

<p>| Task specific criteria and standards sheet for the task—Analyse a powerful text |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>A</strong></th>
<th><strong>B</strong></th>
<th><strong>C</strong></th>
<th><strong>D</strong></th>
<th><strong>E</strong></th>
<th><strong>Control of textual features</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of texts in their contexts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Control of texts in their contexts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Control of texts in their contexts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Control of texts in their contexts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Control of texts in their contexts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Control of texts in their contexts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student consistently shows control of texts in their contexts by:</td>
<td>Student shows control of texts in their contexts by:</td>
<td>Student shows reasonable control of texts in their contexts by:</td>
<td>Student shows some control of texts in their contexts by:</td>
<td>Student shows restricted control of texts in their contexts by:</td>
<td><strong>Student uses textual features by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analysing and synthesising information and substantiating opinions with evidence from the source text</td>
<td>- Analysing and synthesising information and substantiating opinions with evidence from the source text</td>
<td>- Sometimes analysing and synthesising information and substantiating opinions</td>
<td>- Usually controlling the genre of analytical exposition</td>
<td>- Stating opinions</td>
<td>- Linking ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Controlling the genre of analytical exposition, evaluating argument in considerable depth</td>
<td>- Controlling the genre of analytical exposition, evaluating argument in considerable depth</td>
<td>- Sometimes controlling the genre of analytical exposition and sometimes evaluating argument</td>
<td>- Using some of the stages of analytical exposition</td>
<td><strong>Using a range of basic vocabulary about language</strong></td>
<td><strong>Using simple clause and sentence structures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Using conventional spelling, using punctuation and paragraphing</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Control of textual features</strong></th>
<th><strong>Control of textual features</strong></th>
<th><strong>Control of textual features</strong></th>
<th><strong>Control of textual features</strong></th>
<th><strong>Control of textual features</strong></th>
<th><strong>Control of textual features</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student consistently shapes and interprets textual features effectively according to purpose, genre and register by:</td>
<td>Student shapes and interprets textual features effectively according to purpose, genre and register by:</td>
<td>Student shapes textual features taking account of purpose, genre and register by:</td>
<td>Student uses textual features taking some account of purpose, genre and register by:</td>
<td>Student uses some textual features by:</td>
<td><strong>Student has made complex distinctions in the ways discourses shape and are shaped by individuals in cultural contexts and social situations by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Linking ideas with discrimination throughout</td>
<td>- Linking ideas consistently</td>
<td>- Linking ideas cohesively in the main</td>
<td>- Linking ideas</td>
<td><strong>Student has made general distinctions in the ways discourses shape and are shaped by individuals in cultural contexts and social situations by:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Using and controlling with discrimination an extensive range of appropriate vocabulary about specific language features</td>
<td>- Using and controlling an extensive range of appropriate vocabulary about language</td>
<td>- Using and controlling a basic range of appropriate vocabulary about language</td>
<td>- Using a range of clause and sentence structures</td>
<td><strong>Student has recognised the ways discourses shape and are shaped by individuals in cultural contexts and social situations by:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Showing command over a wide range of clause and sentence structures</td>
<td>- Exploiting a range of clause and sentence structures</td>
<td>- Using a range of clause and sentence structures</td>
<td>- Controlling conventional spelling, punctuation and paragraphing in the main</td>
<td><strong>Student has identified some cultural contexts and social situations by:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Controlling spelling, paragraphing and a wide range of punctuation</td>
<td>- Controlling conventional spelling, punctuation and paragraphing</td>
<td>- Controlling conventional spelling, punctuation and paragraphing</td>
<td>- Using some conventional spelling, some punctuation, and some paragraphing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**32**