

# Assessing a student text using Lexis Education's Language and Learning Development Continuum

## Case study with a 9-year-old EAL student

This text has been written by a 9-year-old EAL student after some scaffolding by the teacher. Non-EAL 9-year-olds would be expected to be achieving at least Phase 5 of the LLDC but a reading of the text suggests instead Phases 2 or 3.

### Global assessment

On the basis of this text alone, our analysis confirms our prediction that the student is working mainly in Phase 2 but with quite a few elements of Phase 3.

### GENRE

The structure of this text is according to what one would expect for a very basic personal Recount. The teacher, at some point, has provided the student with the chronology of the weekend's events as sentence starters and the student has organised each day into a separate paragraph. The last paragraph in this text functions as an overall evaluation of the weekend's events.

A high-achieving student might provide an aside or two and might include evaluations of the events within the paragraphs rather than having a final evaluating paragraph. As with any generic structure, options are possible but what a text looks like depends on both the student's abilities and the teacher's scaffolding work. For Genre, this student is working in this text in Phase 3 of the Continuum.

### MODE

The text unfolds according to two main items only. The Circumstances of time (eg On Friday after school, Next, After that) have been provided by the teacher. Apart from those marked Themes, every orientation is to the writer (I). It makes the text read like a calendar 'to do' list with many things repeated each day.

The lack of variety in the Participants acting as Theme means that all the Processes realise actions by the student and so we don't get descriptions or evaluations.

For Mode, the above analysis as well as the errors in spelling and punctuation suggest the student is working in Phases 2/3.

### My Weekend

On Friday after school I went home then I play at the bakyard Next I played withe my frend After that I went home Laeter on I went to bed.

On Saturday I did my homework then I played withe my frend Next I to the shop After theat I went home and I went to bed.

On Sanday I did my homework Next I went to dad's frend I went to play then I went home and I went to bed

I liked Sanday because I went to my fends home.



### FIELD

The main feature of this text in terms of Field is its bare and simplistic content. While the generic structure was scaffolded, the content appears not to have been or been very limited. We hear about five events: going somewhere, doing homework, playing with someone, going home and going to bed. We don't find out about things such as what they played, or who the friend was, or for how long they played. That means that the range of Processes, Participants and Circumstances is very limited. All the nominal groups bar the last one are either 1 or 2 words in length. No Numeratives, Describers, Classifiers or Qualifiers are used. There are simple Circumstances of place (home, at the backyard, to bed ...) and the Circumstances of time essentially have been provided by the teacher.

There are linking conjunctions (and, then) but there is only one use of a binding conjunction (because), underlining the fact that the student hasn't added any complexity through cause and effect, or possibilities.

We can conclude that for Field, the student is working in Phase 2 of the Continuum.

### TENOR

As mentioned for Genre, if the evaluation that comes at the end were instead woven into the other paragraphs and specific events, then we could say the student would be working in a higher Phase. As it is, this text suggests that the student is limited in Tenor and, if we cross-reference with Mode and the student's repetitive orientations making it read like a list of mundane things, we can conclude that the student is working in Phase 2 of the Continuum.