Technical accuracy in writing in GCSE English: methodology

QCA

Publications related to this report

This booklet explains the methodology used to analyse pupils' work in *Technical accuracy in writing in GCSE English*. The report of the findings of this QCA research project is also available on the QCA website or through the English team at QCA (0171 509 5624). This was followed up by a group of teachers who considered the implications of the work for their classroom teaching. Practical guidance on applying the findings in English planning and teaching can be found in a booklet called *Improving writing at key stages 3 and 4*, which is available through our publications order line (01787 88444).

Acknowledgements

Contents

Introduction

In 1995 the SCAA/Ofsted report on *Standards in Public Examinations 1975 to 1995*, found some concerns about GCSE examinations in English and levels of literacy among 16 years-old:

> *SCAA should initiate an enquiry into the standards of technical accuracy typically associated with key grades. Among other outcomes, this enquiry should identify the range of attainment in technical accuracy shown by candidates awarded each of these grades.*

Following this report, work was undertaken to develop ways of analysing accuracy in pupils' writing and the application of such methods to GCSE English scripts. Over 3 years the analyses were trialled and refined.

Six coding frames were designed to analyse the technical accuracy of the scripts: these frames targeted spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, sentence/clause and word class usage, textual organisation, and non-standard English. The coding frames used to analyse the technical accuracy of the scripts were adapted from draft coding frames previously devised by QCA (SCAA) with the intention of providing a common instrument for a variety of analyses and comparisons. Prior to the principal coding exercise in 1998, which furnished the data for this report, the frames had been trialled in a pilot project conducted in May 1997 using 60 GCSE scripts from 1996, and a larger pilot in October 1997 using 350 GCSE scripts. Following these pilots both the frames and the training process were amended and refined to increase the consistency, reliability and usefulness of the data-gathering.

The design aimed principally to provide quantitative data and quanlitative judgements too. Examples of actual errors, in spelling or non-standard English, for example, were recorded to provide additional qualitative data to support the quantitative findings. A computer database was devised and implemented by QCA to process the information.

In advance of the coding exercise itself, the project directors identified those examination tasks which were predominantly a test of writing rather than a test of reading. At this stage the tasks were also broadly categorised into two types, narrative and non-narrative: these categories were then used in the coding exercise in order to compare characteristic performances in narrative and non-narrative writing. Narrative included all tasks which implied recount, whether from real or imagined experience. At the heart of this distinction is the notion of chronology. Most narratives describe or relate to a series of events, characters or settings located in time, even if the events themselves are not presented chronologically. All tasks implying recount were coded as narrative; all tasks implying discussion, persuasion, report or explanation were coded as non-narrative. The purpose of the narrative/non-narrative coding was to allow consideration of relationships between types of text and technical accuracy. For example, through this coding it was possible to consider whether particular grammatical features were more prevalent in narrative than discursive writing, or whether punctuation usage varied according to the type of writing.

The Paragraphing and Textual Organisation frames were used on a complete piece of writing; the remaining four frames used a sample extract of 100 words of text. For the 100-word samples, a count of 100 words was made immediately following the sixth sentence. Where punctuation failed to demarcate sentences accurately the sample was taken from the point where the sixth sentence would have ended had the punctuation been accurate. Where the writing was too brief to provide 100 words after the sixth sentence, a 100-word extract was taken towards the end of the sample text.

In order to maximise accuracy and consistency in the coding exercise the coders were divided into three groups, each working with two of the coding frames. It was deemed more reliable to train coders to use and understand two frames thoroughly, rather than attempt to develop familiarity with all six. Prior to the coding exercise, all coders undertook a full day's training to ensure consistent application of the coding frames. To provide a means of checking the reliability of coders, ten scripts were coded by all coders, and their coding was analysed for item and coder consistency.

The shortcomings in the methodology need acknowledgement. The use of coding frames with pre-determined errors categorised, as in the spelling and non-standard English frames, inevitably means that other patterns of error or success may not be identified. The counts made in the clause analysis and word class analysis reflect characteristics and features of writing rather than accuracy, and do not fully assess effectiveness of usage in context. Additionally, although the frames were designed to be as objective as possible, nevertheless they embrace a variety of judgements which are partially subjective. For example, the classification of a noun as abstract or concrete may appear to be an objective judgement, but in practice frequently provokes disagreement.

The coding frames are a way of identifying specific aspects of writing which affect the reader's judgement of its accuracy and effectiveness. They may useful in contexts other than the one outlined here. For example, they could be applied to the writing of a class to identify areas for further work as well as providing relatively objective evidence of performance. The English team at QCA is keen to hear of any reactions to the coding frames and any uses made of them. Please contact Sue Horner, Janet White, Alastair West on 0171 509 5624.

Spelling

Functions of the frame

The spelling analysis serves two main functions. The first is to give evidence of the accuracy of the spelling of each writer. Each sample of writing analysed is composed of 100 words. The more able pupils in general score more highly, but it is clearly possible for less effective writing to achieve a high score through spelling correctly a very limited range of vocabulary. Thus, in the second box of the frame, coders rate the ambition of the vocabulary used. In this way it is possible to acknowledge both accuracy and complexity.

The second main function of the spelling analysis is to categorise the spelling errors. Although many errors are easily categorised, the different classifications sometimes operate on a 'best fit' principle. Counting large numbers of errors requires quick decisions. It is important not to agonise too long over individual errors; the aim is to find any broad patterns emerging. Specific identification of some errors for teaching purposes may necessitate adapting some categories and creating others. The results do not identify the causes of spelling errors and cannot take account of the fact that two pupils might well make the same spelling error for different reasons.

Although most of the categories are recognisable by most teachers, there is some arbitrariness about them. For example, many spelling errors could easily be classified in two or more categories. For example, *beleive* in the examples that follow is categorised as an error related to the long 'e' sound but it could also be categorised as inversion. It is important that coders establish a consistent approach to such ambiguities. The trial coding needs to take place before the actual coding and in such trials, it is important that coders consider as many words as possible in order that problem areas can be identified and consistency achieved.

A completed frame to illustrate coding decisions is on page 7. A blank frame is found on page 25.

Using the frame

- Identify the sample of 100 words, from the end of the sixth sentence.

- Mark the errors on the script; count the errors and insert in the box at the top of the coding frame the number of words spelt correctly.

- Having listed and counted the errors, think which of the three broad categories each error fits into: errors connected with omission, errors connected with endings and errors connected with sound. Any errors not categorised under these headings are then listed as other errors.

- Having decided which category is appropriate, refine your decision and, for each word, choose a sub-category.

- Write each error identified in the appropriate space; put in the final column the number of errors in each category.

Example and frame showing coding decisions

The following selection of errors can be used in training as a basis for achieving coder consistency.

Examples of spelling errors taken from the pilot project			
try (ing)	wot	finish (ed)	toliets
right (s)	oppertunity	door (s)	begining
beleive	gamling	metal (for mental)	their/there
stoped	det	offerd	caulosphobic
aquired	familyes	crieing	no where
opportunitys	hateing	comeing	of/off
arguement	rember	wastting	know/now
realy	basicly	visable	past/passed
help (ing)	laft	wonderfull	bear/bare
ingredinants	hardley	speach	where/were
becan	suden	religate	wheater
leve	strate	anythink	strenght
stricked	pocket (s)	alot	rumaged
superiar	foot step	habbit	desevre
beautifull			

CODING FRAME FOR THE ANALYSIS OF SPELLING

Total number of words correctly spelled:			
Range and sophistication of the vocabulary used: (3 = most sophisticated)			Total
1	2	3	
Type of Error	**Errors in sample** (write down each example)		
omission: of *d, ed or ing* on verb or participle	try (ing) help (ing) finish (ed)		
omission: of *s* on plural form or on verb	right (s) door (s) pocket (s)		
omission: phonemes (other than *s,* or *ed* or *ing)*	gam (b)ling rem (em)ber me (n) tal		
omission: other single letters	de (b) t offer (e) d a (c) quired		
	total number of errors of omission:		
ending: *s, ed or ing* added to words ending in *y*	familyes crieing opportunitys		
ending: verbs which end in *e*: adding *ing* or other	hateing comeing arguement		
ending: adverb formation error with *ly* or *ally*	hardley realy basicly		
ending: other suffix formations (eg *ful, able, ible*)	visable beautifull wonderfull		
	total number of errors concerned with endings:		
sound: homophones	bear/bare past/passed their/there		
sound: error in use of long *e* formation	beleive speach leve		
sound: errors in unstressed vowels	rel **i** gate superi **a** r opp **e** rtunity		
sound: phonetically plausible	wot strate laft		
sound: consonant confusion	anythink becan stricked		
	total number of errors associated with sound:		
other (1): word division	alot no where foot step		
other (2): inversions	toliets strenght desevre		
other (3): consonant doubling - inflections	stoped wastting begining		
other (4): consonant doubling - all other	habbit suden rumaged		
other (5): common words	where/were know/now of /off		
other (6): implausible, illegible	ingredinants caulosphobic wheater		
	total number of other errors:		

Notes/guidance on categories

- **Omission:** the first two omission categories can only be recognised in context since omitted endings may still leave correctly spelled words, albeit not the words that the writer intended. The other two omission categories distinguish between those errors which result in different pronunciation from the one intended (eg *metal* instead of *mental* - omitted phoneme) and those which leave the pronunciation largely unaltered (eg *det* - omitted letter). However, the last category also includes omission of 'e' from words like *snake* and *shape,* where the omission clearly does have an effect on how the word is said.

- **Ending:** this category draws together familiar types of error related to inflection which are largely self-evident.

- **Sound:** most of the errors exemplified here (as well as many of the errors in other categories) are, arguably, 'phonetically plausible'. However, some attempt has been made to categorise more specifically those errors which relate to sound, leaving only those errors not otherwise identified to be classified as phonetically plausible. Homophones need little elaboration. Long 'e' formations is a category is used to identify confusions particularly between 'e', 'ee', and 'ea', as well as the familiar inversion of 'i' and 'e'. The consonant confusion category captures confusion between words like *anythink* and *anything* where the error, when pronounced, is audible, and words like *absence* and *absense* where it is not. But the intention here is to bracket broad areas of similarity and further categorisation would be needed to make distinctions which might have specific teaching implications. Another example of consonant confusion would be that between 't' and 'd' (eg *excided*).

- **Other:** of these categories, two require some explanation. *Stoped* and *suden* are both errors related to doubling of letters, but they are classed as different types of error. In the former the word *stop* has been correctly spelled, but the writer has failed to double the last letter when inflecting the verb. In the latter, the word *sudden* has been misspelled. Thus the coding frame has a category for each type of error in order to discriminate between the two. Errors classified as 'implausible' are words where more than one error occurs, or where the attempted word bears comparatively little similarity to the one intended. So, while one might acknowledge the correct spelling of the suffix 'phobic', *caulosphobic* is too complex an error to categorise more precisely.

- Make a judgement about the sophistication of the vocabulary. This is a very broad judgement. '1' suggests very simple vocabulary, reducing the likelihood of spelling error. '3' indicates range and sophistication in vocabulary, with more complex demands on spelling.

Punctuation

Functions of the frame

The coding frame for the analysis of punctuation was designed to survey the range of punctuation devices used and the accuracy of their usage. The procedures for coding the punctuation were designed to ensure consistency between coders - the pilot studies had indicated that coders were not always consistent, particularly in decisions regarding sentence demarcation. Thus, a system of symbols for marking the scripts was devised to assist coders in checking their own coding, and more detailed guidance, including examples, was provided to enhance consistency.

Although comma splices are counted within the 'incorrect full stop' category, a separate count of comma splices is taken: the error of comma splicing is common and it is valuable to be able to discriminate between this single error and other errors in incorrect placing of the full stop. Similarly, errors in the use of the apostrophe in *its/it's* are counted separately and are not included in the counts of possessive or omissive apostrophes. In practice, it is often difficult to determine whether the error on *its/it's* is an incorrect use of the omissive apostrophe or an incorrect use of the possessive apostrophe.

A completed frame to illustrate coding decisions is on page 10. A blank frame is found on page 26.

Using the frame

- Identify the sample of 100 words, from the end of the sixth sentence.

- Before beginning the various counts for this frame, it may be helpful to devise a system for marking the script, such as circling correct full stops and using omission arrows for omitted full stops. Use of a colour-coded system for the various categories may make it easier to check back.

- Determine the grammatical end of each sentence.

- Once the grammatical sentence structure has been established, count and enter the occurrence or omission of correct sentence demarcation and capitalisation, remembering to note comma splices in the appropriate box.

- Following this, proceed through the coding frame, counting incidence and omission of punctuation. Although it is possible to count each category as it occurs chronologically in the script, it may be simpler to deal with the counting in sections. A helpful way to approach this is to think of the coding in terms of the following sections:

  - the different types of comma;

  - the apostrophe;

  - the demarcation of speech;

  - other punctuation devices.

Example and frame showing coding decisions

Below is a sample 100-word extract from a script: the completed coding frame resulting from an analysis of this extract is included overleaf, following the explanation of coding decisions.

Sample script

....

I had hunted tiger, wild boar, buffalo, and elephant, but nothing had felt like this.

That all changed the second I saw the huge dinosaur. It's towering body, its sharp teeth, glistening with blood of past prey. It was so big, so frightening. All excitment went, a flood of fear came rushing over me. I never felt such a strong fear before, but I had never had such a large, powerful, creature near me before.

I wanted to leave, I was so afraid I couldn't even speak. I tried to move, when I did I went the wrong way.

....

CODING FRAME FOR THE ANALYSIS OF PUNCTUATION

(showing how the sample script described above is coded)

A: Sentence Demarcation:	Number Correct	Number Incorrect	Number Omitted
Capital letter to begin sentence	8		0
Full stop to end sentence	8	2	0
Number of comma splices		2	

B: The Use of Commas:	Number Correct	Number Incorrect	Number Omitted
Commas to separate items in a list, or to separate a list of clauses	2	2	0
Commas used parenthetically	0	0	0
Commas to demarcate clauses, or as a discourse marker	3	0	0

C: Other Punctuation:	Number Correct	Number Incorrect	Number Omitted
Occurrence of its/it's	1	1	
Omissive apostrophe: eg *didn't; he's*	0	0	0
Possessive apostrophe: eg *girl's; women's*	0	0	0
Speech demarcated by speech marks	0	0	0
Speech layout			
Semi-colon	0	0	
Colon	0	0	
Parentheses	0	0	
Dashes	0	0	

Comment on text-specific punctuation features such as absence of full stops in headlines or leaflets; punctuation accompanying bullet points in a leaflet etc.

There are no text-specific features.

Explanation of coding decisions

Sentence demarcation

In this passage the sentence demarcation is generally clear and it is a straightforward task to count the correct full stops (8) and the correct capital letters (8). The only complication is caused by the comma splicing. There are two clear cases of a comma splice and a third ambiguous one:

- *I wanted to leave, I was so afraid I couldn't even speak.*

Here the comma links two sentences with distinctly different messages - the description of the desire to leave and the description of the fear, which is preventing speech. Thus the comma is categorised as a comma splice.

- *I tried to move, when I did I went the wrong way.*

Again the comma links two sentences with differing messages - the first describing the attempt to move, and the second describing what happened when movement was achieved. Thus the comma is categorised as a comma splice.

- *All excitment went, a flood of fear came rushing over me.*

In this construction the problem lies in deciding whether the comma is used as a comma splice or a co-ordinating device. The distinction between the message of the first clause, the loss of excitement, and the second clause, the rush of fear, is subtle and the omission of *and* to co-ordinate the two clauses contributes to the sense of fear 'rushing' and contrasts with the stillness of the previous short sentence (*It was so big, so frightening.*). The use of a full stop after *excitment went* would create a more staccato effect. Arguably, a semi-colon would be a more appropriate punctuation device in this context. The decision whether this should be a full stop separating two sentences or a comma co-ordinating two clauses is partly stylistic, dependent upon the effect the writer is trying to provoke (which we cannot discern by looking at the script). In the previous two examples of a comma splice there was no such ambiguity. In this case the script is coded as an example of a comma correctly demarcating a clause.

Use of commas

This script provides some helpful examples of a variety of uses of commas. There are two examples of commas used correctly to separate items in a list or a list of clauses:
- *It's towering body, its sharp teeth, glistening with blood of past prey.*
- *It was so big, so frightening.*

There are also two examples of commas used incorrectly in this passage to separate items in a list - firstly because a comma is used before *and* in the list and secondly when a comma separates the adjective from the noun:
- *I had hunted tiger, wild boar, buffalo, and elephant,*
- *I had never had such a large, powerful, creature near me before.*

There are three examples of commas used correctly to demarcate clauses:
- *I had hunted tiger, wild boar, buffalo, and elephant, but nothing had felt like this.*
- *All excitment went, a flood of fear came rushing over me.*
- *I never felt such a strong fear before, but I had never had such a large, powerful, creature near me before.*

Use of apostrophes

This script exemplifies clearly how to code the occurrence of *its/it's*. This writer uses *it's/its* twice, once correctly and once incorrectly. To code this, the occurrence of either *its* or *it's* is noted and a decision made about whether the form used is the correct or the incorrect form:
- *It's towering body, its sharp teeth.*

The first occurrence is coded incorrect, and the second coded correct.

Likewise, this writer's use of the omissive apostrophe in *couldn't* is coded as correct usage.

Sentence/clause structure and word class usage

Functions of the frame

The coding frame for sentence/clause structure and word class usage was designed to investigate the pattern of usage of subordinate and co-ordinate clauses, and the frequency patterns of the various word classes. Counting both the number of sentences and the number of finite verbs offers a dual perspective on sentence structure, allowing the analysis to describe the average number of sentences and of finite verbs per 100 words. Combined with the counts of subordinate and co-ordinate clauses the data offers the possibility of describing the length and structure of sentences in the samples.

The word class analysis provides data on patterns of usage of abstract nouns, adjectives, adverbs and lexical density. The comment box at the foot of the coding frame permits the coder to enter judgements regarding the effectiveness of the co-ordination and subordination, and the quality and range of vocabulary used.

A completed frame to illustrate coding decisions is on page 13. A blank frame is found on page 27.

Using the frame

- Identify the sample of 100 words, from the end of the sixth sentence.

- Determine the grammatical end of each sentence and count the number of sentences.

- To complete the sentence/clause analysis it is helpful to mark the text, such as underlining finite verbs, circling co-ordinating devices and putting square brackets around subordinate clauses. The counting of the features involves low numbers and, once the text is marked appropriately, is relatively straightforward.

- The word class analysis typically involves several double-checks or back-counting. To make this easier, it may help to use different colours to underline each of the word classes to be counted.

- As well as the numerical count of word classes, the actual examples of the words used should be recorded in the right-hand column of the coding frame to enable double-checking of the count of lexical density.

- When using this frame for systematic analysis, write the number (in pencil) above each non-lexical word as it is counted.

Example and frame showing coding decisions

Sample script

I had hunted tiger, wild boar, buffalo, and elephant, but nothing had felt like this.

That all changed the second I saw the huge dinosaur. It's towering body, its sharp teeth, glistening with blood of past prey. It was so big, so frightening. All excitment went, a flood of fear came rushing over me. I never felt such a strong fear before, but I had never had such a large, powerful, creature near me before.

I wanted to leave, I was so afraid I couldn't even speak. I tried to move, when I did I went the wrong way.

CODING FRAME FOR SENTENCE/CLAUSE STRUCTURE AND WORD CLASS USAGE

Sentence/clause analysis	Number
Number of sentences defined by grammatical structure, rather than punctuation	10
Number of finite verbs	15
Co-ordinated clauses Count the number of co-ordinating devices eg *and/but/so/and then/neither...nor* Include the comma as a co-ordinating device if appropriate	3
Effectiveness rating 1 ② 3 4	
Subordinate clauses eg time; place; cause; purpose; relative; condition	3
Effectiveness rating 1 ② 3 4	

Word class usage	Number	Actual words used
Abstract nouns	3	*excitement; fear (2)*
Other nouns (excluding proper nouns)	3	*tiger; boar; buffalo; elephant; second; dinosaur; body; teeth; blood; prey; flood; creature; way*
Adjectives (exclude *some, very, many, much, a lot/lots*, and numbers)	16	*wild; huge; towering; sharp; glistening; past; big; frightening; strong; large; all; such (2) powerful; afraid; wrong*
Adverbs	9	*all; so (3); never (2); before(2); even*
Non-lexical words eg prepositions; conjunctions; articles; auxiliaries; pronouns	21	

Comment on the impact of the sentence/clause structure, verb choices and word class usage.
Note especially how sentence structure, co-ordination and subordination are handled; and whether the vocabulary used is imaginative, adventurous or particularly apt.

Co-ordination and subordination effectively handled; one verbless sentence, possibly for effect. Contrasts in sentence length.

Apt vocabulary, varying from the much-used (big) to the less commonplace (glistening; prey; powerful). More reliant on adjectives for detail than the verbs which are generally straightforward and in common usage.

Explanation of coding decisions

Sentence/clause structure

Once the coding for punctuation has been completed, it is a straightforward task in this script to count the two comma splices as the grammatical ends of sentences and to count the remaining eight correctly used full stops, for a total of ten sentences. Likewise, the count of finite verbs in this extract presents no difficulties.

There are three co-ordinating devices in the script, two examples of *but* used as a co-ordinator, and one of a comma being used as a co-ordinator. (See notes on coding the punctuation frame, page 11, for discussion of this example of a comma used as a co-ordinator). The extract includes three subordinate clauses. Of these, only one uses a subordinating conjunction:

- *[when I did] I went the wrong way.*

The remaining two subordinate clauses are both relative clauses with the relative pronoun 'that' omitted:

- *That all changed the second [I saw the huge dinosaur.]*

- *I was so afraid [I <u>couldn't</u> even speak.]*

Effectiveness rating

Co-ordination is achieved principally through the use of *but*. It is consistently accurate, but neither complex, nor ambitious. The effectiveness rating is 2. Similarly, the subordination is accurately controlled, though simple, and its effectiveness rating is also 2.

Word class usage

The majority of word class decisions presented by this extract are straightforward and unproblematic. However, the four uses of the present participle requires a little more consideration:

- *It's <u>towering</u> body, its sharp teeth,*

- *<u>glistening</u> with blood of past prey.*

- *It was so big, so <u>frightening</u>.*

- *All excitment went, a flood of fear came <u>rushing</u> over me.*

The first three are all adjectival in function - *towering* describes the body; *glistening* describes the sharp teeth; and *frightening* describes the dinosaur (*it*). The fourth present participle, *rushing,* is verbal in function, detailing what the flood of fear did to the protagonist.

Paragraphing

Functions of the frames

The paragraphing frames were designed to investigate how far paragraphs are effectively used to order and manage the text. In particular, they allow exploration of the various ways in which writers link paragraphs. Experience in the pilot project suggested that the ways in which paragraphs are organised in narrative compared to non-narrative are sufficiently different to warrant the adaptation of the frames to suit these two broad categories of writing.

Judgements focus on whether the purposes of the paragraphing and the ways in which paragraphs might be linked – conjuncts in non-narrative and adverbials of time and place in narrative. Further judgements are made about linguistic patterning, which involves particular words or phrases repeated at the start of two or more paragraphs, and structural patterning which explores the underlying structure of the text, for example, the use of chronology in narrative, or the logical development of an argument in non-narrative.

A completed non-narrative frame to illustrate coding decisions is on page 17. Blank frames are found on pages 28 and 29.

Using the frames

Both narrative and non-narrative

- Read through the whole text to get a sense of the content and structure.

- Indicate in the box at the top of the page the total number of paragraphs used; where a script contains one uninterrupted block of text, indicate 0 paragraphs and tick the absent box

- Judge the degree to which the paragraphing is appropriate or partly appropriate: scripts having mainly single sentence paragraphs, for example, might be coded partly appropriate.

Non-narrative

- Note the presence of any other layout devices (for convenience of coding, use of quotations is included in this category): this is not a judgement about how well these devices are used, simply an indication of whether they appear in the text. Leave blank if these features do not appear.

- If there are no paragraphs, do not continue with the coding.

- Where paragraphs are present note the opening sentence of each paragraph and make a judgement as to whether paragraphs are introduced by a topic sentence mostly, sometimes or never. Tick the appropriate box.

- Consider the opening sentences of all paragraphs other than the first. Identify those conjuncts or equivalent phrases that are used either to order ideas or to re-focus what is being said. Equivalent phrases for conjuncts used to order might be the conjunction 'and' used as an alternative to 'additionally', or 'the first thing' used as an alternative to 'firstly'. Equivalents for conjuncts used to refocus or contrast might, for example, be 'but' used at the start of a paragraph as an alternative to 'however', or a clause/rhetorical expression such as 'others might suggest'. The emphasis is on identifying paragraphs explicitly linked by refocusing or ordering, not upon counting conjuncts, and it is likely that not many conjuncts will be used. Indicate in the appropriate box the number of each type of link occurring and write down each example. It is likely that any two paragraphs will be linked, if at all, by refocusing or by ordering, rather than by both.

- Note any linguistic patterning. This refers to any repeated or echoing phrasing which appears to be placed specifically at the opening of a paragraph (rather than appearing randomly and/or regularly in the text) in order to link a paragraph with another which follows or precedes it. Note examples; there is no counting involved.

- Next judge the quality of structural patterning. Decide the degree to which the paragraphs are based on some underlying organising principle. For example, do they support a logical argument, with the paragraphs representing significant elements of that argument? It is possible that paragraphs might not be explicitly linked by conjuncts but still be coherently organised by an underlying structure. Indicate in the appropriate box whether there is strong evidence, some evidence or little evidence for this.

- Finally make a comment which might illuminate any of the judgements, such as the particular form that the structural patterning took.

Narrative

- Consider if dialogue appears in the narrative. If it does, tick the box marked 'yes'. If it does not, tick the box marked 'no'. If you tick the box marked 'yes', make a judgement as to whether the paragraphing is appropriate, partly appropriate or absent.

- If there are no paragraphs, do not continue with the coding

- Consider the opening sentences of all paragraphs other than the first. Count and list the number of opening sentences which link with the previous paragraph by a time adverbial or conjunct. Write the number and the examples in the appropriate box. Count and list the number of opening sentences which link with the previous paragraph by a place adverbial. Write the number and the examples in the appropriate box. Include in each box other expressions, such as main clauses, which serve the function of moving the narrative on via time or place; for example, 'It was seven 0' clock' or 'the day arrived'. It is clearly possible that paragraphs can be linked by time and place, so the total count of paragraph links may amount to more than the total number of paragraphs. Remember that place adverbials usually appear in the latter part of a sentence and coders, unless very careful, may fail to note them.

- Note any linguistic patterning. This refers to any repeated or echoing phrasing which appears to be placed specifically at the opening of a paragraph (rather than appearing randomly and/or regularly in the text) in order to link a paragraph with another which follows or precedes it. There is no counting involved. Note examples only.

- Make a judgement about the quality of structural patterning. Decide the degree to which the paragraphs are based on some underlying organising principle.

- Finally make a comment which might illuminate any of the judgements. For example, describe the particular form that the structural patterning took. Subtle stories may well disguise or even disrupt neat links between segments of narrative. However, for most pupils, particularly in an examination context, conventionally formed narratives depending on chronology are more likely. Also, it is recognised that the structural organisation of a narrative can take many forms and there is not an assumption in these frames that there is a 'correct way' to manage events, characters, time or place. For example, a narrative may have no obvious linguistic links, but may be organised according to the places where events occur; or a narrative may deal with one character in one paragraph and another in another, and so on.

Example and frame showing coding decisions

Sound of Thunder
Inexpensive Progress
> *I thoroughly enjoyed the short story by Ray Bradbury. The idea that if we travelled back in time and changed something it might have an effect on what is at present. It might also change the future. The idea that if one little thing had happened differently, then it might have a knock on effect until something changed drastically.*
>
> *But it might change for the good, or it might change for the bad. In this story, it changes for the worst because of one man's cowardice. For the sake of one small butterfly, all men's lives are distinctly changed for the worst.*
>
> *In John Betjeman's poem, which wittily describes what my happen if we don't protect Britain's Heritage and wild life, there is a contrast, as Betjeman seems to be talking about what may happen in the future and tries to shock us into realising that if we do not stop building on greenery, then the whole country will become concrete and cement.*
>
> *Betjeman seems to be warning us not to overdevelop our towns and cities or we will live to regret it, whereas Ray Bradbury seems to just provoke thought by asking, what if? What if we could master time travel? What if we could go back in time? Surely, if we changed something in the past, then the future would change. Maybe if we went into the past, we would be immaterial. Invisible. This could lead to any number of different theorys.*
>
> *Although both pieces are quite negative about change Bradbury's seems not to matter quite as much as Betjeman's, whose is more of a prophecy than a what-if?*

CODING FRAME FOR THE ANALYSIS OF PARAGRAPHING: NON-NARRATIVE

Total number of paragraphs: (where there is no paragraphing enter 0)			5
Use of paragraphs or other layout devices (please tick)	Appropriate ✓	Partly appropriate	Absent
Other layout devices used (please tick)	Subheadings	Bullet points or numbers	Quotations
Where paragraphs are used, are they introduced by a topic sentence or statement of theme? (please tick)	Mostly ✓	Sometimes	Never

Continue the analysis only if paragraphing is present

Are links between paragraphs shown by:	Number	Notes/examples	
• use of conjuncts - listing, ordering eg *firstly; secondly; finally, to summarise; once; later; meanwhile; after that; then etc* (or phrases whose function is to list or order)	0		
• use of conjuncts - contrasting, re-focusing eg *however; on the other hand; moreover etc* (or phrases whose function is to contrast or re-focus)	3	But it might change ...there is a contrast Although both pieces are...	
• other linguistic patterning eg repetition of key words; repetition of a verbal technique	3	But it might change Betjeman seems to...Ray Bradbury seems to... Although...Bradbury's seems not to...	
• structural patterning eg logical development of subject or theme; logical contrast of subject or theme Please tick	**STRONG EVIDENCE** ✔	**SOME EVIDENCE**	**LITTLE EVIDENCE**

Comment
In a piece of writing designed to offer a personal opinion, there is an awareness of the need to link paragraphs with phrases, which serve to contrast or refocus ideas. Both 'But' and 'Although' are used with reasonable effectiveness to link the paragraphs. 'However' is probably a better alternative than 'But' in this context, but the effect is broadly the same. In the third paragraph, 'there is a contrast' attempts to link the two texts discussed, though it is not made entirely clear that the contrast lies between Bradbury's and Betjeman's texts rather than in John Betjeman's poem'.

There are three clear examples of (fairly simple) 'linguistic' patterning linking paragraphs. In the second paragraph 'But it might change' echoes the general theme of the first paragraph and, particularly, the phrase 'travelled back in time and changed something'. In the fourth paragraph the antithetical, 'Betjeman seems to be warning...whereas Ray Bradbury seems to just provoke' echoes the 'Betjeman seems to be talking about' in the third paragraph.

This (brief) piece has a very clear structure. The first paragraph offers a personal response to Ray Bradbury's story and the second paragraph continues and develops this response, underlining the main premise of the story. The third paragraph introduces the second text, John Betjeman's poem, and explicitly introduces the notion of a contrast with Ray Bradbury's story. The fourth paragraph develops the significance of the contrast and the last paragraph sums up the core of this argument. Though two of the paragraphs consist of single sentences and lack development, the structure of the paragraphing offers clear support to the reader.

Textual organisation

Functions of the frame

The textual organisation coding frames were designed to analyse the writer's ability to manage the text at whole text level. In particular, they invite consideration of four elements of writing: the opening, the ending, establishing of a relationship between the reader and the writer, and cohesion and coherence.

The narrative and non-narrative coding frames are broadly similar with some minor differences. In **openings** the most obvious difference is the need to make a judgement about the narrative 'problem'. For both frames the basic analytical question about **endings** is the same, *to what degree does the conclusion/closure 'fit' what has gone before it?* In terms of the **reader-writer relationship** the differences are obvious and reflect the purposes of narrative as opposed to non-narrative. In the non-narrative frame, 'point of view' is intended to be synonymous with 'argument' or 'opinion'. This contrasts with the narrative frame where 'viewpoint' is intended to describe the perspective from which the story is told.

Using numbers to make judgements about broad textual elements is problematic. Also, it is important to see the detailed criteria as an indication of some of the different elements that might constitute, for example, cohesion or coherence rather than a set of hurdles. To analyse one script in detail, using all the elements suggested would take a considerable amount of time. Working with several hundred scripts, therefore, it is important that the criteria are seen as guides to support the coder in making judgements on broad patterns. A very different sort of attention would be necessary for close analysis of the work of an individual writer.

A completed non-narrative frame to illustrate coding decisions is on page 20. Blank frames are found on pages 30 and 31.

Using the frames – narrative and non-narrative

- Read the text through.

- **Opening:** Read again the first ten lines or the opening paragraph. Where the opening paragraph is very brief, (eg one sentence) continue for the first ten lines. Where the opening paragraph moves beyond 10 lines continue until to the end of a sentence. Make specific judgements as indicated in the left-hand column – ring the appropriate numbers. Use those judgements to inform your overall judgement about the effectiveness of the opening. Ring the appropriate number in the right-hand column.

- **Ending:** Read again the last ten lines or final paragraph. Where the final paragraph is very brief, (eg one sentence) read back till the last 10 lines are read. Where the closing paragraph goes back beyond 10 lines continue to the opening of a sentence. Make specific judgements as indicated in the left-hand column. Use those judgements to inform your overall judgement about the effectiveness of the ending. Again, remember that the numbers on the left help to inform judgement. It is not necessary to aggregate them in order to select a final judgement in the right-hand column.

- **Reader-writer relationship**: Consider the whole text, including the opening and ending. Consider the criteria in the left-hand column. Make judgements about each element and circle the appropriate numbers. Finally make an overall judgement and indicate it by circling the appropriate number in the right-hand column. Your broad judgement will decide to what degree the writer has helped the reader to understand and engage with the text.

- **Cohesion/coherence:** Consider the whole text, including the opening and ending. Consider the criteria in the left-hand column. Make judgements about each element and circle the appropriate numbers. Finally make an overall judgement and indicate it by circling the appropriate number in the right-hand column. Your broad judgement will need to balance your judgements about the effectiveness of the grammatical features, which make the text cohesive, and the degree to which themes and ideas are sustained (coherence).

- Finally, make an overall judgement about the effectiveness of the textual organisation and ring the appropriate number.

Example and frame showing coding decisions

> **Sound of Thunder**
> **Inexpensive Progress**
>
> *I thoroughly enjoyed the short story by Ray Bradbury. The idea that if we travelled back in time and changed something it might have an effect on what is at present. It might also change the future. The idea that if one little thing had happened differently, then it might have a knock on effect until something changed drastically.*
>
> *But it might change for the good, or it might change for the bad. In this story, it changes for the worst because of one man's cowardice. For the sake of one small butterfly, all men's lives are distinctly changed for the worst.*
>
> *In John Betjeman's poem, which wittily describes what my happen if we don't protect Britain's Heritage and wild life, there is a contrast, as Betjeman seems to be talking about what may happen in the future and tries to shock us into realising that if we do not stop building on greenery, then the whole country will become concrete and cement.*
>
> *Betjeman seems to be warning us not to overdevelop our towns and cities or we will live to regret it, whereas Ray Bradbury seems to just provoke thought by asking, what if? What if we could master time travel? What if we could go back in time? Surely, if we changed something in the past, then the future would change. Maybe if we went into the past, we would be immaterial. Invisible. This could lead to any number of different theorys.*
>
> *Although both pieces are quite negative about change Bradbury's seems not to matter quite as much as Betjeman's, whose is more of a prophecy than a what-if?*

CODING FRAME FOR TEXTUAL ORGANISATION: NON-NARRATIVE WRITING

For each point below circle one number (4 = highest quality)

In the first ten lines or opening paragraph, evaluate the writer's ability to:	**produce an effective opening** 1 2 ③ 4 **Comments**
signal the theme/topic 1 ② 3 4	*(see explanation))*
signal the genre/form, for example through use of verb tense or subject (abstract, generic, personal, non-personal) 1 2 ③ 4	
In the final ten lines or closing paragraph, evaluate the writer's ability to:	**produce an effective ending** 1 2 ③ 4 **Comments**
show congruence with the opening 1 2 ③ 4	
show congruence with the theme/topic 1 ② 3 4	*(see explanation))*
show congruence with the genre/form 1 2 ③ 4	
provide a clear summary or conclusion 1 2 ③ 4	
In the whole text, evaluate the writer's ability to:	**establish a relationship with the reader** 1 ② 3 4 **Comments**
position the reader appropriately via address (direct or indirect), register (formal or informal), modality, use of passive or active voice 1 2 ③ 4	
position the reader appropriately via affective or judgmental lexis, use of rhetorical devices 1 2 ③ 4	*(see explanation))*
manage content/information/evidence (on behalf of the reader) 1 ② 3 4	
sustain or develop a point of view or argument 1 ② 3 4	
In the whole text, evaluate the writer's ability to:	**maintain cohesion/coherence** 1 2 ③ 4 **Comments**
maintain cohesion (eg via use of pronouns, ellipsis, conjuncts) 1 ② 3 4	
maintain coherence (eg by sustaining theme or form) 1 ② 3 4	*(see explanation))*
reinforce argument/theme (eg via repetition or contrasts) 1 2 ③ 4	
sustain lexical harmony 1 2 ③ 4	
Make a judgement about the overall quality of the textual organisation; ring the appropriate number 1 2 ③ 4	

Explanation of coding decisions

Opening

One half of the theme (Ray Bradbury's perspective on time) is clearly signalled, though reference to the other half (John Betjeman's perspective on progress) does not appear until midway through the answer: a fairly clear, if incomplete beginning. The genre (combination of report and review) is appropriately conveyed through predominantly generic, third person subjects (eg. *it*, representing time travel, and *all men's lives*). However, the opening sentence begins appropriately in the first person as the writer offers a personal stance before beginning the discussion.

Ending

There is an effective conclusion, entirely appropriate for a discussion: a judgement is made about similarities (*both pieces are quite negative*) and differences (a *prophecy* compared to a *what if*. The final sentence contains direct reference to the question (comparing change in the two texts), but, in the last 10 lines there is an imbalance in addressing the theme - still much more emphasis on Bradbury. The last paragraph certainly echoes the first, linguistically and conceptually.

Reader-writer relationship

The 'tone' is a good balance of tentativeness (conveyed through modal expressions - *might, if, could, would*) and firmness (conveyed through judgmental lexis, particularly adverbs - *thoroughly, drastically, distinctly, surely, wittily*). Arguably, the weakest element of this piece relates to handling of information and development of point of view. There is simply not enough textual evidence and we are left with a number of hypotheses. Arguments are expressed and then left hanging rather than developed, (*this could lead to any number of theorys*). The reader is left to answer most of the questions.

Cohesion/coherence

While the paragraphing structure supports the general coherence of the piece, there are problems of cohesion within the first two paragraphs. In particular the pronoun, *it* is used six times referring to time-travel, an action performed in the future, and the future itself; distinctions between these differing referents are not clarified.

Although the argument is not fully developed, the writer uses repetition and contrast to reinforce the points made. Examples can be found in the first paragraph (*the idea ... the idea*) and in the fourth paragraph where w*hat if* is effectively repeated to drive home the hypothetical theme of Bradbury's story.

For the most part, the vocabulary is reasonably ambitious, consistent, and appropriate to the formality of the genre (*provoke, cowardice, contrast, greenery, immaterial, invisible*). Discordant notes are occasionally struck: *but it might change for good or it might change for <u>bad</u>,* and the final *what-if*? (prefaced by *a*) represents an inventive attempt to deal in one phrase with notions of hypothesis, speculation and prediction.

Judgements

For this particular piece of writing the numbers point towards two tentative judgements. The first is that the preponderance of 3's and 2's suggest this piece is only bordering on successful. More significantly, the particular spread of numbers points to comparative strengths and weaknesses within the writing. So, the numerical judgements suggest that this piece of writing is strongest in its broad structure, ie the opening and ending (mainly graded 3). Although the strategies to support the reader are generally effective, the lack of information, detail and developed argument make this a weaker aspect of the writing (graded 2: the 'tone' is successful but detail is weak). In terms of cohesion/coherence there is a similar balance of strengths and weaknesses though the final judgement is marginally higher.

Non-standard English

Functions of the frame

The coding frame on the use of non-standard English was designed to provide information on the range and nature of non-standard usage in pupils' written work. The basis for the categories listed on the coding frame is a previous research report, commissioned by SCAA in 1995. Unlike punctuation and sentence/clause analysis, where every script can be coded to describe its features of punctuation or sentence/clause structure, the non-standard English analysis looks only at the incidence of non-standard English.

Using the frame

- Identify the sample of 100 words from the end of the sixth sentence.

- As incidences of non-standard English are generally infrequent, simply read the extract and underline any occurrences of non-standard English.

- Do not count any occurrence which is in direct speech.

- Determine what categories of error the non-standard usages represent and enter them on the frame accordingly. The actual examples should be recorded in the right-hand column.

Example and frame showing coding decisions

> **Examples of non-standard English usage found in the pilot scripts**
>
> *It was a sunny afternoon when I found out that <u>we was</u> moving house.*
>
> *If I was Fran and <u>I keeped</u> hearing them arguing <u>I would of</u> shouted at the top of my voice.*
>
> *How I would solve my problems is <u>getting them both sat down</u> and discussing.*
>
> *A very posing issue and one which we need to ask ourselves in this day and age is what <u>the role</u> of men and women <u>are</u> in our society.*
>
> *Nowadays <u>there is more jobs</u> for men than women.*
>
> *We had all got the answer <u>off each other</u>.*
>
> *As the toilets came in sight <u>me and Barry</u> ran ignoring Mrs Cannes screaming.*

ANALYSIS OF NON-STANDARD FEATURES USED IN WRITING

(DO NOT COUNT NON-STANDARD USAGE IN DIRECT SPEECH)

Categories	Number present	Please write actual examples of non-standard usage below
non-standard irregular past tense forms: eg *shooted; breaked*	1	*I keeped...*
plural subject with singular verb: eg *they goes*	1	*we was moving house...*
singular subject with plural verb: eg *he shoot well, doesn't he?*	1	*the role ...are...*
use of is/was after there with plural nouns: eg *there is/was lots of people*	1	*There is more jobs...*
adjective used as adverb: eg *He did it quick*	0	
non-standard irregular past participle: eg *I was sat*	1	*getting them both sat down...*
more with comparative adjective: eg *more quicker*	0	
use of preposition in place of verb: eg *should of; could of*	1	*I would of shouted...*
non-standard use of prepositions: eg *I went up the shops*	1	*got the answer off each other...*
me with subject Noun Phrase: eg *Me and John*	1	*me and Barry ran...*
no plural marker on nouns of quantity, measurement etc: eg *five pound of apples*	0	
non-standard use of definite/indefinite article:	0	

Coding frames

The frames are included here so that teachers and researchers can use them. They may be replicated for non-commercial educational purposes.

The English team at QCA would like to hear of any work involving the use of these coding frames.

Calendar Year	School Year	Candidate No	Coder ID	P (Narrative):	Test:	(please tick where appropriate)
				Q (Non-Narrative):	Coursework:	

QCA

CODING FRAME FOR THE ANALYSIS OF SPELLING

Total number of words correctly spelled:

Range and sophistication of the vocabulary used: (3 = most sophisticated, please circle)

1   2   3

Type of Error	Errors in sample (write down each example)	Total
omission: of *d, ed or ing* on verb or participle		
omission: of *s* on plural form or on verb		
omission: phonemes (other than *s,* or *ed* or *ing)*		
omission: other single letters		
ending: *s, ing* or *ed* added to words ending in *Y*		
ending: verbs which end in *e*, adding *ing* or other		
ending: adverb formation error with *ly* or *ally*		
ending: other suffix formations (eg *ful, able, ible*)		
sound: homophones		
sound: error in long 'e' formation		
sound: errors in unstressed vowels		
sound: phonetically plausible		
sound: consonant confusion		
other (1): word division		
other (2): inversions		
other (3): consonant doubling - inflections		
other (4): consonant doubling - all other		
other (5): common words		
other (6): implausible, illegible		

Calendar Year	School Year	Candidate No	Coder ID	P (Narrative):	Test:	(please tick where appropriate)	
				Q (Non-Narrative):	Coursework:		QCA

CODING FRAME FOR THE ANALYSIS OF PUNCTUATION

A: Sentence Demarcation:	Number Correct	Number Incorrect	Number Omitted
Capital letter to begin sentence			
Full stop to end sentence			
Number of comma splices			

B: The Use of Commas:	Number Correct	Number Incorrect	Number Omitted
Commas to separate items in a list, or to separate a list of clauses			
Commas used parenthetically			
Commas to demarcate clauses, or as a discourse marker			

C: Other Punctuation:	Number Correct	Number Incorrect	Number Omitted
Occurrence of *its/it's*			
Omissive apostrophe: eg *didn't; he's*			
Possessive apostrophe: eg *girl's; women's*			
Speech demarcated by speech marks			
Speech layout			
Semi-colon			
Colon			
Parentheses			
Dashes			

Comment on text-specific punctuation features such as absence of full stops in headlines or leaflets; punctuation accompanying bullet points in a leaflet etc.

Calendar Year	School Year	Candidate No	Coder ID	P (Narrative):	Test:	(please tick where appropriate)	
				Q (Non-Narrative):	Coursework:		QCA

CODING FRAME FOR SENTENCE/CLAUSE STRUCTURE AND WORD CLASS USAGE

Sentence/clause analysis	Number			
Number of sentences defined by grammatical structure, rather than punctuation				
Number of finite verbs				
Co-ordinated clauses Count the number of co-ordinating devices eg *and/but/so/and then/neither...nor* Include the comma as a co-ordinating device if appropriate				
EFFECTIVENESS RATING	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Subordinate clauses eg time, place, cause, purpose, relative, condition				
EFFECTIVENESS RATING	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**

Word class usage	Number	Actual words used
Abstract nouns		
Other nouns (excluding proper nouns)		
Adjectives (exclude *some, very, many, much, a lot/lots*, and numbers)		
Adverbs		
Non-lexical words eg prepositions, conjunctions, articles, auxiliaries, pronouns		

Comment on the impact of the sentence/clause structure, verb choices and word class usage.
Note especially how sentence structure, co-ordination and subordination are effectively handled, or whether the vocabulary used is imaginative, adventurous or particularly apt.

QCA

CODING FRAME FOR THE ANALYSIS OF PARAGRAPHING: NARRATIVE

Total number of paragraphs: [　] (where there is no paragraphing enter '0')

Use of paragraphs or other layout devices (please tick)	Appropriate	Partly appropriate	Absent

Is dialogue used? (please tick)	YES	**If yes, is paragraphing** (please tick)	Appropriate	Partly appropriate	Absent
	NO				

Continue the analysis only if paragraphing is present.

Are links between paragraphs shown by:	Number	Notes/examples
• use of conjuncts (ordering) • or adverbials (time) (eg *later; meanwhile; later that day; after a while; finally; when they saw the body; at 10 o'clock,* etc)		
• adverbials (place) (eg *in the garden; back at the ranch*, etc)		
• other linguistic patterning (*eg repetition of verbs or significant nouns, or refrain*)		
• structural patterning (eg events in plot, chronology, shifts or patterns in character or place; thematic patterning)　　Please tick	STRONG EVIDENCE	SOME EVIDENCE	LITTLE EVIDENCE
Any comments, particularly on structural patterning		

Calendar Year	School Year	Candidate No	Coder ID	P (Narrative):	Test:	(please tick where appropriate)
				Q (Non-Narrative):	Coursework:	

QCA

CODING FRAME FOR THE ANALYSIS OF PARAGRAPHING: NON-NARRATIVE

Total number of paragraphs: [ ] (where there is no paragraphing enter '0')

Use of paragraphs or other layout devices (please tick)	Appropriate	Partly appropriate	Absent
Other layout devices used (please tick)	Subheadings	Bullet Points or Numbers	Quotations
Where paragraphs are used, are they introduced by a topic sentence or statement of theme? (please tick)	Mostly	Sometimes	Never

Continue the analysis only if paragraphing is present.

Are links between paragraphs shown by:	Number Occurring	Notes/examples		
• use of conjuncts - listing, ordering eg *firstly; secondly, finally, to summarise, once, later, meanwhile, after that, then* (or phrases whose function is to list or order)				
• use of conjuncts - contrasting, re-focusing eg *however, on the other hand, moreover* (or phrases whose function is to contrast or re-focus)				
• other linguistic patterning eg repetition of key words; repetition of a verbal technique				
• structural patterning eg logical development of subject or theme; logical contrast of subject or theme (please tick)	STRONG EVIDENCE	SOME EVIDENCE	LITTLE EVIDENCE	
Any comments, particularly on structural patterning:				

Calendar Year	School Year	Candidate No	Coder ID	P (Narrative):	Test:	(please tick where appropriate)
				Q (Non-Narrative):	Coursework:	

QCA

CODING FRAME FOR TEXTUAL ORGANISATION: NARRATIVE WRITING

For each point below circle one number (4 = highest quality)

In the first ten lines or opening paragraph, evaluate the writer's ability to:	**produce an effective opening** **1 2 3 4** **Comments**
signal the genre/theme, either explicitly or implicitly 1 2 3 4	
establish or leave clues to context: character/setting/time frame 1 2 3 4	
initiate the narrative 'problem' 1 2 3 4	
In the final ten lines or closing paragraph, evaluate the writer's ability to:	**produce an effective ending** **1 2 3 4** **Comments**
show evidence of closure or resolution (including deliberate ambiguity) 1 2 3 4	
show congruence with genre/theme 1 2 3 4	
echo/make reference to opening and/or developed context (character/setting/time frame) 1 2 3 4	
produce a coda, or comment upon theme 1 2 3 4	
In the whole text, evaluate the writer's ability to:	**establish a relationship with the reader** **1 2 3 4** **Comments**
position the reader appropriately via rhetorical questions, asides, statements and questions, use of passive or active voice 1 2 3 4	
position the reader appropriately via emotive or judgmental lexis 1 2 3 4	
support the reader by maintaining control of narrative through use of pace and detail 1 2 3 4	
sustain or develop viewpoint 1 2 3 4	
In the whole text, evaluate the writer's ability to:	**maintain cohesion/coherence** **1 2 3 4** **Comments**
maintain cohesion (eg via use of names, pronouns, ellipsis, reference to assumed knowledge, tense) 1 2 3 4	
maintain coherence (eg by sustaining narrative, character, setting, theme, genre) 1 2 3 4	
reinforce plot/theme (eg via repetition or contrasts) 1 2 3 4	
sustain lexical harmony 1 2 3 4	

Make a judgement about the overall quality of the textual organisation; ring the appropriate number

1   2   3   4

Calendar Year	School Year	Candidate No	Coder ID	P (Narrative):	Test:	(please tick where appropriate)
				Q (Non-Narrative):	Coursework:	

QCA

CODING FRAME FOR TEXTUAL ORGANISATION: NON-NARRATIVE WRITING
For each point below circle one number (4 = highest quality)

In the first ten lines or opening paragraph, evaluate the writer's ability to:	**produce an effective opening** **1 2 3 4** **Comments**
signal the theme/topic 1 2 3 4	
signal the genre/form, for example through use of verb tense or subject (abstract, generic, personal, non-personal) 1 2 3 4	

In the final ten lines or closing paragraph, evaluate the writer's ability to:	**produce an effective ending** **1 2 3 4** **Comments**
show congruence with the opening 1 2 3 4	
show congruence with the theme/topic 1 2 3 4	
show congruence with the genre/form 1 2 3 4	
provide a clear summary or conclusion 1 2 3 4	

In the whole text, evaluate the writer's ability to:	**establish a relationship with the reader** **1 2 3 4** **Comments**
position the reader appropriately via address (direct or indirect), register (formal or informal), modality, use of passive or active voice 1 2 3 4	
position the reader appropriately via affective or judgmental lexis, use of rhetorical devices 1 2 3 4	
manage content/information/evidence (on behalf of the reader) 1 2 3 4	
sustain or develop a point of view or argument 1 2 3 4	

In the whole text, evaluate the writer's ability to:	**maintain cohesion/coherence** **1 2 3 4** **Comments**
maintain cohesion (eg via use of pronouns, ellipsis, conjuncts, tense) 1 2 3 4	
maintain coherence (eg by sustaining theme or form) 1 2 3 4	
reinforce argument/theme (eg via repetition or contrasts) 1 2 3 4	
sustain lexical harmony 1 2 3 4	

Make a judgement about the overall quality of the textual organisation; ring the appropriate number 1   2   3   4

P (Narrative):   Test: (please tick where appropriate)

Q (Non-Narrative):   Coursework:

QCA

ANALYSIS OF NON-STANDARD FEATURES USED IN WRITING
DO NOT COUNT NON-STANDARD USAGE IN DIRECT SPEECH
(leave box in blank if you find zero)

	Number present	Please write actual examples of non-standard usage below
non-standard irregular past tense forms: eg *shooted; breaked*		
plural subject with singular verb: eg *they goes*		
singular subject with plural verb: eg *he shoot well, doesn't he?*		
use of is/was after there with plural nouns: eg *there is/was lots of people*		
adjective used as adverb: eg *He did it quick*		
non-standard irregular past participle forms: eg *I was sat*		
more with comparative adjective: eg *more quicker*		
use of preposition in place of verb: eg *should of; could of*		
non-standard use of prepositions: eg *I went up the shops*		
me with subject Noun Phrase: eg *Me and John*		
no plural marker on nouns of quantity, measurement etc: eg *five pound of apples*		
non-standard use of definite/indefinite article:		