### Assessment of learning in the context of equity and power

Literature Review

Attention to the ways of assessing student learning is a central element of inclusive teaching, particularly when attention is given to the importance of language and literacies for learning. There is a significant body of literature that laments assessment that is based on tacit and unclear understandings of what counts as ‘good’ assessed work (Lea & Street, 1998; Smith, 2004; Green, 2011; Clughen & Hardy, 2012) and impoverished feedback (Beaumont et al., 2011; Tuck, 2012; Harman & McDowell, 2011; Buchanan, Ljungdahl & Maher, 2015;), although there is also literature that speaks from the lecturer-assessor’s perspective and critiques the work involved in offering feedback and different levels of student uptake of that feedback (Bailey & Garner, 2010; Price, Handley & Millar, 2011; Tuck, 2012, 2013).

The literature included in this review that attends to the issues connected with assessment examines the importance of clarity in communicating what is expected. For example, Devlin & O’Shea’s (2012) research into effective teaching and learning for/with low SES students reports that having available and enthusiastic teachers was the most significant factor cited by students who had completed Year 1 of their undergraduate degree; teachers’ ‘communication skills’ were the third most commonly reported factor, which was particularly the case when it came to the clarity of assessment criteria**.** Similarly, Trevor Gale (2011b) argues that there are three narratives that guide principles for inclusive teaching (‘teaching for equity’) which align with the findings in Devlin & O’Shea (2012): the diversity of learners needs to be considered in curriculum and pedagogy, active engagement with students is necessary (through pedagogy), and assessment should be explicitly and clearly linked to pedagogy.

Assessment has also been a focus in the literature that attends to particular equity groups. For example, Kent’s (2016) work on access and participation in online learning for students with disabilities illustrates how assumptions about assessment can impede their success. For instance, assessment in the form of on-campus, invigilated exams can be difficult to access for people who have limited mobility or transport issues, not to mention being incongruent with the mode of delivery (online). Moreover, for students who have mental health issues, the imposition of (multiple) deadlines and narrow frames of what ‘counts’ can cause stress, and group work assignments need to be carefully designed to allow for the possibility of accommodation. Kent argues that these issues need to be carefully attended to, as well as revising extension policies to ensure they are flexible and responsive to students’ needs. Slee’s (2010) essay on the alignment of a culturally responsive program for teacher training Indigenous students in the Northern Territory, which includes ‘culturally responsive assessment practices’, exposes similar tensions. Her analysis of the ‘Growing Own Our’ program and the institution’s policy on assessment were in conflict because of the narrow view of assessment instantiated in policy. Slee makes a series of recommendations to permit the flexibility to build culturally responsive forms of pedagogy and assessment, such as allowing teaching assistants to work as group to meet the criteria of one task (to design, make and appraise a teaching aid) rather than doing it individually, so that their ‘communitarian’ ethos (Bunda, Zipin & Brennan, 2012) is valorised, and by explicitly drawing on knowledge of elders (lecturers and students) to design, deliver and evaluate the program. The tension between prescriptive institutional guidelines on assessment, based on notions of fairness and impartiality and the experience of designing assessments that demonstrate a holistic understanding of ‘assessment literacies’ (see Willis, Adie & Klenowski, 2013).

For students entering higher education from ‘alternative pathways’, adapting to university assessment epistemologies and practices are often challenging. This is particularly the case for students who use the TAFE pathway to access higher education studies because of the wholesale epistemological differences between competency-based training (TAFE) and graded assessment (university), which involves not only different ways of assessing learning, but also different literacies, different practices and qualitatively different views of what counts as knowledge (Wheelahan, 2009; Pardy & Seddon, 2011; Tranter, 2012; Weadon & Baker, 2014; Delly, 2015). Ambrose et al.’s (2013) study of how academic language and literacies staff can facilitate the transitions for students moving from TAFE to higher education more effectively also identified incongruities between cultures of learning, literacies, and assessment practices. They argue that to counter these issues, TAFE students need more carefully scaffolded orientations – especially for Diploma students moving into Year 2 of undergraduate study. More importantly, university lecturers should explicitly expect to teach students who have not previously studied at university; therefore, they need to unpack their own assumptions of who is in their class and about what students ‘should be able to do’. This could be enacted in the pedagogic environment by revising all core ‘skills’, which would arguably aid all students after a long break between academic years.

Another assessment-related concern that is noted in the literature reviewed here is that of diagnostic testing. Similar to the discussions about open access programs that impose no pre-requisite entry qualifications, there are ethical, logistical and equity issues at play here. The work of Neil Murray (for example, Klinger & Murray, 2012; Murray, 2013) has examined the efficacy of implementing a Post-Enrolment Language Assessment (PELA) as a means of identifying ‘at risk’ students who require additional support with their learning, language and literacies to succeed in their studies. As well as considering the potential institutional risk and kudos that a PELA might bring, Klinger & Murray question who should be asked to take the PELA: who are the at-risk groups? They make the point that If the PELA is elective, some ‘at-risk’ students may not be assessed; thus “the only watertight alternative is to test *all* newly enrolled students” (p.306), but this would be (more) expensive and logistically complicated. Murray explicates further in his 2013 paper, arguing that implementing a PELA needs broad consultation throughout and within institutions; “Only then can institutions feel confident they are meeting their ethical and educational responsibilities to those non-traditional student cohorts whose interests they espouse, and whose successes or failures both during and following their studies will reflect on their graduating universities” (p.309).
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| Murray, N. (2013). [Widening participation and English language proficiency: a convergence with implications for assessment practices in higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075079.2011.580838), *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(2), 299–311.  AUS  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *widening participation; English language proficiency; post-enrolment; language assessment; language competence of non-traditional students* | **Context:** Explores interconnections between WP agenda and English language proficiency (assessment and support) in context of diverse student population (as a result of massification). Examines the efficacy and argues for/against the use of post-enrolment English assessments (PELAs). Interconnection between WP & language proficiency = not restricted to NESB, although NESB is often focus. Issues with proficiency prevail despite entry requirements leading to some teachers ‘toning down’ their courses to accommodate linguistically diverse cohort [but this is not often the case; perhaps tutors are toning down marks/grades]. For students, lower than needed proficiency leads to attrition, lack of engagement, stigma, “potential source of real trauma”, reinforcing “latent feelings of a lack of self-efficacy” and can lead to issues getting work after graduating (p.300).  Policy context = DEEWR doc ‘Good practice principles for English language proficiency for international students in Australian universities’. English language also aligned with national economic (neoliberal goals) in Bradley Review (p.xi). **However**, English proficiency causes issues for native speakers too (acknowledged in DEEWR doc): Native speakers (inc. domestic LBOTE students) often not asked to demonstrate ‘adequate’ proficiency (p.302): “few if any students, whether native speakers or NESB, domestic or international, will come adequately equipped with the specific set of academic literacy practices they require for their particular degree” (p.303) – makes case for embedding ac lits into curriculum based on notion that “subject lecturers can reasonably be expected to have an implicit knowledge of the academic literacies and communication skills [of their discipline]… many will require professional development by English language and communication specialists to help them articulate and acquire a good understanding of [what they] demonstrate unconsciously on a daily basis, along with the associated pedagogies for their delivery” (p.304). Embedding = acknowledged as likely to be challenging and long-term, requiring cultural change; argument made that if done sensitively and collaboratively, it will reduce need for English language specialists and professional development (as new academics replace old) if embedding/ awareness raising = common place in academic teaching courses.  **Aim:** To consider some issues related to the implementation of post-enrolment English tests  **Theoretical frame:** Draws on own posited notion (Murray, 2010) of language proficiency as composed of three intersecting but distinct components: proficiency as “a set of generic skills and abilities” (grammar, punctuation, fluency, skills), academic literacy (refs to Lea & Street) and professional communication skills [prosaic, pragmatic features?]. Uses word ‘skills’ a lot  **Methodology:** Essay  **Core argument:** How to implement PELAs? Need to be cost-efficient and bring required improvements (p.305). Need to think about validity and reliability of assessment design (definition of valid PELA offered on p.307), but also think about the potential reputational risk/ kudos that PELA could bring: English language learners may look on it favourably (if follow-up provision also provided) or less favourably. Poses questions: what should be tested, who should be tested and how should they be tested? Proficiency can be the “only sensible focus” given that academic literacy and professional communication should be taught as part of course.  Issues: how to identify who to test? Who are the at-risk groups? Who might slip through the net? If PELA is elective, some ‘at-risk’ students may not be assessed; thus “the only watertight alternative is to test *all* newly enrolled students” (p.306) – but this would be (more) expensive and logistically complicated. Alternative to PELA (as a test) is to use early piece of assessed work as diagnostic (under controlled conditions and within prescribed rubric/ length rules). This would have to be conducted early enough for support needs to be identified and implemented. Who would mark? Faculty staff or English language specialists? Needs broad consultation within institutions: “Only then can institutions feel confident they are meeting their ethical and educational responsibilities to those non-traditional student cohorts whose interests they espouse, and whose successes or failures both during and following their studies will reflect on their graduating universities” (p.309). |
| Ryan, T. & Henderson, M. (2017). [Feeling feedback: students’ emotional responses to educator feedback](https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1416456), *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,*  AUS  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Assessment feedback; international students; grade expectations; negative emotion; individual differences* | **Context:** Emotional dimensions of feedback; assessment —central aspect in student satisfaction (as evidenced by its frequency in student experience surveys). Students’ receptiveness to feedback received = impaired if negative emotions are generated, particularly if there is an absence of dialogue. Authors focus on two groups of students: international students, and students who receive marks they are unhappy with. Authors review of literature on international students highlights the role of language and culture in taking up feedback (e.g. Warner & Miller, 2015), which can impact on their emotions; the review of ‘underperforming students’ suggests that many students internalise feelings of shame/ sadness, or get angry (because of perceived unfairness).  **Aim:** To respond to two hypotheses:  “H1: International students are more likely than domestic students to find the feedback comments they generally receive at university to be discouraging, upsetting and too critical.  H2: International students who speak languages other than English at home are more likely than domestic students who speak languages other than English at home to agree that the feedback comments they generally receive at university are discouraging, upsetting and too critical” (p.4).  **Methodology:** “Large-scale cross-sectional survey” conducted in two Australian universities with students (n=4514) – see p.5 for details of scales included.  **Findings:**  Majority of students = rarely or never discouraged by feedback  42.6% of international students = occasionally/ frequently/always discouraged, compared with 35.4% of domestic students  24.4% of international students ‘strongly agreed’ that feedback = too critical (compared to 13.5% domestic)  19.8% of international students ‘strongly agreed’ that feedback = too upsetting (compared to 12.5% domestic)  Students who received lower marks than expected = “more likely to feel sadness, anger and shame due to the feedback comments” (p.10) **Core argument:** Students should not be treated as homogenous because this study supports the idea that international and domestic students respond to feedback differently |
| Tett, L.; Hounsell, J.; Christie, H.; Cree, V. & McCune, V. (2012). [Learning from feedback? Mature students’ experiences of assessment in higher education](https://doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2011.627174), *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 17(2), 247–260.  UK  Keywords: *assessment; feeding forward; mature students* | **Context:** Mature age students entering an elite Scottish institution via FE college; role played by assessment on their experiences of university study. Authors note literature that points to importance of feedback on assessment for retention, and the context of assessment as persistent area of concern in National Student Survey  **Aims:** To illuminate “aspects of learning from feedback from the perspective of students whose pre-university experiences of assessment provided a major contrast to that of the majority of their peers” (abstract)  **Theoretical frame:**  **Methodology:** Longitudinal qualitative study of students’ transitions from FE into elite HE; paper reports on data collected via multiple interviews with subset of mature age students with childcare responsibilities (n=16, see p.248 for overview)  **Findings:**  *Initial feelings about assessment*: considerable disconnections between expectations and experiences, which authors note are particularly marked for these ‘non-traditional’ students. Participants discussed the contrasts between FE and university in terms of no opportunities for inter-draft feedback, lesser guidance (less from tutors, less information in assignment briefs), new types of assessment tasks.  *Experiences of assessment in Year 1*: student expectations of feedback impacted on how they used it/ how useful they found it. Authors discuss participants’ experiences/ perceptions of finding supportive peers/ doing group work. This can be great, but can also be isolating.  *Experiences of assessment in middle years*: can be where differing expectations of feedback between tutors and students can be most significant/ do damage. Example of student who found the grades much lower/ assessment more difficult to reconcile at university than FE, and describing ‘I just put masses of work into it and hope for the best’, which leads authors to suggest that “a sizeable minority of students appeared to be progressing through their course of study with- out a clear understanding of what was required to improve their expressed cognitive skills” (p.252). Student data also suggested that by mid-way, students still weren’t sure how to use the feedback to improve their work, illustrating the importance of tutors dedicating time to “the importance of making sure that students understand what is being said and are willing to accept that it is fair” (p.253). Authors also note the emotional dimension of receiving feedback.  *Experiences of assessment in final year*: Suggestion that by the final year, students had shifted their view of tutors/ feedback to supporting independent learning, with students describing heightened understanding of what was expected of them. Students also noted that the timing of multiple assignments made life more difficult for them, but also described strategies to manage competing demands on time.  **Core argument:** For feedback to facilitate transition, it “needs to relate explicitly to students’ expectations if they are to learn from it” (p.257). Relationship between assessment and feedback (and tutors and students) = particularly dynamic for WP students, who have less familiarity with the system and practices, and who are therefore “were disadvantaged by their lack of knowledge of the system and were adjusting to a very different support and assessment regime” (p.257). Authors identify the challenges with feeding-forward (as opposed to feedback), meaning “that teaching staff should encourage an orientation towards learning goals through clear and timely comments where students use feedback to increase their understanding” (p.258). |
| Torrance, H. (2007). [Assessment as learning? How the use of explicit learning objectives, assessment criteria and feedback in post‐secondary education and training can come to dominate learning](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/27399696_Assessment_as_learning_How_the_use_of_explicit_learning_objectives_assessment_criteria_and_feedback_in_post-secondary_education_and_training_can_come_to_dominate_learning), *Assessment in Education*, 14(3), 281–294.  UK  Annotation written by Sally Baker | **Context:** Formative assessment in post-compulsory education and training. Calls to shift from assessment *of* learning to assessment *for* learning. Author argues that while formative assessment has an increased role in post-secondary education (including A-levels, NVQs, Access, Basic Skills and Community Education), it is most commonly conceived in terms of criteria compliance and award achievement (p.282), which conversely promotes more reliance on tutors, rather than more autonomy and self-determination. Approaches towards transparency, such as exam coaching and practice, have resulted in more instrumentalism: “This might be characterized as a move from assessment of learning, through the currently popular idea of assessment for learning, to assessment as learning, where assessment procedures and practices come completely to dominate the learning experience, and ‘criteria compliance’ comes to replace ‘learning’” (p.282)  **Aim:**  **Methodology:** Case study approach (‘vertical investigations’ – from awarding body through institution to learner). Interviews with learners (n=237) and ‘assessors’ (n=95) + survey responses (n=260)  **Findings:**  Achievement described in narrow and instrumental terms: “securing the evidence to complete a portfolio and/or the ‘necessary’ or ‘expected’ grades to accomplish an award” (p.284).  Failure = defined as not completing the award/ not securing the needed grades.  Author notes how modularized courses (such as A-levels) allow students to game the system by retaking assessments to get better grades. Also, tutors break down assessments and assessment codes to help students, and also by them marking for exam boards: “Such involvement helps to develop teachers’ understanding of the assessment process and criteria which, in turn, they pass on to students through exam coaching” (p.285).  Author argues that coaching in itself is not inappropriate, but it can create/ contribute to inequitable conditions.  Assessment as learning is where “assessment procedures and processes completely dominat[e] the teaching and learning experience” (p.291) **Core argument:** Formative assessment is useful but “Making learning objectives and instructional processes more explicit calls into question the validity and worthwhileness of the outcomes achieved” (p.291). |
| Torrance, H. (2017). [Blaming the victim: assessment, examinations, and the responsibilisation of students and teachers in neo-liberal governance](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01596306.2015.1104854), *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 38(1), 83–96.  UK  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Neoliberalism; responsibilisation; assessment; accountability; school-reform* | **Context:** Examinations in UK schooling. Offers a historical account of assessment, with examinations in 1860s to 1960s used as educational technology to make selections about who would get to participate in further/ higher education when educational opportunities were fewer; as such “this process functioned to identify, and legitimate on grounds of educational merit, the identification of the next cohort of suitably qualified and socialised personnel for economic and social leadership roles in society” (p.84). Assessment therefore = “technology of exclusion” (p.84). Since massification of education systems, assessment = converted into ‘technology of inclusion’. From social justice perspective, argument = “we need our assessment systems to identify and report what students can do, rather than what they cannot” (p.85), through explication and transparent use of assessment criteria. Alignment of neoliberal and social justice arguments, “specific technical and procedural innovations in assessment theory and practice” are needed (p.85).  **Aim:** To explore “the role of assessment in relation to issues of social and political governance” (p.83); to argue that the “role, reach and discursive influence [of assessments] have expanded as education systems have expanded, and vastly increased numbers of students are exposed to the processes and consequences of assessment” (p.83)  **Theoretical frame:** Foucault  **Methodology:** Essay  **Findings:**  Massification and expansion of education systems (especially compulsory education) = lead to higher standards for more students with a proliferation of subjects, and ‘skills’ and proficiencies demanded have expanded. Education market = coupled with focus on employability and competitive economic power, so that education aligns with producing skilled workers.  Assessment in age of responsibilisation: global project of curriculum and assessment reform to drive up educational standards. Increasing test results have led to concerns about falling standards. Author also points to equity concerns (test results and socioeconomic status), and issues with graduate employment pipeline/ credential creep.  Examinations define the subject (e.g. history) and the ‘knowing subject’ (the individual student). Examinations are self-serving/ self-constituting in that “Examinations organise and legitimate knowledge qua knowledge,  in testable form, and at one and the same time produce/endorse the fact that knowledge can be and should be tested” (p.90) = form of disciplinary power (Foucault).  We are all “co-opted” into the project of assessment: we “have an ‘ interest’ in examinations continuing to exist in one form or another – teachers for purposes of student motivation and classroom control; students  and parents for purposes of credentialism and social mobility; governments to measure educational performance and control teachers” (p.92).  **Core argument:** Antithesis of modern assessment regimes = collective/ collaborative outcomes, “with much more emphasis being placed on the collective responsibility of teachers, students and their peers to understand that educational encounters are a collaborative endeavour which should produce outcomes that benefit communities as well as individuals” (p.94). |
| Tuck, J. (2018). [“I’m nobody’s Mum in this university”: The gendering of work around student writing in UK higher education](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1475158518301073), *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 32, 32–41.  UK  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Academic labour, Academic literacies, Care, Emotional labour, Gendering, Discourse* | **Context:** Increased diversity in student body, increased workload for academic teachers, decreased time and space; gendered dimensions of academic work. Author draws on work that argues that women are disadvantaged “by the contradictory demands of two “greedy” institutions, the family and academia” (p.33). Feminist literature on ‘emotional labour’ and care reviewed. Focus on student writing and feedback because “Work with student writing connects with a holistic but ambivalent understanding of care for a number of reasons - it is incremental, cyclical and slow, it often takes place in hidden spaces e.g. at home and in personal tutorials, often involves listening, empathy, attention to identities and meanings, and to the ‘whole person’ e the intellectual, emotional and even physical. It is also an exceptionally demanding and time-consuming aspect of the role of academics with teaching responsibilities (particularly in setting, supporting and assessing students' written work, Tuck, 2012) and frequently straddles, in both time and space, the increasingly blurred boundary between academics' working and home lives.” (p.33).  **Aim:** To respond to two RQs:  “How do academic teachers' discourses and practices contribute to and reflect the gendering of academic work around student writing in the disciplines?  What are the consequences of such gendering?” (p.35)  **Theoretical frame:** Academic Literacies;  **Methodology:** Author makes the argument that it’s difficult to study gender ‘head on’ because “subtle gendering processes which are often practiced with only “liminal awareness” (Martin, 2006, p.258)” (p.34). Paper draws from author’s PhD research on academics work with student writing; author notes that the study did not explicitly set out to examine gender, but it “emerged as significant in the form of feminising discourses of writing work which became evident as the project unfolded, surfacing in the form of familial analogies and nurturing imagery in the words of participants” (p.34).  **Findings:** Themes: work around writing on work/life boundary; work around writing on work/personal boundary; gendering work = emotional labour  *Student writing/ work-life boundaries*: lived experiences of working with student writing = done “at marginal times and in marginal places” (p.35) – temporal and spatial blurring of boundaries.  *Student writing/ work-personal boundaries*: student writing often happens in addition to formally ascribed duties, and “becomes squeezed into the “above and beyond”, not fully acknowledged at institutional level, but necessary to meet students' perceived needs” (p.36), particularly for sessional tutors. Author describes this as ‘shadow work’. Author also offers example of students approaching a female tutor because they don’t want to approach the (male) course leader, asking for a task translation. The accessibility and availability of tutors = connected to notion of care, as articulated by participant ‘Angela’: “*I think they [students] appreciate at some level that I'm more available to them than some of their other tutors are, possibly because of my age and because I've offered, and possibly ‘cause I'm just a little less intimidating*” (p.36).  *Gendered view of work with student writing as emotional labour:* creates dilemmas and tensions between professional identities, especially for ‘research-active’ academics. Author cites examples of people finding it difficult to get people to mark dissertations; participant Pam said “*I'm nobody's Mum in this University, so when the students are begging me for things I just think I really need to direct you on to somebody else who might have more time and patience and actually get paid for it*” (on p.37). Pam goes on to argue that students need ‘somebody’ to help with writing, as do other participants. Also, the metaphor of ‘handholding’ is evoked, along with the idea that responding to students’ questions about assignments = care; conversely, the idea that there is a ‘constant stream of needy students’ perpetuates a view of students as children. This comes at a cost: physical exhaustion: “The effort of integrating intellectual and emotional labour in academic work is exhausting, not least because it is undervalued at institutional level and thus poorly resourced in institutional terms. A feminised construction of such labour, which disaggregates the emotional from the intellectual, enables lower (monetary) value to be accorded to writing work, which in part explains the persistence of such models in the managerialist university” (p.38) **Core argument:** “Data analysis in this paper points to the potentially gendered nature of writing-related work for academic teachers because it is time-consuming, potentially emotionally demanding and can involve a lot of conversation and interpersonal engagement, things which have often been associated with female labour and with ‘nurture’” (p.39). |
| Williamson, S. (2012). [Generation 1.5: The LBOTE blind spot](http://www.journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/viewArticle/195), *Journal of Academic Language & Learning,* 6(2), A1–13.  AUS  Annotation written by Sally Baker | **Context:** Post Bradley Review/ Transforming Australia’s HE System, has focused attention on ‘students from disadvantaged backgrounds’ but large number of NESB/ LBOTE students continue to have issues with language proficiency and academic preparedness = “Generation 1.5 (Rumbaut & Ima, 1988), are students who migrated to Australia from a non-English speaking country during childhood” (p.1) – educators assume such students have similar language and literacies to other NES students and most literature focuses on international students. Most literature that explores Gen 1.5 is American (but see Starfield/ Chanock in Aus). Discussion of LBOTE (in all many guises) = underpinned by assumption of homogeneity (p.3). Much research fails to differentiate between international and domestic LBOTE students. Generation 1.5 often display strong oral communication and use “a rich, varied and flexible idiomatic vocabulary, complex forms and reduced forms…often without a discernable accent” (p.3) but have issues with written proficiency (grammar mentioned), making academic literacies difficult. Gen 1.5 “not necessarily literate in L1 due to very little formal education in that language” (p.4)  Discussion of ‘eye’ v. ‘ear’ learning  Discussion of bilingual and biliterate (related to diglossia) – students can speak two or more languages but are not literate in those languages  Language proficiency v. socio-demographic factors = not necessarily due to SES. Long-term migrant children may be disadvantaged with schooling by lack of parental support due to low levels of L2 proficiency (Borland & Pearce, 1997), leading to a “cultural fracture between generations which centred around the specifics of their education” (Borland & Pearce, 1997: 107, cited on p.6) – although Williamson makes point that this is not specific to LBOTE students. Silva (1993) “concluded that L2 texts are less fluent (fewer words), less accurate (more mistakes), and less effective” (cited on p.6) and L2 writing is “characterised by less use of passive voice, nominalisation and subordination (in favour of more coordination), less lexical cohesion and more reliance on conjunctive cohesion” (p.6) – this is broad and does not differentiate between international/domestic.  ‘Basic writer’ v. L2 writer: Friedrich (2006): “basic writer status concerns academic development whereas ESL status is about proficiency in English” (cited p.6). Gen 1.5 very similar to ‘basic writer’ features. Williamson argues “The few differences to be found are to do with fact that Generation 1.5 students may have a potentially conflicted and ambivalent relationship between their L1, L2 and mainstream culture that could impact on their ability to succeed in first year university and that many have the added frustration of persistent ESL-type errors” (p.A7).  Assumptions about monolingual academy “As a result, students’ multilingual-influenced writing is often viewed by institutions as “unwelcome deviations from a monolingual standard of English usage” (Harklau, 2003, p. 155)” – p.8) **Core argument:** “Generation 1.5 represents a significant blind spot in current discourses of social inclusion and educational disadvantage” (p.9)  “The question of whether to identify as ESL or CALD at university is often a difficult one: will it afford an advantage (e.g. more accommodation given by lecturers) or will it be stigmatising?” (p.9)  Academic pathways = different for Gen 1.5  Gen 1.5 = ear learners who are bilingual but rarely biliterate  Issue of what counts as ‘acceptable English’ needs to be debated – part of problem is neoliberal approach to commodification of education, which has forced EAP practitioners to the margins by faculty colleagues, as are LBOTE students. |