

# Workshop: Evaluating as a Discourse Function



Helmut Johannes Vollmer  
([hvollmer@uos.de](mailto:hvollmer@uos.de))

Universität Osnabrück/Hamburg  
Wiesbaden, 11. 11.2014

# Evaluating

- Makro-Funktion, die eine Reihe von Unterfunktionen abdeckt
- In der Regel müssen die zu bewertenden Sachverhalten genau beobachtet, „studiert“, in Erfahrung gebracht oder beschrieben werden.
- In der Situation/im Sachverhalt müssen genügend Indikatoren für eine Beurteilung vorhanden sein
- Entscheidend ist der Rückgriff auf ein Kriterienraster bzw. der Aufbau eines solchen Rasters am Material selbst oder der Rückgriff auf ein (ethisches) Bezugssystem
- Man unterscheidet primär zwischen den Teil-Funktionen

## **Beurteilen – Bewerten – Stellung nehmen**

Dazu gehören Unterfunktionen wie *Checking, Comparing, Weighing, Concluding, Criticizing, Giving Reasons, Positioning*.

Andere (eher subjektiv eingefärbte) Sprachfunktionen wie *Likes-Dislike* oder *Preferring* werden hier nicht berücksichtigt .

# EXAMPLE 1: Sustainability

- Evaluating a proposal how to preserve or save the tropical rain forest (geography, grade 10)
- Cf. Worksheet 1, Material 1 and 2
- In evaluating an evaluative text/response by students we need to do three things separately: analysing 1.content, 2.language, 3.procedures
- We also need to integrate these results into a 4. holistic judgement at the end

## EXAMPLE TASK 6: SUSTAINABILITY

Since the world summit of Rio de Janeiro in 1992 (Agenda 21) the principle of sustainability has been globally accepted. This principle means that in terms of the use of natural resources, ecological, social and economic goals should be treated as equally important. At the same time, the rights and needs of future generations should be respected, so that they are not disadvantaged in any way through the exploitation of the resources.

*Against the background of the aims of Agenda 21, how do you evaluate the following suggestion for a solution? Support your answer.*

**One possible way of protecting the tropical rain forest would be to turn the remaining forests into conservation areas or national parks. This would mean that nature would be left to itself again, untouched by mankind. Only a limited number of people would then be allowed to enter restricted areas in the parks along special trails and accompanied by a ranger.**

## Some Students' Responses

I think the suggestion to solve the problem is a good idea. The forest could grow again and would be safe. The government needs makes money with the po people who visit the national parks and the Indians had a place to live. (5006)

I think this suggestion for a solution is the best.

Therefore only a few enterprises, which are also interested in the forest itself and not only in money would be allowed to enter this national park. Moreover than the forest can regenerate itself. He will grow as he did it no in foreign times and then, I think, that the tropical rain forest will get bigger again and a lot of animals are saved! (3025)

I think it's a great idea because the nature that is left should be kept and protected four the next generations. (2018)

# 1.1 Diagnostic Scales for CONTENT

(for the end of compulsory education)

- 1. Completeness of the content in terms of the main points to be included
- 2. Completeness of the content in terms of supporting details, such as giving examples or figures
- 3. Correctness of the information included
- 4. Relevance of the answer in relation to task definition

--> **Ausformulieren eines inhaltlichen Erwartungshorizontes**

## 1.2 Analytical/Diagnostic Scales for Assessing Subject-Specific Language Competence

- Entwicklung von insges. 7 Skalen (DFG-Projekt Vollmer)
- Für den schulischen Kontext reicht es vermutlich aus, wenn man die beiden Oberkategorien „Angemessenheit der Sprachgebrauchs“ und „Effektivität der textuellen Organisation“ operationalisiert und die verschiedenen Ausprägungen in ein eigenes Stufenschema bringt; in denen verschiedene Gesichtspunkte aus den Skalenbereichen 1.-3. bzw. 4.-7. zusammengefasst werden (siehe nächste Folie):
- Stufe/Level 1-4: e.g. **excellent /quite good/not fully appropriate / inappropriate**

## **EFFECTIVENESS OF TEXTUAL ORGANISATION OF MEANING**

- 1. Organisation of content/ordering + structuring text as a whole**
- 2. Logical organisation of ideas into different structural units**
- 3. Cohesiveness (effective linking of sentences and parts of it)**

## **APPROPRIATENESS OF LANGUAGE USE**

- 4. Sufficient + correct use of subject-specific register (terms/expressions)**
- 5. Sufficient use of formal language (style, clear + succinct formulations)**
- 6. Appropriate use of lexical-grammatical conventions /sufficient variation**
- 7. Correctness/accuracy of grammar, vocabulary, and punctuation.**



SCALE 3 COHESION: EFFECTIVE LINKING OF STRUCTURAL UNITS

Descriptor	Score
<b>Sentences and sentence parts are consistently well linked, producing a clear flow of ideas.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Sentences and sentence parts are for the most part well linked. Seen in relation to the text's length, there are only a limited number of instances in which the linking could have been more effective.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Sentences and sentence parts are to some extent linked. However, seen in relation to the text's length, there are a number of instances of disconnectedness, so that parts of the text might be fragmentary or choppy.</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Sentences and sentence parts are linked to a limited degree, causing parts of the text to be so fragmentary that a flow of ideas is obstructed.</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>There is no identifiable linking of sentences and sentence parts</b>	<b>0</b>

**Scale 4: Sufficient and correct use of subject-specific REGISTER: terms and expressions**

<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Subject-specific terms and expressions are consistently used where references are made to subject-related phenomena and are continuously used correctly.</b>	4
<b>Subject-specific terms and expressions are used to a large extent where references are made to subject-related phenomena and are used correctly in most instances. Only a limited number of subject-specific terms are lacking and/or a limited number of subject-specific terms and expressions included, are not used correctly. Incorrect terms might be used and/or collocations and spelling might be incorrect.</b>	3
<b>Subject-specific terms and expressions are used, but not to a sufficient extent and/or frequent errors are made in the application of subject-specific terms. About half of the references to subject-related phenomena are either made using terms and expressions that are not part of the subject-specific register and/or show errors in terms of the terms used, collocations and spelling.</b>	2
<b>The use of subject-specific terms and expressions is limited and/or only a limited number of terms and expressions included are used correctly. In most instances, there are errors in terms of the terms used, collocations and spelling.</b>	1
<b>No subject-specific terms or expressions are used.</b>	0

## Alternative Stufung von Sprachkompetenz-Skalen für CLIL (Sek. I und II)

Der **Sprachgebrauch** ist

durchgängig angemessen bis hervorragend  
insgesamt angemessen  
mehr oder minder angemessen  
nur zum Teil angemessen  
nicht (wirklich) angemessen

Die **Organisation der Gedanken und des Textes** sind

höchst effektiv bis hervorragend  
insgesamt effektiv  
mehr oder minder effektiv  
nur zum Teil effektiv  
nicht effektiv bis mangelhaft.

Achtung: Diese Skalierungsansätze sind bisher nicht empirisch validiert, sie dienen nur der Illustration und Anregung! Ähnliche Überlegungen müsste jede bilinguale Lehrkraft anstellen.

## 1.3 Third Dimension: Procedural Competence/with Indicators

1. Identifying the task, the necessary Discourse Functions and Genre/Text Type demands involved correctly
2. Retrieving relevant (as opposed to irrelevant) information from the task formulation/stem/instruction
3. Making effective use of details (e.g. extracted from largely non-v materials, transforming/translating)
4. Linking information successfully from different sources (including activation of prior knowledge)
5. “Added quality” of the answer: Making inferences, drawing conclusions, constructing “new” insights



# 1.4. Criteria for Holistic Rating

Criteria for the holistic rating/overall assessment of st. answers:  
Extent to which the text/utterance solves the task appropriately,  
in terms of the required content, discourse function(s) and  
appropriate language choice

Extent to which the text/product/performance is  
Complete – Relevant - Consistent  
Structured – Efficient – Reflective - Creative

## ***EX. Relevance of the answer in relation to task definition***

Does the text clearly respond to the task and the problem defined therein? Yes1 No 0

Does the text answer the given questions or solve the problem defined? Yes2 No 0

# Descriptors for overall assessment of student responses to Task 6 (Ex.1)

- The two macro functions required by this task are:  
EVALUATING + GIVING REASONS/ARGUING
- The 3 dimensions Content, Language and Procedural Competence have been evaluated separately
- All aspects are to be integrated into holistic judgment
- The descriptors can range from „There is a succinct and *balanced* evaluation of the suggestion, with adequate support” to “There is no evaluation/no reasons given”
- Depending on need, one could distinguish 6 levels (grade 1 to 6) or 15 points, clustering them into 6 groups

### Level 1

There is a succinct and *balanced* evaluation of the suggestion. This is preceded or followed by succinct and *comprehensive* support that is fully consistent with the evaluation and that is based on a *complete* and a *correct* application of the principle of sustainability in evaluating the suggestion. The argumentation is well-structured.

### Level 4

There is an evaluation of the suggestion that is *unbalanced*. The evaluation may be clearly formulated. There is support that *may be sufficient, clearly formulated and consistent*. However, the support is based on an *incorrect* application of the principle of sustainability in evaluating the suggestion. The argumentation may show *major deficiencies* in terms of logical structuring and formulation.

### Level 5 or 6

There is *no evaluation of the suggestion*. There is only a discussion of Agenda 21 and/or the principle of sustainability that may show *major deficiencies* in terms of logical structuring and formulation.

Or, there is an *evaluation that may be balanced, but there is no or hardly any support, or the support is not based on an application of the principle of sustainability at all*. The evaluation may show *major deficiencies* in terms of logical structuring and formulation.



## 1.5 Summary: CLIL Assessment

- It is not sufficient to diagnose content, language + the procedural side of subject competence **separately**
- Rather, we have to see how **knowledge construction** (content), **cognition/procedures** (epistemological/methodological competence) and **linguistic expression of meaning** **relate + interact**
- **Holistic judgements** (e.g. degree of task fulfillment, integrated scales of subject-specific discourse competence) seem to be **meaningful and valid**.

# EXAMPLE 2: The Truman Doctrine

- Dieses Beispiel bezieht sich auf die Anwendung eines vorgegebenen/adaptierten Kriterienrasters und Stufungsmodells zur Beurteilung von historisch evaluativen Texten.
- Es handelt sich um das Modell der sog. SOLO-Taxonomie (Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome), mit dessen Hilfe sich fünf Stufen zunehmender Komplexität beim Verstehen von Inhalten/Aufgaben und beim Abfassen von (Schüler-)Produkten bilden lassen: Sprache bleibt „Stiefkind“.
- Materialien 3, dann 4, dann 5 und 6 (Taxonomie)

## Schreibkonferenz

In einer Schreibkonferenz kontrollieren die Lernenden gegenseitig ihren Schreibprozesse und kommentieren und verbessern die Texte der Mitschüler. So erhält jeder Text eine Würdigung. Die Korrektur erfolgt in der Regel anhand zuvor gemeinsam erarbeiteter Kriterien für die Qualität eines Textes wie z. B.

- gelungene/nicht gelungene Passagen
- zusätzliche Information notwendig, nachvollziehbarere Argumente oder stärkere Beispiele wählen
- unklare oder redundante Passagen ausarbeiten oder streichen
- Formulierungen verbessern

Mit diesem Feedback der Mitschüler überarbeitet jeder Lernende seinen Text in Einzelarbeit. Das Überarbeiten fördert das Sprachbewusstsein der Lernenden und macht ihnen die Prozesshaftigkeit des Schreibens bewusst. Die Überarbeitung führt auch zu einer vertieften Auseinandersetzung mit den Inhalten und dient als *scaffolding* für den Lernprozess.

# Weiterführende Literatur

Coetzee-Lachmann, D. (2007). Assessment of subject-specific task performance of bilingual geography learners: Analysing aspects of subject-specific written discourse.

(<http://webdoc.sub.gwdg.de/ebook/dissts/Osnabrueck/Coetzee-Lachmann2009.pdf> )

Dalton-Puffer, Christiane (2013). A construct of cognitive discourse functions for conceptualizing. *EurJournal of App.Ling.*, 1, 2, 1-38

Hallet, W. (2012). Semiotic Translation and Literacy Learning in CLIL. In: Marsh, D./Meyer, O. eds. *Quality Interfaces*. Eichstätt 191-201.

Staschen-Dielmann, S. 2010. It must be our policy to support free people. Scaffolding durch peer-Schreiberziehung. *Der fremdsprachliche Unterricht Englisch* 106, 32-38 [Themenheft Scaffolding im BU].

Vollmer, H. J. (2008). Constructing tasks for content and language integrated learning and assessment. In J. Eckerth & S. Siekmann (Eds.) *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching. Theoretical, Methodological, and Pedagogical Perspectives* (pp. 227-290). Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang.

Vollmer, H. J. (2010). Fachkompetenz als fachbasierte Diskurskompetenz am Beispiel Geographie. In Doff, S. (Hrsg.), *Bilingualer Sachfachunterricht in der Sekundarstufe*. Tübingen: Narr 242-257.

Vollmer, H. J. (2011). Schulsprachliche Kompetenzen: Zentrale Diskursfunktionen. (<http://www.home.uni-osnabrueck.de/hvollmer/VollmerDF-Kurzdefinitionen.pdf>)

Vollmer, H. J. (2012). Fachliche Diskursfähigkeit bei bilingualen und monolingualen Geographielernern. In: Bayrhuber, H. et al. (Hrsg.), *Formate Fachdidaktischer Forschung*. Münster: Waxmann, 85-107.

Vollmer, H. J. (2013). Das Verhältnis von Sprach- und Inhaltslernen im BU. In: Hallet, W./Königs, F. (Hrsg.), *Handbuch Bilingualer Unterricht*, 124-131.

Zwiers, J. (2007). Teacher practices and perspectives for developing academic language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17 (1), 93-116.

Zydatiß, W. (Bearb.) (2010). Scaffolding im Bilingualen Unterricht. Themenheft DfU-Englisch. 106.