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Overview

1. Background of study and its place within scholarship on L2 writing
2. Explication of theoretical framework
3. Specification of the educational setting
4. Presentation of results from longitudinal study on writing development
5. Discussion of results’ relevance for understanding advancedness
1. The Research Context: Collegiate FL Instruction in the U.S.A.

- Four years of university study, from beginning to advanced
- Limited contact hours (45-75 per semester)
- Traditional focus at the lower levels on “language” within a communicative language teaching framework
  - 2-4 semester language requirement contributes majority of lower-level enrollment; noticeable attrition after completion of requirement
- Subsequent focus at the upper levels on “content”, i.e, literary and cultural studies
Goal of study

To contribute to a more differentiated understanding of advanced L2 writing, particularly its gradual development in instructed settings
L2 writing research I

• Advancedness
  – Varied operationalizations
    • Institutional status / Program level
    • Test scores
    • “Native-like” ability
    • Facility with late-acquired language features
    • Increasing incidence, variety, and length of clauses yet reduced number of clauses
  – Challenges in comparing data
  – Lack of theoretical framework
L2 writing research II

• Gradual development of advancedness, i.e., longitudinal studies
  – Different research designs (Ortega & Iberri-Shea, 2005):
    • Quantitative research
      – Descriptive-quantitative studies
      – Programmatic longitudinal studies
      – Instructional effectiveness studies
    • Qualitative research
      – Sociocultural SLA studies
      – Longitudinal ethnographies of L2 learners

*BUT* predominance of cross-sectional studies
L2 writing research III

• Development of advancedness in instructed settings, i.e., curriculum-based learning trajectory
  – Different settings:
    • ESL, EFL, FL
    • University - Secondary - Primary
    • Study abroad
  – Different data elicitation
    • Curriculum-independent writing prompts
    • Time-constrained writing assignments
    • Take-home writing assignments

_BUT_ very few U.S. collegiate FL contexts and even fewer from a programmatic perspective
2. Systemic Functional Linguistics I

From http://www.uefap.com/courses/baecc/sfl/intro.htm
Systemic Functional Linguistics II

Metafunctions of language:

• Interpersonal metafunction
  mood and modality

• Textual metafunction
  theme/rheme

• Ideational metafunction
  clause complex  transitivity
  » Experiential
  » Logical
Systemic Functional Linguistics III

Categories of the ideational metafunction:

- **Expansion** of meaning through:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Expands meaning through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration:</td>
<td>apposition, clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension:</td>
<td>addition, variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement:</td>
<td>spatio-temporal, manner, causal-conditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Projection** of thoughts/speech

  Compact and dispersed realizations
3. Educational setting: Georgetown University German Department (GUGD)

- Highly selective private university with strong tradition of language and linguistic study
- Unique integrated four-year, content-oriented, genre-based undergraduate curriculum
- Articulated curricular and pedagogical practices for the development of advanced competencies
Data source I

• 14 learners who completed three consecutive curricular levels:
  – **Level II**: telling personal stories about contemporary issues in the German-speaking world
  – **Level III**: framing personal stories in public events and histories, 1945-present
  – **Level IV**: “reading” discourses of contemporary public life

  • “Students begin to develop the kinds of literacy abilities that are at the heart of summarizing, interpreting, critiquing, presenting and substantiating an opinion or argument, and practice these orally and in writing. Such language use is critical for study abroad as well as any other professional context in which the German language is used.” (Developing multiple literacies)
Data source II

• End-of-level prototypical performance writing tasks (PPTs)
  – Curriculum-dependent and pedagogy-embedded tasks that reflect content and language focus of particular level
  – Detailed task sheet divided into 3 categories
    • Task appropriateness
    • Content
    • Language focus
  – Rough draft submitted to corpus
## Overview of PPTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Focus</th>
<th>Textual Focus</th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative treatment of personal relationships</td>
<td>Placing narration about personal lives into the context of a literary work, literary conventions</td>
<td>Personal and public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Alternative Ending to the Novel „The Story of Mr. Sommer“]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Level III** |              |                 |
| Multicultural lives in contemporary German | Placing personal experiences into a broader social context | Public |
| [Journalistic treatment „At home in Germany? A Portrait of a Vietnamese Family“] | | |

| **Level IV** |              |                 |
| Germany’s role in the EU; creation of a constitution | Making an argument about social, political, economic developments in societies | Public |
| [European Union and the United States: comparisons and lessons“] | | |
Previous GUGD-based writing research (Byrnes, et al. 2005)

- Cross-sectional syntactic analysis of 86 participants who completed curriculum-dependent PPTs and curriculum-independent Baseline Writing Tasks (BWTs)
- Analysis of
  - Mean length of T-Unit (MLTU)
  - Mean length of clause (MLC)
  - Clauses per T-Unit (CTU)
- Analogous developmental patterns on both tasks
  ⇒ Changes in syntactic complexity are related to learner development via the curriculum, i.e., refutation of task effect
4. Treatment of data

- No SFL grammar of German
  - Steiner and Teich 2004
  - Eggins 2004, Halliday and Matthiesen 2004

- Clause coding (double coding)
  identification and computation of clauses (complexing, taxis and logico-semantics)

- Transitivity coding (double coding, double checking)
  identification and computation of processes and participants
Clause types

- Clause = A grammatical unit that includes a predicate and an explicit or implied subject, and expresses a proposition.
- Clause simplex = A sentence of only one clause
  - Wir liefen bis Morgen, in den Wald, in die Heide, überall. (*We ran until morning, into the woods, in the heath, everywhere*)
- Clause complex = A sentence of more than one clause
  - Ich war sehr müde, als wir in ein kleines Dorf in den Gebirgen kamen. (*I was very tired when we arrived in a small town in the mountains*)
  - Er klopfte viele Male und endlich kam eine alte, müde Frau. (*He knocked many times and finally an old, tired woman came*)
- Embedded clause = Clauses functioning at “phrase/group rank”
  - Wenn man die Familie Ngoc zu Hause in Berlin besucht, findet man eine Mutter und Tochter, {{die sich sehr gut in der deutschen Gesellschaft integriert haben}}. (*When one visits the Ngoc family in Berlin, one finds a mother and daughter who have integrated themselves very nicely into German society*)
Clause analysis I

- Mean length of sentence
- Mean length of clause
- Lexical density (= content words/clause)
- Clause complexes per sentence
- Grammatical intricacy (=clauses/sentence)
- Embedded clauses per sentence
Clause analysis II

Length of Sentence by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Level</th>
<th>Upper Cl</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Lower Cl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>13.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>17.79</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>15.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clause analysis III

Length of Clause by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Level</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cl</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>9.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cl</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>9.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tokens per clause

Level 2

Level 3

Level 4
**Lexical Density By Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Level</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cl.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cl</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clause analysis V

Clause Complexes per Sentence by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Level</th>
<th>Upper Cl</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Lower Cl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clause analysis VI

Grammatical Intricacy by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clauses/Sentence</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cl.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cl.</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clause analysis VII

Embedded Clauses by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Level</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cl</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>15.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cl</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curricular Level
Summary of clause analysis

• As learners progress through the curriculum, their trend is to produce …
  – Longer sentences
  – Longer* & more lexically dense* clauses
  – Fewer clause complexes and thus sentences that are less grammatically intricate
  – More embedded clauses

*statistical significance (alpha = 0.05)
Interclausal relationships

Taxis
Hypotaxis
Parataxis

Logico-semantics
Projection: locution, idea
Expansion: elaboration, extension, enhancement
Taxis I

Development of hypotaxis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hypotaxis as percentage of total no. of complex clauses</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cl</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Mean</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cl</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Development of projection (hypotaxis and parataxis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cl</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cl</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projected clauses as percentage of total no. of complex clauses**

- Level 2
- Level 3
- Level 4

Taxis II
Taxis III

Percentage of hypotactic projected clauses as percentage of total no. of projected clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of total no. of projected clauses</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cl</td>
<td>0,75</td>
<td>0,87</td>
<td>0,98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0,64</td>
<td>0,78</td>
<td>0,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cl</td>
<td>0,52</td>
<td>0,70</td>
<td>0,88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Logico-semantics I

Distribution of clause expansion types

Level 2
- Elaboration: 11%
- Extension: 46%
- Enhancement: 43%

Level 3
- Elaboration: 19%
- Extension: 36%
- Enhancement: 45%

Level 4
- Elaboration: 22%
- Extension: 33%
- Enhancement: 45%
### Development of elaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Upper CI</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Lower CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart illustrates the elaboration as a percentage of the total number of complex clauses across different levels. The data shows a progression from Level 2 to Level 4, with a notable increase from Level 2 to Level 3, followed by a slight decrease to Level 4.
Extended clauses as percentage of total no. of complex clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cl</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Mean</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cl</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Logico-semantics IV

Development of enhancement over three levels

Percentage of total expanded clauses

level
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Findings for taxis and logico-semantics

Taxis:
- General significant increase in hypotaxis from levels 2 to 4. Increase in hypotactic projection.

Logico-semantics
- Significant increase of elaboration and decrease of extension from levels 2 to 4.

Hypotaxis requires more planning on the side of the writer.
The construction of hypotactic projection is more complex than paratactic projections.

Extension hardly occurs in hypotaxis and simply joins clause to clause.
Intraclausal relationships: processes I

Processes

- Material: doing, happening
- Mental: cognition, perception, affection
- Verbal: verbal action
- Behavioral: physiological and psychological behavior
- Relational: being (attributive and identifying)
- Possessive: possession
- Existential: being
- Casuative: causing

Encoded meaning:
### Development of behavioral processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Upper CI</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Lower CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Processes IV

#### Development of mental processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Upper CI</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Lower CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The chart shows the distribution of mental processes as a percentage of total processes across different levels. The values range from 0.00 to 0.24.
Development of verbal processes

Verbal processes as percentage of total no. of processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper CI</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower CI</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level
# Processes VI

**Development of intensive relational processes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Upper CI</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Lower CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph shows the development of intensive relational processes as a percentage of total processes across different levels.
## Processes VII

### Development of possessive processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Upper CI</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Lower CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possessive processes as percentage of total no. of processes**

- Level 2: upper CI 0.06, mean 0.04, lower CI 0.03
- Level 3: upper CI 0.10, mean 0.08, lower CI 0.06
- Level 4: upper CI 0.10, mean 0.08, lower CI 0.06
Processes VIII

Example of relational processes in level 4:

Die Vereinigung der amerikanischen Staaten (T) war (Pi) eher eine Notwendigkeit als eine echte Wahl (V).

The unification of the American states was a neccesity rather than a real choice
Processes: findings

The percentage of behavioral and mental processes is significantly higher in level 2 than in levels 3 and 4. The percentage of verbal processes is significantly lower in level 4 than in levels 2 and 3. The percentage of possessive processes is significantly lower in level 2 than levels 3 and 4. There is a tendency for increase in intensive relational processes from level 2 to 4.

- **Mental** and **behavioral** processes are used to describe and hypothesize about psychological/physiological events and actions of figures in the narrative of level 2. There is less hypothesizing in the texts of level 3 and 4.

- The narrative of level two incorporates dialogues between characters and thus makes use of **verbal** processes for this. The level 3 text quotes the different utterances made by figures appearing in it.

- The texts of level 3 and 4 focus on description and are thus obliged to express a variety of statements concerning ‘being’, ‘not being’, ‘having’ and ‘not having’.
Circumstances

Location: temporal, spatial
Manner: means, comparison, quality, degree
Cause: cause, reason, purpose, behalf
Extent: distance, duration, frequency
Contingency: condition, concession
Accompaniment: additive
Role: guise, product
Matter: “with reference to”, about
Angle: viewpoint

enhancing
extending
elaborating
projecting
Circumstances II

Development of circumstances (mean)

Percentage of all circumstances

Level
Circumstances III

Development of no. of circumstances per process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number of circumstance per process</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper CI</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower CI</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Circumstances IV

Development of location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location as percentage of total no. of circumstances</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper CI</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower CI</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

level
## Circumstances V
### Types of location circumstances:
#### Examples from learner 2106

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • 2 types (temporal and spatial)  
• Spatial adverbs and adverbial prepositional phrases that describe places in the first-person narrator’s immediate, personal, familiar world  
  – *im Dorf* (in the town)  
  – *am Ufer* (on the lake’s edge)  
  – *nach Hause* (homeward)  
• Temporal adverbs that organize the chronology of events  
  – *dann* (then)  
  – *später* (later)  
  – *endlich* (finally) | • 2 types (temporal and spatial)  
• Spatial adverbial phrases that describe societal phenomena and locations affecting foreign residents  
  – *auf dem Schwarzmarkt* (on the black market)  
  – *in einer freien Gesellschaft* (in a free society)  
  – *zurück nach Vietnam* (back to Vietnam)  
• Temporal adverbs and adverbial phrases that refer to historical moments relevant to foreign residents  
  – *nach der Wende* (after the Fall of the Wall)  
  – *heute* (today)  
  – *jetzt* (now) | • 2 types (temporal and spatial)  
• Spatial adverbial phrases that thematize locations important in this public debate  
  – *in der EU* (in the EU)  
  – *in NATO*  
  – *in den neuen westlichen Gebieten* (in the new western areas)  
  – *in seinem Artikel* (in his article)  
• Temporal adverbial phrases that thematize relevant historical periods  
  – *im 19. Jahrhundert* (in the 19th century)  
  – *in der Zukunft* (in the future)  
  – *nach der Gründung der USA* (after the founding of the USA) |
Circumstances VI

Mean length of location circumstances for learner 2106

Curricular Level

Level 2: 2.41
Level 3: 2.34
Level 4: 3.02
Circumstances VII

Development of matter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>matter as percentage of total no. of circumstances</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper CI</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower CI</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Circumstances VIII

Development of cause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause as percentage of total no. of circumstances</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper CI</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower CI</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Circumstances IX

Examples of intraclausal causal expansion:

Deshalb (Cc) war (Pi) dieser Konflikt (Cr) sowohl wirtschaftlich (At) als auch politisch (At).

Therefore the conflict was both economic and political.

Es (Cr) ist (Pi) besonders (Cm) schwer (At), {{die neuen ostlichen Mitgliedstaaten (G) zu integrieren (Pm)}}{, wegen des Gefühls im Osten (Cc), dass die Westeuropäer (S) sie (Ph) nicht verstehen (Pme)}.

It is particularly difficult to integrate the new eastern member states due to the feeling in the East that the west Europeans don’t understand them.
Circumstances X

Development of manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner as percentage of total no. of circumstances</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper CI</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower CI</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level
## Circumstances XI
### Types of manner circumstances: Examples from learner 2106

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • 2 types (quality and degree)  
• Mostly adverbs describing the quality of immediate physical human actions (speed, sound) | • 4 types (quality, degree, means, comparison) -> greater range than level 2  
• Adverbs and adverbial phrases that describe the quality and extent of human actions that take place over longer stretches of time (integrate, live) and describe the qualities of cognitive processes. | • 2 types (quality and degree)  
• adverbs and adverbial phrases that describe the quality of actions typically associated with taking part in society politically (ways of constructing democracy, ways of confronting problems, degrees of overcoming problems, ways of identifying oneself). |

Examples:
Geräuschlos  
Langsam  
Nachdenklich  
Plötzlich

Examples:
Ganz völlig (integrieren)  
Höflich wie eine Vietnamesin (benehmen)  
Gegen ihren Willen (abschieben)  
Frei (denken)

Examples:
Horizontal (demokratisieren)  
Mit ähnlichen herausforderungen (konfrontieren)  
Politisch, wirtschaftlich und kulturell (integrieren).
Circumstances XII

Mean length of manner circumstances for learner 2106

Manner: means, quality, comparison, degree
5. Discussion: Toward advancedness

- Texts organized in terms of ideas, reasons, causes, not in terms of actors
  - Increased hierarchical organization of information through increased hypotaxis & decreased parataxis
  - Increased complexification at the phrasal, rather than at the clausal, level (longer, denser, yet fewer, clauses) ⇒ increase in intraclausal activity & decrease in interclausal activity through
    - Increased use of circumstances of manner and cause
    - Increased use of intraclausal projection through circumstances of matter coupled with decreased use of interclausal projection
    - Increased incidence of relational processes, rather than clauses, to link ideas/reasons
  - Decreased use of mental and verbal processes ⇒ writer as authority
  - Decreased use of behavioral processes ⇒ reduced role of physiologically-dominant participants
  - Increased use of clausal elaboration and circumstantial enhancement (i.e., manner & cause) and decreased use of clausal extension ⇒ increased need to establish how & why rather than where and when
  - Increased use and length of circumstances of manner and cause ⇒ text’s field focus on reasons and explanations
  - Increased use and length of circumstances of location that refer to time, space, location outside the personal sphere
Discussion: Curriculum-supported learner trajectory

- Articulated, theoretically grounded learner pathway
- Attainable curricular goals
- Accountable learning environment
Needs analysis

• Theoretically grounded notions of advancedness
• Programmatic, curricular thinking to support development of advancedness
• Programmatic, curriculum-embedded longitudinal research to examine learner development
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