Abstract

Teachers of writing in English in Papua New Guinea (PNG) face many challenges. PNG is a developing country with many high schools located in remote, near inaccessible areas. PNG is one of the most linguistically diverse countries in the world, with English the second, third, or fourth language of many people. For almost all secondary school students, English is taught as a second language (L2). Traditional PNG culture does not have a written language, so reading and writing are not common activities in many parts of the country. Many English teachers did not train as English teachers.

The first author conducted six site visits to schools in geographically diverse parts of PNG to study the implementation of the Secondary Year 11 and 12 Language and Literacy (L&L) syllabus, focusing on writing in English classes. She conducted interviews with teachers and observed them teaching (using the Quality Teaching Model as a basis for observation) on multiple occasions. The data she gathered provided evidence that teachers were struggling to implement the syllabus successfully. Many students remained uninterested in learning to write in English. Teachers indicated that the syllabus made unrealistic demands of them. They were not provided with appropriate pedagogical strategies that might help them achieve the syllabus outcomes. This lack of pedagogical support was particularly acute for teachers who had little or no training in teaching English writing.

In response, a pedagogical framework is proposed to help teachers implement the Senior L&L syllabus in writing in English classes. The framework has four domains and associated components: (1) Intellectual Stimulation (including the components of purposeful stimulation, authentic communication, and meaningful information); (2) Productive Writing Environment (including the components of teachers’ preparation, students’ interaction, and group collaboration); (3) Cultural Relevance (including the components of understanding localisation, promoting globalisation, and encouraging integration among disciplines); and (4) Human Development (including the components of individual recognition, knowledge construction, and critical evaluation).
Introduction

Teaching writing skills in English as a second or foreign language to non-native speakers of English is a challenge faced by English teachers in non-English-dominant countries of the South Pacific, Asia, Africa, Europe and South America (Grabe, 2001; Kale, 2005). The challenges that English teachers encounter in non-English-dominant countries are unique and they relate to a multiplicity of factors that not only are associated with teaching writing skills but also with the difficulties students encounter when learning to write in English as a third, fourth, or fifth language. Non-native English speakers (NNES) or second-language (L2) writers who come from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds may have special needs because the nature and functions of discourse, audience, and persuasive appeals often differ across linguistic, cultural, and educational contexts (Matsuda, 2003a, Matsuda 2003b, Matsuda 2003c; Silva, 2001). There is an additional impediment:

… most second-language writers are still in the process of acquiring syntactic and lexical competence – a process that will take a lifetime. These differences are often a matter of degree, and not all second-language writers face the same set of difficulties. While some native speakers of English may face similar difficulties, those experienced by second-language writers are often more intense (Silva, 2001, p. 230).

Due to difficulties experienced by L2 writers, research-based recommendations by language teaching researchers in education have urged writing teachers and program administrators to acknowledge the presence of L2 writers in writing classes, to understand their characteristics, and to develop instructional and administrative practices sensitive to their linguistic and cultural needs (Atkinson, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c; Silva, 2001).

L2 in Papua New Guinea  Papua New Guinea is a nation of diversity in geography, culture and language. A number of people have reported that there are more than 800 indigenous languages (Kale, 2005; Litteral, 2000, 2005) and numerous dialects, which are spoken by 5.5 million people. This also includes the official language (English) and two lingua francas (‘Pidgin’ that is referred to as ‘Tok Pisin’ and ‘Hiri Motu’) that are widely used to facilitate communication among people of diverse linguistic backgrounds. According to Litteral (2005), PNG leads the world in linguistic diversity. A third of the world’s total languages are spoken in the country.

Despite its cultural and linguistic diversity, English has been the language of education at all levels since the 1950s under the colonial administration of Australia,
with the intention to westernise the nation through education. A review of the education system in 1991 led to a reform "to include vernacular preparatory schools [called Elementary Education] in the formal system, in order to improve and increase access to initial education" (Litteral, 1999, p. 3). Litteral (2005) reported that PNG has over 435 languages used for initial education, a situation unique in education.

PNG’s school curriculum outlines teaching and learning strategies that identify the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values that all students should be able to demonstrate as a consequence of following the national syllabuses which have been developed for Elementary Prep to Grade 12 (Matane, 1986). The National Curriculum acknowledges the goals and directives embodied in the National Constitution and ‘The Philosophy of Education for PNG’ (Department of Education, 1993).

Method

Six multi-site case studies involved interviews, observations, and document analysis. These three data collection strategies enabled the first author to focus on obtaining in-depth detailed knowledge of teaching writing in English at the selected sites. At each site, two sources of data were obtained, lesson observations and in-depth interviews. Lesson observations provided descriptions of teaching practices in the classrooms while in-depth interviews provided details from teachers about their experiences, in particular, actions relating to teaching writing skills and using the L&L syllabus. A document analysis of the PNG Upper-Secondary Language and Literature (L&L) Syllabus, particularly the writing skills objectives, was conducted by the first author. The analysis examined the objectives of the mandated pedagogy, the writing skills objectives, teaching guidelines, and observed teaching practices in relation to contemporary theories of ESL writing pedagogy. Data from three different sources (interviews, observations and detailed field notes, and document analysis) informed the study.

The study was conducted in PNG upper-secondary schools that have Grades 11 and 12. Participants were teachers involved in teaching writing skills based on the PNG Upper-Secondary L&L Syllabus. The study had the following objectives:

1. To compare the writing skills objectives outlined in the PNG Upper-Secondary L&L Syllabus with observed writing skills lessons;
2. To compare teachers’ current pedagogical approaches to teaching writing skills
with the mandated pedagogical guidelines outlined in the PNG Upper-
Secondary L&L Syllabus;

3. To compare the observed writing activities with the teaching guidelines outlined
in the PNG Upper-Secondary L&L Syllabus.

Using stratified purposeful sampling, upper-secondary schools were categorized
on the basis of their Grade 12 students’ average achievement scores in the PNG
National Grade 12 English Written Expression Exam (WEE) Report for 2004 (PNG
DoE Measurement Service Unit, 2005). This document reports the mean examination
score of the cohort of Grade 12 students at each school. The six case study schools
were selected using purposeful stratified sampling. Sixty-five schools were ranked
from highest to lowest according to the mean scores obtained in the 2004 National
Grade 12 English WEE. Three categories were identified: above average, average
and below average scores. Within each of these categories, two schools were selected
to obtain variation according to the geographical location and students’ cultural/ethnic
and socio-economic backgrounds.

Seven Grade 11 English teachers participated in the six case studies and they
were all Papua New Guineans. Each site had a teacher who volunteered to participate
with the exception of one site (case study #4) which had two teachers. The majority
of the English teachers at each case study site were females, with only one or two
males. This was also evident with the seven participants in this study who were all
females. These teachers had either a diploma (Dip) and/or a degree in Education
(BEd) with the exception of one teacher who had a degree in another field, Language
and Communication Studies. Of the six BEd teachers, four were trained English
teachers while the other two teachers were trained Drama and Expressive Arts
teachers. Overall, their teaching backgrounds ranged from novice/new graduate
English teachers to senior/experienced English teachers (1 - 14 years) and reflected a
wide range of teaching practices and experiences in writing instruction.

**Interviews with teachers** Each teacher was interviewed twice, prior to the first
lesson observation and after the last lesson observation. The first interview focused
on the teachers’ life history that led to her becoming an English teacher and her
experiences. The second interview focused on teachers’ reflection on their teaching
experience (teaching practices and using the syllabus) as an English teacher at the
upper-secondary level. The questions elicited definitions of the meanings that shaped
the teachers’ knowledge and their behaviour in the classroom. Each interview lasted approximately 30 minutes and was tape-recorded. Comprehensive field notes were taken.

Observation instrument One to two weeks of lesson observations (3-6 lessons, each of 50 minutes duration) were conducted with each teacher-participant between their first and second interviews using a classroom observation manual. This manual was based on the New South Wales Quality Teaching Model (NSW Department of Education and Training (DET), 2003a) and its Classroom Practice Guide (NSW DET, 2003b).

The NSW QTM was developed by James Ladwig and Jennifer Gore from the University of Newcastle in consultation with the NSW Department of Education and Training (NSW DET, 2003a). The model is based on a substantial body of research into pedagogical practice and its relationship to student achievement. Original research was conducted at the University of Wisconsin in the United States by Newmann and his colleagues (e.g., Newmann & Associates, 1996). Newmann’s ideas were adopted by the Queensland Department of Education. From there, a modified version of Newmann’s work was developed for use in NSW. The QTM now has been adopted for use in schools in the Australian Capital Territory as well. The authors of the QTM argue that this model of pedagogy can be applied across all years of schooling and in all curriculum areas (NSW DET, 2003a, p.4).

The model had been developed as a framework for teachers’ professional self-reflection and for school improvement practices. “With the aim of improving pedagogy and hence student learning, the model is available for use by schools and teachers to focus discussion and critical reflection on the teaching and assessment practices that take place in classrooms” (NSW DET, 2003a, p.4). The model had been designed to cater for a wide variety of student and teacher individual differences across different approaches to teaching.

The NSW Quality Teaching Model consists of three dimensions which form the basis for pedagogy: intellectual quality, quality learning environment, and significance. The following is a brief overview of the three dimensions of the NSW model of pedagogy.
1. **Intellectual quality** refers to pedagogy focused on producing deep understanding of important, substantive concepts, skills and idea. Such pedagogy treats knowledge as something that requires active construction and requires students to engage in higher-order thinking and to communicate substantively about what they are learning.

2. **Quality learning environment** refers to pedagogy that creates classrooms where students and teachers work productively in an environment clearly focused on learning. Such pedagogy sets high and explicit expectations and develops positive relationships between teachers and students and among students.

3. **Significance** refers to pedagogy that helps make learning meaningful and important to students. Such pedagogy draws clear connections with students’ prior knowledge and identities, with contexts outside of the classroom, and with multiple ways of knowing or cultural perspectives.

Each of the three dimensions of pedagogy can be described in terms of a number of elements. Each element has been selected and defined on the basis of research linking the practices or qualities of the element to improved student learning outcomes, and the practical capacity of each element to act as an indicator of the underlying dimension.

Elements comprising Intellectual Quality

- **Deep knowledge**: key concepts and ideas in the learning area and relationships among the concepts are presented to students.
- **Deep understanding**: students demonstrate meaningful understanding of these key concepts and the relationships among them.
- **Problematic knowledge**: students address multiple perspectives or solutions to problems and recognise that knowledge is constructed and therefore is open to question.
- **Higher-order thinking**: students are engaged in thinking that requires them to organise, reorganise, apply, analyse, synthesise and evaluate knowledge.
- **Meta-language**: teachers explicitly name and analyse the specialist language of a learning area and comment on language use and how language is used differently in different contexts.

- **Substantive conversation**: students regularly engage in sustained conversations (in oral, written, or artistic forms) about the concepts and ideas they are encountering.

Elements comprising Quality Learning Environment

- **Explicit quality criteria**: Students are provided with explicit criteria for the quality of the work they are to produce.

- **Engagement**: Most students, most of the time, are seriously engaged in the lesson, and display sustained interest in and attention to their work.

- **High expectations**: Teachers communicate high expectations to all students and encourage students to take academic risks.

- **Social support**: Teachers encourage strong positive support for learning, and there is mutual respect among teachers and students. The classroom is free of negative personal comment or put-downs.

- **Students’ self-regulation**: Students demonstrate autonomy and initiative so that there is little need to discipline misbehaving students.

- **Student direction**: Students exercise some direction over the activities they undertake and the manner in which they complete these activities.

Elements comprising Significance

- **Background knowledge**: Lessons regularly and explicitly build on students’ background knowledge in terms of prior school knowledge as well as aspects of their private lives.

- **Cultural knowledge**: Lessons regularly incorporate the cultural knowledge of diverse social groupings, such as economic class, gender, ethnicity, race, sexuality, disability, language, and religion.

- **Knowledge integration**: Lessons regularly demonstrate links between and within learning areas.

- **Inclusivity**: Lessons include and publicly value the participation of all students across the social and cultural backgrounds represented in the classroom.
- **Connectedness**: Lessons rely on the application of school knowledge to real-life contexts or problems, and provide opportunities for students to share their work with audiences beyond the classroom and the school.

- **Narrative**: Lessons employ narrative accounts within lessons (as content or as a process) to help student understanding.

The first author studied the observation-scoring manual that coded classroom practice in line with the dimensions of the QTM. Additionally, she observed the video of the Classroom Practice Guide Package (NSW DET, 2003b) which showed a number of lessons being taught and accompanied with notes illustrating the scores given for the QTM elements evident during each lesson. Table 1 provides an overview of the lessons observed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>No. lessons</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 wks/6 lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 wk/4 lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 wk/2 lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 wk/3 lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 wk/2 lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 wk/5 lessons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During each lesson observation, field notes were taken on aspects of the dimensions and elements of the QTM. Copies of lesson plans and activity worksheets/handouts were obtained from the teachers after lessons were observed.

Interview data

The following is a summary of seven teachers’ responses during the interviews. Excerpts from the interviews are provided in Appendix A (note to research group – not provided as yet). The main themes that emerged are discussed below.

Background and teaching experiences of teachers Of the seven teachers, six were trained secondary school teachers, four were initially trained as English teachers, while the other two were trained in other subjects. The three teachers who were not trained English teachers reported that they began teaching English when there was a shortage of English teachers in the L&L course at their school.

Students’ knowledge of English According to the teachers, the students in their classes were all Papua New Guineans. Most students spoke English as a third, fourth or fifth language. Most teachers said that their students’ performances and competence in English in general and more specifically in writing in English were unsatisfactory, that is, students were still learning how to master writing skills. Their students’ unsatisfactory performances could be attributed to two main reasons: the diversity in the students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds; and the impact of the current education structure and curricular reforms, for example, a too quick shift in the language of instructions from the local vernacular to English in Grade Three in the lower-primary school.

Location of schools Many of the upper-secondary schools in PNG are located in the rural and remote areas of the country that have limited access to teaching and learning resources compared with those schools located in the urban areas. PNG’s rugged terrain, inadequate infrastructure, and limited school funding are major factors
that hinder the accessibility of learning and teaching resources. Furthermore, students from rural and remote upper-secondary schools cannot afford or have limited or no access to services and resources that might enhance their learning such as public computers, and Internet access.

**Effective and ineffective teaching strategies** Writing instruction strategies varied: a student-centred approach in an urban city Catholic school, assisting students by providing points or ideas for both sides of an argumentative essay topic in a new private school in an urban town, and taking a step-by-step approach in teaching any English topic in a rural Catholic agro-technical school. All the English teachers were confronted with difficulties in maintaining their students’ interest during their English writing lessons.

The teachers’ instructions and explanations had to be very clear and the English vocabulary used had to be appropriate to the students’ level of understanding. The teachers claimed that their writing lessons were most effective when they took on a guided step-by-step approach because this assisted the students through the different writing stages towards developing the writing task.

Most teachers thought that pre-writing activities done in small groups were more effective than individual students working alone. Working in small groups enabled the students to share, enhance and develop deep knowledge and understanding of the topic which they would later write about. When assigning writing exercises or tasks, the teachers chose topics that were related to their students’ cultural context and prior knowledge. Case Study #5 teacher stated that when it comes to assignments, she uses most recent information and information related to the school community. One of the teachers kept a collection of copies of her past students’ writing which she uses to illustrate a particular writing style or aspects that are relevant to her writing lesson.

Since the students were non-native speakers of English, they were encouraged to read a variety of English literature (books, magazines, newspapers) in order to be exposed to different writing styles/formats and to expand their English vocabulary. Two of the teachers encouraged students to enter a public essay writing competitions (e.g., Pacific Youth Essay Competition) to practise their writing skills. Another teacher asked her students to keep a personal journal and write anything in it to practise using English vocabulary.
Most students do acknowledge the importance of the English L&L course because they are aware that their English speaking and writing skills are important for learning and communicating in other subjects; as the medium of instruction and communication in tertiary institutions and the workplace; and as the global language of communication. However, there were a number of factors which the teachers noted impeded their students’ willingness to practise writing in English.

**Impediments to students’ success in writing in English**

For most PNG students, writing is not part of their traditional culture. Oral communication plays the major role in PNG’s traditional culture. Events were spoken about repetitively from one generation to the next through story-telling, legends, songs, and illustrated in art work such as wooden carvings and story-boards, paintings and dances. Writing was introduced into PNG after the arrival of the first western missionaries as part of their literacy program to enable Papua New Guineans to read the Bible.

At present, writing skills are formally learnt by most PNG children once they begin schooling at the elementary level, also referred to as the ‘Tok Ples’ (vernacular) pre-school. The language of instruction in the elementary schools in the rural areas is mostly in the local vernacular, while the lingua franca or national language (that is, ‘Tok Pisin’ [pidgin]) is the language of instruction in the urban elementary schools. Only a small number of private International Education Agency schools in the urban towns of PNG use English as the language of instruction in their curriculum from elementary classes up to grade 12. Most of their students only practise English literacy skills (speaking, reading and writing) when they attend classes. After classes and at home most students communicate with friends and family members in other languages, that is, ‘Tok Pisin’ and their vernacular.

‘Tok Pisin’ does not align closely with formal English. Most students' expression (oral and written) in the English language is influenced by ‘Tok Pisin’. Students did not read many books written in English. Reading a variety of books that are written in English would enable the students to become familiar with figurative language in English, for example, use of idioms. Most students are not critical when writing an argumentative essay. Students tend to be passive in English classes, not thinking about how to use English to help them find a suitable career. Teachers lack sufficient time to work closely with students on the basics of writing in English. Teachers require updated resources to help students read and write in English.
Some students are not interested in becoming competent in writing in English, but want to do well in other subjects (for example, Science, Social Science, History and others) in which English is the medium of instruction and involves writing tasks. Students complain that there is too much writing in the English course and that they do not like instruction about grammar, tenses, vocabulary, spelling, and punctuation. The teachers also made reference to the students’ strengths in their writing lesson, that their students do better in descriptive writing than in argumentative writing.

Teachers’ views of the Upper Secondary L&L Syllabus and their preparation to teach the syllabus. Only one teacher indicated that her teacher-training program had a course relating to the implementation of the L&L syllabus guidelines into the English teaching program. The English L&L Departments of all the upper-secondary schools in the country are provided with students' resource booklets for the different teaching themes for each term. The teachers’ comments about teaching resources varied.

Although some teachers felt that the L&L Syllabus guidelines did meet the learning needs of their students, others identified weaknesses: the syllabus guidelines were very broad when trying to incorporate them into the teaching program; teachers are given limited freedom to select issues/topics that relate to the students' learning context, for example, PNG poetry or literature; and that limited time is given to teaching speaking and writing skills in English.

The trained English teachers claimed that the only course in their teacher-training program which was relevant to the upper-secondary L&L Syllabus was the English literature course. The teachers indicated that their teacher-training program did not prepare them well for the challenges that they confronted in the classroom at upper-secondary level. The difficulties included implementing the syllabus guidelines into the teaching program; teaching academic writing; teaching creative writing; and administering writing assessment. The teachers said that strategies to overcome these difficulties and strategies for improving feedback on writing should be included in the English teacher-training programs at universities in PNG.

Lesson observations

The first author spent a week at each case study site (except for case study site #1). The number of writing lessons observed at each site was determined by the teacher’s teaching program for the week. Within the week of lesson observations, the
minimum number of writing lessons observed was two and the maximum was five. The duration for each lesson was 50 minutes.

There was a wide range of writing skills topics that were taught across the six case studies: descriptive (narrative) writing, argumentative writing, poetry writing, response to a newspaper article (letter to the editor(letter of complaint), and summary writing. The Grade 11 L&L Syllabus course structure for term four indicates that the theme is ‘culture’. This implies that the content of what is taught could relate to the learning context or particular cultural aspects of the PNG society. The writing skills activities focused on narrative, poetry, and drama/script writing.

The range of writing skills (narrative and poetry) and the instructions for the different genres enabled the first author to observe the quality of the teaching content, the nature of the learning environment, and the type of pedagogical strategies including the responses from the students. Table 2 shows the scores for the seven teachers across the three dimensions and the associated elements of the Quality Teaching Model: Intellectual Quality, Quality learning Environment, and Significance. Table 3 shows teachers’ scores on the QT dimensions combining the elements of each dimension.

Lesson observation data After the completion of the lesson observations, a summative score was given for each element on the Lesson Observation Coding Sheet. The scoring scale (1-5) was based on evidence of the elements in the observed lessons: (1) = no evidence of an element at all, or not applicable, to (5) = substantial evidence of the element is observed or present. The observation scores indicate the extent to which the elements of the three dimensions of the QTM were evident in the observed lessons.

Table 2 presents lesson observation scores for each of the QTM dimensions for each teacher in the study. Table 3 presents the same data but with the scores for the elements for each QT combined for each dimension. The results in Table 2 indicate that there were differences in the scores for each teacher within each dimension of the QTM. The majority of the scores within the ‘Quality Learning Environment’ dimension were the teachers’ highest scores, except for CS4T2. Within the ‘Quality Learning Environment’ dimension, CS1T had the highest score of 4.0, which indicated that the quality of her learning environment was high in comparison to the other teachers, particularly CS3T and CS6T who both had scores of 2.8.
Some of the factors which might explain these differences included the schools’ location, students’ socio-economic backgrounds, and the teachers’ teaching experiences. CS1T was a more experienced English teacher (12 years) than CS3T (1 year) and CS6T (5 years) (refer to Table 4.2). CS3T was a new graduate and was in her first year of teaching while CS6T was not a trained English teacher. CS1T’s school was located in the city and the students’ socio-economic backgrounds were higher than those of CS3T and CS6T whose schools were located in a town (newly established) and a rural area, respectively.

Within the ‘Intellectual Quality’ dimension, CS1T also had the highest score of 3.5, which indicated that her lessons focused on producing deep understanding of concepts, skills and ideas and actively involving her students in higher-order thinking. Since most of CS1T’s students come from affluent family backgrounds with high income and high standard of living, it is likely that they have been exposed to educational resources that enhanced their learning (e.g., textbooks, TV, public library). CS1T’s students’ educational competence may have determined her careful preparation and approach. In contrast, CS3T (a new graduate) had the lowest score of 2.5 for this dimension. CS3T stated during the interview that her students were always shy and reluctant to answer questions or speak openly in class.

Finally, the ‘Significance’ dimension contained most of the low scores, except for CS4T2 and CS5T who had scores of 3.7. CS3T and CS4T1 both had the lowest score of 2.3. CS3T, a new graduate, indicated during the interview that she had great difficulties in teaching her students who constantly had to be guided in lesson tasks and activities. Her students were not critical in their reasoning and in analyzing given tasks. CS3T felt that her students’ previous English teachers did not teach the English subject well and this had affected her students’ current interest in and approach to learning English writing skills. For CS4T1, it was the topic, poetry, which did not capture the interest of her students. The students did not have the creative and imaginative minds required for poetry writing. She argued that creative and imaginative thinking was not a significant part of the cultural life in Papua New Guinea and therefore poetry lessons lacked significance for most students.

Overall, the lessons observed did not rate highly on QT elements or their dimensions. Only one teacher scored a mean of 4 (out of a possible 5) for one dimension. As Table 3 shows, the average mean for the seven teachers were not high:
### Table 2  Lesson observation ratings by QTM dimensions and associated elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions/Elements</th>
<th>Ratings for each teacher</th>
<th>M*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) (4) (2) (3) (2) (5) (2)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Intellectual Quality**

| Deep knowledge                           | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 |  (3.6) |
| Deep Understanding                       | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  (3.0) |
| Problematic knowledge                    | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  (2.7) |
| Higher order thinking                    | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  (2.7) |
| Meta-language                            | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 |  (3.1) |
| Substantive communication                | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |  (3.0) |

(Teachers’ MEAN scores - Dimension)

2. **Quality Learning Environment**

| Explicit quality criteria                | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 |  (3.4) |
| Engagement                               | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 |  (4.0) |
| High expectations                        | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 |  (4.1) |
| Social Support                           | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 |  (3.7) |
| Students’ self-regulation                | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  (4.0) |
| Students’ direction                      | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  (1.3) |

(Teachers’ MEAN scores - Dimension)

3. **Significance**

| Background knowledge                     | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  (3.3) |
| Cultural knowledge                       | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 |  (1.9) |
| Knowledge integration                    | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |  (2.3) |
| Inclusivity                              | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  (4.4) |
| Connectedness                            | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |  (3.6) |
| Narrative                                | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 |  (2.9) |

(Teachers’ MEAN scores - Dimension)

* M* Mean for each element

** Number of lessons observed for each teacher; there was one summative rating for each element across the lessons observed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Intellectual Quality</th>
<th>Quality Learning</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>QTM Mean**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS1T (6)*</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.60 (0.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS2T (4)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.36 (0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS3T (2)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.53 (0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4T1 (3)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.80 (0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4T2 (2)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.33 (0.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS5T (5)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.60 (0.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS6T (2)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.67 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean**</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>QTM Dimension (0.38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* number of lessons observed.

** number in parenthesis is the standard deviation for the mean.
M = 3.02 for Intellectual Quality, M = 3.43 for a Quality Learning Environment, and M = 3.00 for Significance. Three teachers (CS3T, CST41, and CST6) had low ratings across the three dimensions. Averaging across the teachers, there were mean scores less than 3.0 for Problematic Knowledge (M = 2.7) and Higher order thinking (M = 2.7) within the dimension Intellectual Quality, for Students’ direction (M = 1.3) within the dimension Quality Learning Environment, and for cultural knowledge (M = 1.9), knowledge integration (M = 2.3), and narrative (M = 2.9) within the dimension of Significance.

Analysis of the interview and observation data

Examination of the teacher interviews and the lesson observations has revealed at least three areas of deficiency in teaching English writing skills in PNG upper-secondary schools. First, current practices for teaching English writing skills in PNG are affected by an out-of-date syllabus for the English (L&L) course. The theoretical foundation behind the syllabus is the proposition of “process writing” which was developed in English speaking countries. When it was imported into PNG where English is the third, fourth or fifth language, its validity and effectiveness are questionable. The teachers in this study point out that many PNG English teachers have called for a change in theoretical foundation and teaching practice.

Second, because of the outdated syllabus, the current practices for teaching English writing skills have not been able to accommodate the cultural reality of PNG students. The instructions about English writing and contents of English writing are not closely associated with the students’ lives outside school. For most students, writing is not part of their day-to-day lives and they are only exposed to writing in school. Many students in upper-secondary schools are not motivated to learn to write in English. The quality of students’ work is far below teachers’ expectations. The learning outcomes do not match the objectives of the English syllabus. The unrealistic objectives of the curriculum have been criticized by teachers.

Third, the teachers complained that the existing English syllabus does not provide any implementation strategies. Teachers are expected independently to interpret how to use this syllabus to direct their teaching practice in schools that are diversified in geographical location and cultural norms. The teachers spoke of difficulties in adapting syllabus guidelines into their teaching program. They would welcome a pedagogical framework to support syllabus documents. Effective writing
instructions for students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds require a variety of pedagogical techniques.

Findings from the interviews and the lesson observations provide insights into the English teachers’ writing instruction practices in upper-secondary schools in PNG. The findings point to the desirability of a pedagogical framework to provide specific teaching guidelines and strategies that focus on enhancing writing instructions to improve students’ writing skills.

**Pedagogical framework for teaching writing in English in PNG**

Students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds need specific and appropriate instruction to write in English. There should be a variety of writing activities that take into account students’ prior learning. In light of the findings, we propose a new pedagogical framework with four domains and associated components: Intellectual Stimulation; Productive Writing Environment; Cultural Relevance to writing; and Human Development. This framework is shown in Table 4.

**Intellectual stimulation** The ‘Intellectual Stimulation’ domain involves teaching content that facilitates the learning of English writing skills. Within this domain, instructions and corresponding cognitive processes serve as the basis for designing and selecting appropriate teaching and learning materials. In addition, instructions need to be clear in defining the intellectual skills that the students are required to acquire for the writing tasks at hand.

ESL students in upper-secondary schools in PNG are expected to learn different writing genres in the L&L course using a language which is their second, third, or fourth language. Language teaching is most effective when learners are presented with meaningful language in context. Furthermore, the integration of language (English) and content (PNG related issues/topics) in teaching is appropriate because it enables the students.

Tasks should be selected according to a hierarchy organised by the complexity of the tasks and students’ ability. The primary significance of the hierarchy is to identify prerequisites that should be completed to facilitate learning at each level. The prerequisites can be identified by doing an analysis of the learning task. Learning hierarchies could provide a basis for the sequencing of instructions. The domain of
‘Intellectual Stimulation’ consists of three components: purposeful stimulation, authentic communication, and meaningful communication.

Table 4  Pedagogical Framework for English Writing in PNG Upper-secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>Purposeful stimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authentic communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meaningful information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Productive Writing Environment</td>
<td>Teachers’ preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cultural Relevance</td>
<td>Understanding localization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting globalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging integration among disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Human Development</td>
<td>Recognition of difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For purposeful stimulation, it is important to consider what each task or activity will require of students. Teachers should take time to activate students’ relevant background knowledge. Any stimulation should be related to a clear pedagogical purpose so that the stimulation gets students’ attention. Helping students to make links between new information and information they have stored in long-term memory is one of the most significant implications of the information processing model (Ormrod, 2005).
The content of lessons should reflect authentic communication. It is important to link learning activities within the school and classroom to the naturally occurring communication that occurs outside the school. One of the problems identified in the current research was that writing topics were not relevant to students’ lives outside school. Students were asked to write in English for the sake of writing. Students should understand the purpose of writing and enjoy the challenge of communicating in English in real life situations. In countries like Australia, communicative language teaching has been a commonplace for decades. In PNG, it is a relatively new phenomenon. Although some teachers are attempting to make their content more communicative, for instance, have students imagine they are traveling around Australia or shopping in London, such content is artificial because few PNG students will go to Australia or Britain. Authentic communication should be linked to students’ lives in PNG.

Writing usually involves an attempt to make meaning. There is an increasing focus on the social nature of the meaning making process (e.g., Vygotsky, 1978; Lave & Wenger, 1991). From this perspective, learning is a dialogue, a process of internal as well as social negotiation. Human beings are unique information processors who make meaning from their experience.

**Productive writing environment** The domain of Productive Writing Environment involves teaching instructions that support the learning of English writing skills. Teaching should be more effective when students are engaged in activities within a supportive environment and receive guidance from the teacher using appropriate physical, cultural, and psychological tools.

Within PNG’s diverse linguistic and socio-cultural context, students cannot be understood independently from the social and cultural forces that shape them. Instructions should enable students to participate in meaningful writing tasks and conversations with other students who share their interests. Conceptual and cultural learning can occur through conversation. Vygotsky (1978) proposed that there is a close relationship between the use of language as a cultural tool in social interaction and the use of language as a psychological tool providing the resources for individual thinking. This socio-cultural view of learning sees as central the relationship between learning and the social situations in which it occurs. For Vygotsky, talk is not simply a mirror on a learner’s inner thought processes, but actually constructs and shapes the learner’s thinking.
Effective teaching helps students to learn. Instructions enable students to learn to write by working with a more knowledgeable person (usually a teacher or a more advanced student) on the skills and knowledge needed to perform specific purposeful action. Students learn by gradually appropriating the teacher’s goals and purposes for writing, as well as the appropriate language forms in the process of the writing activity and through feedback on writing. Appropriation occurs in what Vygotsky (1978) termed the ‘zone of proximal development’ (ZPD), that level of knowledge between normal student performance and what a student is capable of attaining with expert assistance.

Teachers should maintain high expectations for all students as well as provide scaffolding to assist students to complete tasks. However, expectations should not be unrealistic and beyond students’ capability because students will lose motivation if they are not able to reach goals. Students should have the knowledge and skills required for the task. Teachers should provide information and support if and when requested by the students. Teachers should establish a supportive learning environment where students are given challenging tasks but have the support and help of the teacher and other students to surmount challenges.

Students should be encouraged to interact with each other. They should be allowed to work on tasks in small groups after the teacher has modeled the activities that should be occurring. The teacher assists as needed but does not dominate the groups. Teachers sequence teaching activities, provide support and guidance, and challenge students to extend their learning. Group collaboration can be used to achieve several outcomes: helping students explore the personal relevance of content; making students more active participants in learning about different writing genres; improving social skills; and giving teachers insight into what students think or believe. Collaborative group work should be encouraged. Students work together to achieve a goal and each member is accountable for the final product. This organizational structure should provide a setting for Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development where students can be helped to learn with the assistance of a more capable peer.

Cultural relevance This dimension involves teaching strategies that help motivate the learning of English writing skills. Learning is a situated and contextualized enterprise. Learning happens at a specific time and in a specific place, and the characteristics of that time and place matter greatly in how students learn and
develop (Wertsch, 1985). Teachers of English writing should recognise that cultural experiences affect students’ values, pattern of language use, and interpersonal style. Students are likely to be more responsive to a teacher who affirms the values of their home culture. In the multicultural environment of PNG schools, it is important that teachers promote regional-ethnic harmony and respect for different cultural values.

Teachers should understand that English writing, as a learning process, cannot be separated from its cultural context. Unfortunately, many current learning activities involve knowledge that is abstract and out of context. Learning, both outside and inside school, advances through collaborative social interaction and the social construction of knowledge. Linking English writing to the social and cultural contexts of PNG should be a key consideration when selecting teaching strategies.

There are three components of the Cultural Relevance within the proposed pedagogical framework: understanding localization, promoting globalization, and encouraging integration among disciplines.

Effective teachers understand their students’ backgrounds and abilities and are aware of their individual effort and achievement. Students should be given the opportunity to write about local issues with which they are familiar. As Vygotsky pointed out, human learning cannot be understood independently from social and cultural forces. English writing in PNG must be related to the local culture. Students should be encouraged to write about local affairs.

While emphasizing the link between English writing and local culture, English writing also can promote globalization. One of the reasons for introducing English to school curricula was to prepare younger generations for economic expansion. In an era of economic globalization, English not only is an intra-national language for communication among various cultural communities within PNG, but also is a means of communication with Asian-Pacific countries and the wider world.

To make English writing more meaningful to students, it should be integrated with other subject areas such as Mathematics, Social Science, and Information Technology. Here integration refers to cross-disciplinary integration of knowledge. Upper-secondary school students in PNG are required to choose subjects or disciplines which are taught in English. The content of various subjects could form part of the focus of English writing. Teachers of English should cooperate with teachers of other subjects which are taught in English. When students find that
English writing is relevant to other parts of their learning, their motivation may be enhanced.

**Human Development** This domain involves teaching activities that enhance learning beyond English writing. Learning is an active process and students are able to construct new ideas based upon their current and past knowledge. Teachers should encourage self-regulation in their students. Students should be actively involved in their own learning, deciding what they want to learn, monitoring their progress towards achieving their goals, and assessing the quality of what they have achieved.

The task of the teacher is to translate information they want students to learn into a format appropriate to the students’ current state of understanding. Learning activities can be made more effective by careful sequencing of materials to allow students to build upon what they already know and go beyond the information they have been given to discover key principles.

This is in line with the major goal of education in PNG, encapsulated in *A Philosophy of Education for Papua New Guinea* (Matane, 1986). The goal is integral human development. “It emphasises the need for developing human potential so that each individual can solve his or her own problems, contribute to the common good of society and maintain, promote and improve learning and living” (PNG Department of Education, 1993, p. 2). Three components comprise this domain: recognition of individual differences, knowledge construction, and critical evaluation.

Teachers should recognize individual differences among their students. Because of differences in gender, ethnicity, and social-economic backgrounds, it is counterproductive to regard students as one homogeneous cohort and to use a limited range of teaching activities. A variety of teaching activities should be tried to suit students’ learning ability, their level of language proficiency, their ability to self-regulate, and so on. For example, flexibility in pedagogy is necessary when considering how to meet the differing goals and expectations of relatively wealthy urban students living in big cities and poor rural students in remote areas.

The constructivist view sees knowledge not as externally transmitted but as constructed by learners themselves. Teaching activities are not just a means of presenting knowledge for learners to grasp. Rather, teaching activities should help students learn how to self-regulate their learning. Active, thoughtful learners tend to be more successful than passive learners who have an excessive reliance on teachers. Teachers of English should create classroom environments where students are
actively engaged in learning the skills of writing in English.

PNG’s Philosophy of Education focuses on integral human development. English writing is related to the processes of critical and creative thinking. If writing in English contributes to human development, then teaching activities should encourage critical thinking. Education in any country plays both a conserving role and an innovative role. The conserving role can be seen in the way education maintains cultural values, passing the traditions of a country from generation to generation. The innovative role can be seen in the way education helps to produce creative people who bring changes to their country. Teaching activities should promote critical thinking in students. Students should develop their ability to evaluate both local and global events that are shaping their world and respond to them in a thoughtful manner.

Conclusion

A pedagogical framework consisting of four domains has been presented. The components overlap although they are discussed separately. They form parts of an inter-related system, a framework which should prove useful for teachers of English in PNG. Three of the four domains have features in common with the Quality Teaching Model (QTM) endorsed by the New South Wales Department of Education and Training in Australia. The QTM was used to guide the classroom observation aspect of the current thesis. There are overlaps between the QTM dimension of Intellectual Quality and the domain of Intellectual Stimulation. In both cases, it is argued that teachers who stimulate their students with challenging and interesting tasks are likely to enhance their intellectual development. There are overlaps between the QTM dimension of a Supportive Classroom Environment and the domain of Productive Writing Environment. In both cases, teachers are encouraged to create classrooms where students have the confidence to tackle challenging tasks, classrooms where teachers and students work together in communities of practice.

Finally, there are overlaps between the QTM dimension of Significance and the domain of Cultural Relevance of Writing. In both cases, teachers are encouraged to design learning tasks that have relevance for students in their world outside school. This is a particular challenge for teachers of English writing in PNG. For many of their students, written English does not play a significant role in their everyday lives. The proposed pedagogical framework presented here may help teachers with this
daunting task.

Construction of the new pedagogical framework was based on the findings of this study. The pedagogical framework itself focuses on the teaching of English writing skills in the upper-secondary L&L course in PNG. Its intention is to guide English teachers in teaching English writing skills, particularly teachers new to the L&L course and those not trained as English teachers. The pedagogical framework’s guidelines would help them provide explicit instructions when teaching English within a meaningful learning environment.

Because of PNG students’ diverse cultural and language backgrounds it is important for English teachers in upper-secondary schools to build effective learning environments that take into account these backgrounds. There is no one best way to teach English writing skills to non-English speaking background students. Different approaches are required because of the diversity of conditions faced by schools and the varying experiences of PNG English learners with literacy and schooling in their first language.

Implementation of the proposed pedagogical framework should result in important consequences for teaching and teacher-education in PNG. First, unlike the PNG Upper-Secondary L&L Syllabus for Grade 11 and 12 (a document that provides general objectives but allows teachers to teach in their own ways), the proposed pedagogical framework makes specific recommendations for pedagogical practice. These recommendations are the result of the current research. Second, the domains and components of the framework can be used during the preparation of novice secondary school teachers so that they have strategies prepared for the classroom. The domains and components also can be explored during in-service programs particularly for novice English teachers who wish to keep up to date with current practices. Third, if this pedagogical framework can be shown to contribute to effective writing in English, it should be considered by teachers in other areas of the English curriculum.

The pedagogical framework has yet to be trialed. Its implementation is beyond the scope of the current study. The development of this framework marks a start rather than an end to improving the teaching of English writing skills in the PNG upper-secondary L&L writing program.
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Appendix A: selected excerpts from interviews with teachers

**Case Study #1**  We’ve got students who just don’t like to write, they hate writing! … when they go to grade 12, they are sitting for this Written Expression [Exam] and it will reflect back on the teacher, whether the teachers taught all these things and trying to force students to write and to love writing. So my responsibility is to ensure that they have to do some kind of writing, whether they like it or not. [Interv#1/Q5(p.4): para3, lines 2-7]

**Case Study #4T1** They have good ideas, but when it comes to expressing those ideas in writing, that’s when they are not expressing it well. Especially, it has to be with the use of language. Many of them even though they are in grade 11, there are some words that they should know how to spell by now; they are not spelling correctly as well. They are still mixing up their tenses and all these things, so that affects their expression of those very good ideas that they have. [Interv#1/Q5(p.3): para1]

... the past school that they came from and as well as their own attitude towards the subject. Like I said, if only they can speak English often and maybe read a lot of materials in English literature, it will help them. [Interv#1/Q6(p.4): para4]

**Case Study #4T2** … they can write creative pieces, however, they have problems with tenses and how to write their sentences constructively and correctly, the general organization of their writing pieces. They have a lot of problems with that – tense, word order, spelling … Their problem basically is how to put it on paper. [Interv#1/Q5(p.2): para1]

Because some of the schools [i.e., high schools] from which the students come from, I don’t know what happened there but the students seem not to know how to construct basic sentences. Spellings of words are usually linked to ‘pidgin’. I think it depends on which schools they came from. If they started with Elementary schools where they had to start off with their own languages, I think those are the students that we are dealing with who are having problems with sentence construction, spelling and all that. [Interv#1/Q6(p.3): para2, lines 1-7]

**Case Study #5** Maybe it’s the general kind of mentality at the moment. … I blame it on us teachers for seeing subjects as not related to each other. So from there, students have the tendency to see things as different little bits and I think I blame it on that mentality. So from there it is brought into their lesson and learning. … That’s my opinion. [Interv#1/Q5(p.4): para2]

We are getting students from other high schools. … And sometimes teachers out there do not worry about giving them that skill [i.e., writing] at that level. And when they come in, they come with that – they lack those skills when they come in. And to go on and just teach from our level where we left with our students and assuming that they have acquired the skill, that’s where the problem is. [Interv#1/Q6(pp.4-5): para5/1]

**Case Study #6** … the importance of that has been mentioned to them but some of them they still complaining of too much writing. When they complain, at the same time they do not do it and then they find it very hard to do it again. And it leads to their understanding of comprehension which is very low. They see the relevance in the writing skills, but then they themselves do not want to do it. They think it’s a waste of time. They think that English language is reading a passage and then answering questions, that’s it (answering in short sentences). When it comes to writing they do not want to do it. [Interv#2/Q2(p.1): para2]

**Case Study #2** … my concern for my school is that we really need materials … in order to teach effectively we need a lot of reading materials. … If there are video cassettes on different programs, the ABC [TV] has themes on English – verbs and all that. If only we have these things, it will make teaching a lot … easier, because students tend to be bored of the same old style – you write on the board, they copy –note-taking. It’s boring for them. If you try it from another approach, have something different, they’ll be interested. [Interv#1/Q6(p.5): para4-5]
… some of the materials are out-of-date. It really needs to be updated. Some of the theories or ideas being argued on or ideas being communicated are also out-of-date, need to be corrected, need to be updated. Again should be focused on the Papua New Guinean students. [Interv#2/Q5(pp.2-3): para9/1]

**Case Study #4T1** I found out when I started teaching grade 11 that there were not enough resources. I have to look around for resources to supplement whatever topics I was going to teach. … So we had to do extra work researching, gather notes, prepare to supplement whatever information we can get out of the booklet together with other notes too. [Interv#1/Q2(p.1): para2]

**Case Study #6** For our part here we are dealing with so many different students from different backgrounds. To be more effective, I have to go step by step. If I just give them things, they cannot do it. … Only those few bright ones [understand the ideas]. The majority of the students would be lost. [Interv#1/Q3(p.3): para1-2]

**Case Study #5** When you just go in and you start giving them notes, just notes after notes and then just using single sentences like “fill in the blanks – 1, 2, 3 up to 10” and just leave out the blanks and they just write, I think that is not good. I’d rather see if you are going to teach adjectives, you have to have a passage and then you teach from there. You have to show them where the adjectives are, the function of it. I don’t like single exercises, like sentences where you just fill in the best or appropriate word. [Interv#1/Q4(p.3): para2]

**Case Study #3** My students see writing skills especially in essay and letter writing as very important, because they know that with letter writing, when they get out of school then in one point in their life they will be writing letters, so they see that it is an important skill in writing. And essays, especially report writing, they see it as something important because I emphasise this when some students don’t show any interest … that, ‘no matter wherever, which university you go, you should be writing reports. So for this writing skill, you are to pay attention to it now … if you go higher into other institutions, you may be able to write without so much difficulties. [Interv#2/Q2(p.2): para1]

**Case Study #5** The first thing is familiarity I would say – a topic they are used to seeing around them like for the theme that we are on – ‘sports’. We talk about sports in school first and the violence that is involved … For example, ‘sports violence’. I talked about our issue so from there they relate to that immediately, and then we bring that to the broader perspective, probably Lae [the town where the school is located] … and from there to global issues using newspapers. [Interv#2/Q3(p.2): para2]

**Case Study #3** there was the Australasian English Competition, and one of my bright students came up and she was asking me about figurative speeches, metaphors and all those, similes, analogy and all that. … And it made me think – Yeah, we could relate to our culture and use some of these figurative speeches and integrate it with our culture and use examples with our culture. … sometimes students get bored and half the time they don’t know what or have a fair background of … [other foreign] culture. Do more of PNG poems, legends, myths. Those are some of the things I’d really like to do with grade 11s. And those are some of the things that appear in the South Pacific Literature. [Interv#2/Q6(p.6): para 3&4]

**Case Study #2** … What I’ve noticed is that, in order to write good English, you have to speak good English first. First and foremost, in order to write good English you have to speak good English. And if they are not practicing speaking English enough, then they don’t write well. … most of the boys who end up here, most of the time they are speaking ‘pidgin’(PNG’s national language). They don’t speak English, even at home. Even in the school itself. They are speaking ‘pidgin’ all the time and they don’t see the importance in speaking English. To them it’s a prestigious thing. If you speak English that means that you are bright, that you have come from a school that is cool. They are quite prejudice against it. [Interv#1/Q6(pp.3-4): para7/1]

**Case Study #4T2** I find that the students are not really interested being very good in English. I think they are more concentrated on doing well in other subjects … and English is not really a concern to them, I see that. Even though I stress to them how important is, … they think that they can manage English even if they don’t have to work hard for it. They are not really interested in developing English skills, especially writing skills. It’s an effort for me as an English teacher now. I see that it is becoming for me teaching the kids the skills. It’s getting difficult too, teaching it. [Interv#2/Q2(p.1): para1]
**Case Study #6**
To most of them … the importance of that [writing] has been mentioned to them but some of them they still complaining of too much writing. When they complain, at the same time they do not do it and then they find it very hard to do it again. And it leads to their misunderstanding of comprehension which is very low. They see the relevance in the writing skills, but then they themselves do not want to do it. They think it is a waste of time. They think that English language is reading a passage and then answering questions, that’s it (answering in short sentences).

**Case Study #1**
About this kind of English, that is the English that is spoken in Port Moresby on the street, where you have English and ‘pidgin’, ‘Motu’ and all that, they are all mixed together. … That is one of the biggest problem that I have seen in the writing of the students is that kind of English that is spoken on the street. They try to put that into their writing paper. … And really this is one of the area we have to really improve on and the type of English that we speak, and then when we write, it's different. … That is one of the biggest problem that I have seen. [Interv#1/Q6(p.4): para1]

**Case Study #4**
Maybe one other thing affecting the learning in English would be the speaking of the language itself. Most of them [students] they converse in ‘tok pisin’ and also in their own ‘tok ples’ [local vernacular/dialect] and it’s affecting their English learning. So we encourage them to speak a lot of English, read a lot. … only a few are doing that. The majority are still carrying on. That is why sometimes in their writing, when they write, it’s like they are translating their idea in ‘tok pisin’ into English in which it makes it all grammatically wrong. So if they speak English and read a lot, I believe that it will help them in their learning of that subject. [Interv#1/Q6(p.4): para3]

**Case Study #4T2**
Tenses, grammar, sentence construction are the areas where they really need help in. Because some of the schools [i.e., high schools] from which the students come from … the students seem not to know how to construct basic sentences. Spellings of words are usually linked to ‘pidgin’ [PNG's lingua franca and national language]. I think it depends on which schools they came from. If they started with Elementary schools where they had to start off in their own languages, I think those are the students that we are dealing with who are having problems with sentence construction, spelling and all that. So basically these students’ main aim in English is to spell words correctly and write good sentences, writing well constructed sentences and tenses. The use of sentences is also a big problem for them. [Interv#1/Q6(p.3): para4]

**Case Study #4T2**
There is a need for the teachers that are coming out to teach at the secondary level for them to be taught writing skills, because when I first came here to teach I just felt lost the minute I was told to teach writing skills because I did not have the material. There wasn’t a detailed syllabus to use as a guide to teach. The syllabus that we have just tells us what the theme is, it’s just broad. I really had a hard time trying to organize myself so that I could teach writing skills. I was quite lost when I first started, but as time went on I picked up and I collected information here and there and materials. … there is definitely a need for teacher trainers to be taught [English writing skills]. [Interv#2/Q6(p.5): para5]

**Case Study #3**
A good example is that we have to do something on Sports [theme for Term 3]. And most of the articles were Australian articles and during that period I switched off to something else rather than concentrating on another culture. And at that time I saw that there was a need for comprehension for my students, so what I did was for half the term I did not follow that. And I used my discretion to teach according to my students’ needs. [Interv#2/Q6(p.5): para2]

**Case Study #4T1**
I would say that to do with the language learning, I think it is affecting the students, because of the structure of the language comparing English and their own vernaculars as well as some of them are probably starting off in ‘Tok Pisin’. Maybe the structure in terms of how they place their words in a sentence. Even at this level students are still confusing the layout - just to write a simple sentence they are putting words not in the proper order. [Interv#2/Other Related Qtns(p.6): para4]