All 2017 data was imported—data was the CEFR scoring of all GRC 600 Unit 1 essays as to get the raw score upon intake. Scoring used the following categories:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Code | CEFR Variable | Basic Idea |
| WI | Written Interaction | Can express him/herself with clarity and precision, relating to the addressee flexibly and effectively. |
| WP | Written  Production | Can write clear, well-structured texts of complex subjects, underlining the relevant salient issues, expanding and supporting points of view at some length with subsidiary points, reasons and relevant examples, and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion. |
| CO | Correspondence | Able to produce clear and effective personal correspondence. |
| CW | Creative  Writing | Can write clear, detailed, well-structured and developed descriptions and imaginative texts in an assured, personal, natural style appropriate to the reader in mind. |
| ES | Essaying | Can write clear, well-structured expositions of complex subjects, underlining the relevant salient issues. |
| RA | Range | Can select an appropriate formulation from a broad range of language to express him/herself clearly, without having to restrict what he/she wants to say. |
| CN | Control | Consistently correct and appropriate use of vocabulary. |
| VC | Vocabulary | Has a good command of a very broad lexical repertoire including idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms; shows awareness of connotative levels of meaning. |
| GA | Grammar | Maintains consistent grammatical control of complex language, even while attention is otherwise engaged (e.g. In forward planning, in monitoring others’ reactions). |
| OR | Orthography | Layout, paragraphing and punctuation are consistent and helpful. |
| TD | Thematic  Development | Can give elaborate descriptions and narratives, integrating subthemes, developing particular points and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion. |
| CH | Coherence | Can produce clear, smoothly flowing, well-structured speech, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices. |
| SL | Sociolinguistic | Has a good command of idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms with awareness of connotative levels of meaning. |

Parallel analysis suggests that the number of factors = 1. Thus, models with 1 and 2 factors will be tested; using a cutoff for factor weights.

Kendell correlation was significant for all pairs of CEFR variables. Thus, use Promax method for fa() call (α = 0.01).

Two models were produced. Only the 2-factor model demonstrated an acceptable Tucker-Lewis Index greater than 0.95 (TLI = 0.974). The ultra-Heywood model (weights > 1.0) is:

MR1 MR2

WI 0.688

WP 0.926

CO 0.825

CW 0.896

ES 0.808

~~RA~~

CN 0.644

VC 1.058

GA 0.770

OR 0.864

TD 0.789

CH 0.772

~~SL~~

A cutoff of 0.596 was imposed in accordance with the power law involving the number of modelled observations: 4.9123\*n-0.476 (n = 84). RA and SL are insignificant variables in the model. Thus, we have two factors:

* MR1: WI, WP, CO, CW, ES, GA, OR, TD, CH
* MR2: CN, VC

The first factor (MR1) asks us to consider the student’s ability to produce an essay able to relate more complex experiences and concepts (WI, WP, CO, CW, ES) while adhering to the basic rules of written expression/essaying (GA, OR, TD, CH). This hints at the ability to use phenomenological/systems thinking as to present a structured perspective.

The second factor (MR2) is a mixing of *control and vocabulary*. This factor asks us to consider whether the student can manage word choice while pursuing a broad lexical base.

The analysis offers two aspects for the writing centre/University to consider:

* (MR1) Workshops focusing on the construction and organisation of an essay (adhering to mechanics) with the goal of presenting a perspective. DBA = conceptual framework course/lit matrices. MBA/BBA = structured essay writing as to appeal to academia and business.
* (MR2) Workshops on word choice and control.