



Exploring Writing Instruction: Perceptions, Learning Processes, and Enhancing Skills through Metalinguistic Reflection

Mariya Voronchikhina¹, Duarte Nuno Farbu Pinto²

Nord University, Norway¹
Nord University, Norway²

Abstract

This article aims to explore the factors that influence second-grade pupils' text production and how different instructional writing discourses affect their ability to express themselves in writing. Writing instruction is a fundamental aspect of early education, and it is crucial to tailor teaching methods to effectively support pupils' writing development. The study is based on a qualitative analysis of written work from two pupils with similar letter knowledge but differing levels of text production. Through metalinguistic conversations with the pupils and text observations, the social and pedagogical factors influencing the pupils' writing processes are examined. Ivanić's six discourses on writing pedagogy are used as a theoretical framework to analyze how these can be integrated to promote a holistic approach to writing instruction. The findings provide insights into the pupils' metalinguistic competence and how instructional discourses can either support or hinder their creative expression.

Keywords: Pedagogical discourses, Writing instruction, Pupils' writing development, Text production in early education, Metalinguistic competence, Creative writing development.

Introduction

Written communication is an essential skill in both education and the workplace, playing a central role in individuals' academic and professional development. Writing serves not only as a medium for conveying thoughts and ideas, but also as a fundamental component of learning processes that shape pupils' ability to reflect, analyze, and create coherence in their own work. Helpful writing instruction is therefore essential to ensure pupils' academic progress and lifelong learning. This article examines two key theoretical perspectives within writing pedagogy: Ivanić's [8] six discourses of writing instruction and Myhill et al.'s [14] focus on metalinguistic awareness. By exploring how these theoretical approaches can complement each other, the article seeks to illuminate how writing instruction can be structured to promote both practical writing skills and a deeper understanding of linguistic choices. The aim is to contribute to a holistic approach that strengthens pupils' writing abilities while also laying a robust foundation for their capacity to communicate effectively in various contexts. Furthermore, the article will discuss how pupils acquire writing skills and metalinguistic insight, and how these can be applied to develop a pedagogical practice that supports their long-term writing development.

Research question:

How do different instructional writing discourses influence second-grade pupils' text production and creative expression, and how can metalinguistic conversations enhance their ability to reflect on and improve their writing?

Theoretical Framework

The article "*Discourses of Writing and Learning to Write*" by Roz Ivanić [8] explores various approaches to writing instruction, focusing on how writing is perceived and how one learns to write. The first section discusses two main approaches to writing instruction. The first approach is based on the idea that writing should meet externally defined goals, often focusing on specific skills and formal requirements. This approach is characterized by a more traditional, rule-based instruction that prepares pupils to write within clearly defined frameworks.

The second approach, called "purposeful communication", developed as a reaction against the more form-focused approaches of the 1980s. This approach emphasizes writing as a social activity, where



writing is driven by concrete goals and situations. Here, the teacher's role is to create authentic situations that require writing and reflect the complex practices that arise in real-world writing contexts. This can be challenging for teachers, as they are often confined to the classroom and the institutional frameworks they operate within. Nevertheless, such environments can in themselves provide opportunities for meaningful communication, especially when writing is used as a tool for learning and as part of the pupils' education. Furthermore, modern technology provides new opportunities for authentic communication at a distance, which naturally involves writing. For teachers adopting this purposeful approach, it may be helpful to set up activities that simulate real communication situations. An example of this is Littlejohn's simulations-based business letter writing course [12], where pupils must make decisions and take actions through writing under time pressure and changing conditions. This gives pupils the opportunity to learn through practice, where much of the learning occurs implicitly.

The third approach to writing instruction, which also falls within the discourse of purposeful communication, encourages pupils to become ethnographers of the reading and writing practices that exist in the contexts they wish to participate in. This involves pupils studying specific environments, such as academic courses or workplaces, and documenting the practices and texts in use. This approach is more common in higher education but can also be applied to younger pupils. Through this research process, pupils learn about the practices they must engage in and the texts they must produce. Within this discourse, good writing is evaluated based on how effectively it achieves social goals, something that can only be seen through the consequences of the writing, including its impact on others. This contrasts with traditional assessment criteria, which often focus on the formal quality and structure of the text. In educational contexts, effectiveness can be difficult to assess objectively, as evaluations are often made by teachers or examiners in isolated settings. Some assessment methods, such as portfolio assessment, however, may allow pupils to reflect on how their writing has achieved social goals, which can be considered in the final assessment.

Further, Ivanić also discusses a socio-political discourse on writing, which views writing as shaped by social forces and power relations. Here, writing is not just a matter of conveying information. It is also about how writing shapes and is shaped by societal structures. This discourse sees writing as an action with political and social consequences, where the choice of language and genres is influenced by power relations and social context. Writers are not entirely free to choose how they represent the world; their choices are to some extent dictated by prevailing social and political conditions. This discourse implies that writing instruction should also include the development of a critical awareness of why certain discourses and genres are as they are, and what historical and political factors have shaped them. Learning without this critical dimension can lead to unreflective conformity, which can be harmful both to the writer and to those the text is directed at. Critical Literacy or Critical Language Awareness [1]; [2]; [3]; [4]; [5]; [6]; [10] are approaches developed to include this critical understanding in writing instruction. This involves identifying how specific language choices position both the writer and the reader in relation to their worldview and social roles. Although these critical approaches have become more widespread since the 1990s, they have also been criticized for overlooking the dialogic tensions in writing or for not sufficiently addressing emotional and affective aspects.

Finally, Ivanić suggests that a comprehensive pedagogy for teaching writing should integrate elements from all six discourses described. Although this may lead to tensions and conflicting demands, it provides an opportunity for a more holistic approach to writing instruction, where all aspects of the nature of writing are considered. Teachers should be aware of the different discourses they operate within and how these influence their teaching practices to maximize what they can offer pupils.

Metalinguistic Competence

Children learn to speak through interaction with others. By around the age of four, most children speak grammatically correct language, but they are not aware of the system behind the words and sentences they use [11]. Gradually, they become more aware of this system, and when they start school, they receive instruction in grammar. Understanding the grammatical system involves being able to talk about how this system creates meaning [15]. Metalinguistic knowledge focuses on language itself, rather than just using it as a means of communication. An example of this is when a child discovers that words rhyme, such as in *cake* and *bake* [13]. The concept of "metalinguistic awareness" or "metalinguistic understanding" is central in this context. The linguistic perspective focuses on grammatical metalanguage as a tool for text analysis, while the cognitive-psychological perspective focuses on thought processes surrounding metalinguistic awareness [13]. Here, Myhill defines metalinguistic knowledge as conscious awareness of language as a tool, and the conscious



monitoring and manipulation of language to create desired meanings based on socially shared understandings [13].

Metalinguistic awareness involves an active and attentive attitude towards language, not just the use of latent knowledge and skills. Metalinguistic understanding is an awareness of the choices one makes when writing [13]. An important element in metalinguistic awareness is that it must be able to be verbalized. A distinction is made between non-verbalizable linguistic knowledge and verbalizable linguistic knowledge, which is related to implicit linguistic knowledge and explicit metalinguistic knowledge [14]. To use metalinguistic knowledge in one's own writing, one must make unconscious knowledge conscious. Myhill et al. [13] indicate that all writing activity involves some form of metalinguistic activity and entails making conscious choices to shape, reflect on, and revise language. Metalinguistic awareness, which is required for writing, includes grammatical knowledge, knowledge of written genres, and knowledge of the writing process. In teaching, it is about developing pupils' metalinguistic knowledge by making the choices in the writing process visible and showing how these choices affect the meaning in their texts.

Metalinguage

As previously mentioned, metalinguistic knowledge must be expressed linguistically to be considered explicit, and to observe and assess pupils' metalinguistic competence, one can examine their use of metalanguage. The language pupils use when discussing texts can provide insight into their metalinguistic competence. Iversen and Otnes [9] describe metalanguage as a language about language and text. This metalanguage is drawn from various fields to discuss writing, including literary theory, genre studies, and text linguistics [9]. Myhill et al. [14] also highlight spoken language as an important mechanism for developing metalinguistic understanding in writing. Metalinguistic understanding must be expressible verbally and can be observed through the use of metalanguage or metalinguistic discussion [14]. However, Myhill et al. point out that metalinguistic discussion can occur without the use of specific metalanguage. For example, pupils may sense that a sentence is incorrect without being able to explain what is wrong. They may talk about a sentence, feel that something sounds odd, and revise the sentence without further explanation. This can be related to Fontich and Camps' [7] categorization of metalinguistic activity into three levels: 1) non-verbal manifestation, 2) verbalized in everyday language, and 3) verbalized using a specific metalanguage. In an educational context, these levels can represent a developmental progression. Pupils start at level 1, where they may, for example, perceive that a sentence sounds wrong without having the language to describe what is wrong. Gradually, they may use everyday language to explain that a sentence is, for example, too long or short. Later in their development, they may reach a level where they use technical terminology and discuss, for instance, main clauses and subordinate clauses. Iversen and Otnes [9] refer to this as a more precise metalanguage, but it concerns different levels of metalanguage that often coincide with the pupils' developmental stages.

Methodology

The data, consisting of four pupil texts and two individual metalinguistic text conversations, were collected from two pupils in a second-grade class of 20 pupils. The pupil group had not previously engaged in active individual writing tasks. They had undergone standard instruction in letter learning, followed by writing words and sentences. The assignments, a letter and a list, were given over two days: the letter on day one and the list on day two. The text conversations with the pupils were conducted by their own teacher, who also served as our contact at the school, one week after the first assignment. After these two tasks, we had a total of 40 pupil texts. We selected and organized the pupil texts based on a simple criterion related to production quantity — specifically, how much text the pupils wrote independently. We deliberately chose texts of varying lengths with the aim of understanding the influence of pedagogical discourses on second-grade pupils' writing processes, regardless of how much they wrote.

The pupils in this article are referred to as Pupil A and Pupil B. Pupil A worked independently throughout the entire process, while Pupil B asked for some initial help. The pupil knew what should be written in the introduction of the assignment but mentioned that there was too much to write. The pupil dictated, and the teacher wrote. This was the only involvement from the teacher throughout the writing process. The individual metalinguistic text conversations lasted between 10 and 15 minutes.



Presentation of Findings

The pupils were presented with a writing task set in a fictional context, with a specific goal. In Task 1, they are on a boat trip and have run out of money. The goal of writing the letter is to ask for more money so they can continue their journey. In Task 2, the pupils were asked to create a list of only seven items they would take with them from the boat to the deserted island they reached after the boat was lost. The texts are presented below in their original pupil versions and also in a corrected version for improved readability. On the far right of the table, the texts are translated into English. First, the findings from Pupil A's texts are presented, followed by findings from the text conversation. The same procedure is repeated for Pupil B.

Pupil A - Findings from pupil text

Pupil text A1 (Norwegian)	Corrected text in Norwegian	Text in English
TiL ABBA Hei Jeg HAR PRUKT OB MinTAn Jeg LUTe BO Om Jeg GViSTe OB MiNTene	Til Pappa Hei jeg har brukt opp myntene. Jeg lurte på om jeg knuste opp myntene.	To Dad, Hi, I've used up the coins. I was wondering if I smashed the coins.
ViST DV LUTe BO SO ER Jeg MeD «venns navn» KOeRO BABA Jeg ER i ØiA UT BO HAVneR	Hvis du lurte på så er jeg med «venns navn». Hvor er du pappa? Jeg er på øya ut på havet.	If you were wondering, I'm with "[friend's name]". Where are you, Dad? I'm on an island out at sea.
PLiS hjelP Jeg KLATe O LAGe eT LiT hUS men VARm hÅL iTe LeGeRe	Please hjelp! Jeg klarte å lage et lite hus, men varmen holder ikke lenger.	Please help! I managed to build a small house, but it's not keeping me warm anymore.
JeG VÅGnA TiL eN BAT Den KØTe meJ UTi hAVe VAL	Jeg våkna til en båt. Den kjørte meg uti havet. Hval.	I woke up to a boat. It took me out to sea. A whale.
SÅ3hAIA men De Kom en VAL E FiG SiT BO VALen o VALe han TOK mej TiL ØjY o DER VAR BÅTen e BRØVDA FIKSn gO KLTet	Så 3 haier, men det kom en hval Jeg fikk sitte på hvalen og hvalen han tok meg til øya og der var båten Jeg prøvde å fikse og jeg klarte det.	I saw three sharks, but then a whale came. I got to ride on the whale, and it took me to the island where the boat was. I tried to fix it, and I did it.

The pupil includes both the recipient and sender of the letter. The writer is very present in the text, which is written in the first person. He explains why he has run out of money and mentions who he is with and where he is. The text also includes a question about where his dad is, and a sentence starting with "if you were wondering," which adds a slight disruption to the flow. This shows that Pupil A is aware of the recipient but also demonstrates a good understanding of the letter genre. The text has an informal tone, which fits both the genre and the function of the text.

Overall, the text maintains good coherence regarding time and sequence. The pupil expresses a problem and asks for help from the recipient; however, while the problem is made clear, it is left ambiguous exactly what the recipient is expected to do, such as sending more money. The pupil does not have consistent sentence structure with proper capitalization and punctuation, making it difficult to separate some words. Despite this, the text features varied and well-constructed sentences, including exclamations, questions, statements, subordinate clauses, as well as some letter mix-ups and omissions. The pupil mixes upper- and lowercase letters but is relatively consistent within the words. For example, he writes a lowercase "e" in "Jeg" (I) but uses a capital "E" consistently in "ER" (IS). Certain words are also written with a clear dialect influence. For the teacher, who knows the pupil, it is evident that the dialect mix present in his spoken language is also reflected in his written expression.



Pupil text A2 (Norwegian)	Corrected text in Norwegian	Text in English
VÅGiTOGi VAN TeLT SÅVeDiNe mAT FLØoR TANKST	Walkie-Talkie Vann Telt Sovedyne Mat Fluor Tannkost	Walkie-Talkie Water Tent Sleeping bag Food Fluoride Toothbrush
OK FÅR AT BÅTen SiGeT Ok Jeg VÅKnA Å SÅ VAR BÅTe min BA GLeT	Ok for at båten sank og jeg våknet og så var båten min manglet.	It was okay that the boat sank, and I woke up to find that my boat was missing.
Jeg mÅTo HÅBe UT i limBÅTe	Jeg måtte hoppe ut i livbåten.	I had to jump into the lifeboat.
Jeg KÅm TiL ØRKen Å DeR VAR De VeLTi VARm Men VAR DENEVAni	Jeg kom til ørken Og der var det veldig varmt. Men var det vann i. (Men det var vann i).	I arrived at the desert And it was very hot there. But there was water in it.

The pupils received no instructions to list or number the items they wanted to bring with them. Pupil A's text shows that he has a good understanding of the list genre as well. At the same time, he continues the story from Task 1, demonstrating an interest in conveying more, leading to a blend of genres between a list and perhaps a letter. While there are no clear letter conventions, such as "to/from," the form is similar enough to the text in Task 1 that we assume he has continued writing the letter to his dad.

Findings from the Text Conversation

The pupil explains that the first text is a letter. He discusses why we write letters and provides specific examples. He also mentions that *today we do not write as many letters as we used to but use alternatives such as email and mobile messages instead*. He adds that *his letter is like a story* because what he wrote is *somewhat exciting*. When asked why he does not call it a story, he responds that it does not begin with "Once upon a time."

Regarding the second text, he is very clear that it is a list and mentions that he has written many lists before. When asked if he knows different types of lists, he mentions a wish list and a shopping list. He is not sure what kind of list he wrote in this case but agrees that it could be a reminder list when the teacher suggests it. He then shares that he is planning to write a reminder list for the upcoming weekend trip so he does not forget his iPad charger. This demonstrates his understanding of what a list is and its purpose. When asked what he thinks about his own text, he expresses that it is very good and elaborates by saying that it has many words and is exciting. The teacher asks if there was anything he found easy, and he responds that *writing "FROM 'Pupil A' TO DAD" was easy because he could draw the letters large*. In the original text, we see these words written at the top, where there is more space to form the letters. When asked what he found difficult, he points to "KØTe" (kjørte, meaning drove) and says, *"Kjørte (drove) – because I think of the 'kj' sound and that there must be a letter called 'kj'."*

The Norwegian 'kj' sound is a voiceless palatal fricative, often written as [ç] in phonetic terms. This sound is created by positioning the tongue close to the roof of the mouth (near the hard palate) without fully touching it, allowing air to flow through and create friction. In English, there is not a direct equivalent of the 'kj' sound, but it is somewhat similar to the sound in the German word "ich" or the Scottish pronunciation of "loch". The 'kj' sound is produced in words like "kjøre" (drive) and "kjempe" (fight). English speakers might initially confuse it with the "sh" sound or the hard "k" sound, but the 'kj' sound is softer and breathier. It differs from the voiced sounds like "ch" in "cheese," making it one of the more challenging Norwegian sounds for English speakers to master.



Pupil B - Findings from pupil text

Pupil Text B1 (Norwegian) Text in italics was written by an adult as the pupil was unable to start the assignment	Corrected text in Norwegian	Text in English
<i>Kjære mamma og pappa. Jeg trenger hjelp. Jeg er på båttur med Leo. Vi er på tur til Syden, men jeg har mistet pengene mine. Jeg brukte dem opp på å fikse båten.</i>	<i>Kjære mamma og pappa. Jeg trenger hjelp. Jeg er på båttur med Leo. Vi er på tur til Syden, men jeg har mistet pengene mine. Jeg brukte dem opp på å fikse båten.</i>	Dear Mom and Dad, I need help. I'm on a boat trip with Leo. We're on our way to the South, but I lost my money. I spent it all on fixing the boat.
fÅr YÅBE i PenGer tilBake HiLSen «elev B».	Får jobbe i(nn) penger tilbake Hilsen «elev B».	I'll work to earn the money back. Sincerely, "pupil B.

Pupil B, like Pupil A, demonstrates genre awareness in Task 1, where he tells the person writing for him that he wants it to say "Dear Mom and Dad," and that he writes that the letter is from himself. He mentions where he is and who he is with. This pupil also expresses that he needs help, but it is not clear what the recipient could contribute with. Since most of the text was written by an adult and the text is generally short, there is limited basis for analyzing structure, sentence construction, spelling, and similar aspects. What we do see is that the text is written in the first person, contains narrative sentences, and includes a subordinate clause.

Pupil text B2 (Norwegian)	Corrected text in Norwegian	Text in English
Mat OG DreKe renDiGSVest jeG sKal Ha me Over OG mDeLen «Elev B» teleFOOn	Mat og drikke Redningsvest Jeg skal ha med Oliver og Madelen «Elev B» Telefon	Food and drink Life jacket I will bring Oliver and Madelen "[Pupil B]" Phone

In Task 2, the pupil writes the entire text by himself. Here, we see that this pupil has also omitted certain letters, but the text does not contain letter mixes as we saw in pupil A's text. This pupil also mixes uppercase and lowercase letters, and he is mostly consistent in which letters are written uppercase and which are lowercase. In terms of genre, the pupil mixes listing with telling what he wants to include. The text does not appear as a clear list, and our impression after reading it is that he is somewhat uncertain about this genre.

Findings from the text conversation

Pupil B says that his first text is a fairy tale. When the teacher asks him what a fairy tale is, he responds that it is a book that mom or dad can read, or you can go to the library and read it. The teacher asks if he knows anything that happens in fairy tales, and he says that you can be on a deserted island without a phone and without money (he is actually referring to the story he wrote). The teacher points to the text and says that it says "Dear Mom and Dad," and therefore it seems like this is written for someone, and she asks if fairy tales are usually written for someone. The pupil says no. They then discuss how mom and dad will receive this if it is for them, and he says that he can write a letter to them.

When looking at the next text (the list) and the teacher asks if he knows what kind of text it is, he also answers "letter" here. When the teacher asks why they wrote this, he says that *maybe it's because they are supposed to have fun and because they are supposed to think in their heads to become smart*. The teacher tries different approaches to her questions but eventually has to say that she thinks his text is a list, and he agrees, saying that he *wrote the list as a little Santa Claus for his mom*. The teacher continues and brings up the idea of a wish list. She asks the pupil if there are other times when he might need to write a list, and he says that maybe he's on a high mountain and it's very cold, and there's a ladder somewhere, and it might be slippery, and he can't get down because he forgot his spiked shoes at home, along with his phone and walkie-talkie. Despite the teacher asking what type of



text he might need to write when he's up there, the pupil continues to tell his story, which ends with him being halfway to the moon. The teacher then asks if he might eventually need a list when he's up there, but he denies this, saying that he *would rather write a letter so he can get more rope to make it all the way to the moon*. The teacher finally asks if he thinks he'll ever need to write a letter or a list. He responds: *yes, because you're teaching us to be smart, and because we're supposed to learn things at school*.

Discussion

Ivanić (2004) describes writing in the first discourse as a skill that requires precision and an understanding of the mechanical elements of language. In Ivanić's description, "mechanical elements" refer to the fundamental components of language essential for writing. These include sound-symbol relationships, which connect speech sounds (phonemes) with their written representations (graphemes), and syntactic structures, which are the rules for combining words into grammatically correct sentences. These elements are essential for precise writing, as they enable the accurate translation of thoughts into written form. Ivanić highlights that writing demands precision and a deep understanding of these mechanical elements, emphasizing the technical aspects of language and writing skills. Both pupils in this study are in the phonological phase; they have understood the alphabetic principle, meaning that in writing, we have graphemes (letters) that correspond to phonemes (sounds). When pupils at this stage write, according to Traavik and Alver [16], they largely experiment with the principles by writing words as they sound or how they pronounce them. Since these pupils are in the second grade, they are at an early stage of their writing development. At this level, they still have a limited ability to conduct a full analysis of each word, leading to frequent omissions of letters, especially vowels. The skills discourse, which Ivanić [8] identifies as the first discourse, is an ongoing process where pupil will continuously develop, and mastering the basic principles and rules of writing involves practical practice and repetition.

Myhill, Jones, Lones & Watson [15] state that it is about understanding the grammatical principle and being able to talk about how and why this system creates meaning. In the text conversations, both pupils were able to express insightfully what was difficult and easy to write, and why they experienced it that way. Pupil A uses words like *sentence, capital and lowercase letters, period, and heading*. He mentions that he would have liked to write "greetings from pupil A" at the bottom of his text. In other words, he uses metalanguage to talk about the text when describing things, he finds incorrect or strange about his text and things he is satisfied with. Pupil A, who has correct sentence structure but lacks a beginning and end, expresses himself that the text becomes difficult to read. A conversation about his text, perhaps just reading it afterwards, allowed the pupil to reflect on readability - and this can contribute to creating development in his writing. Ivanić [8] talks about the different stages of the writing process when discussing the process discourse. Here she mentions, among other things, self-reflection - and this would have been interesting to look closer at, especially considering Pupil A's clear self-reflection on his own text. If the pupils had received the text back for further work after our text conversation, we might have seen changes as a result of the conversations and the reflections the pupils themselves made.

In the text conversation with Pupil B, he spends a lot of time elaborating on the story, or a similar story, with impressive imagination. When asked why he has not written down the story, he explains that it would be far too long and that he does not write as fast as he thinks. Here, we see that Pupil B reflects well and shares something about what makes writing difficult for him. When asked why an adult wrote much of his text, he said that the word "dear" (kjære) was difficult. This makes me wonder if the adult perhaps wrote more for this pupil than strictly necessary - maybe it was only that word that needed to be written, and then the pupil could have continued on his own. This also points to the creative discourse described by Ivanić [8], where creativity and imagination play an important role in pupils' writing development. Pupil B's ability to create stories demonstrates a strong creative capacity, but the challenge lies in transferring this oral creativity into written form. This may indicate a need for more support in the writing process to help him overcome technical barriers and fully realize his creative potential.

Both in the texts and in the text conversation, Pupil A demonstrates a strong understanding of genres. He is familiar with and can describe the use of both letters and lists, and he compares his text to a fairy tale, describing the characteristics of this genre. Pupil B, on the other hand, appears more uncertain in his genre knowledge, particularly when we discuss the "why," meaning the purpose of the different texts (genres). Ivanić's [8] genre discourse is about how writing should be adapted and



shaped according to the social and communicative needs that each genre demands. This discourse emphasizes the importance of the pupil understanding not only the structure but also the purpose behind each genre, so that the writing becomes meaningful. Pupil A can easily present strong arguments for why each text looks the way it does, showing an ability to adapt to the social and communicative functions of the genre. Pupil B, however, seems more focused on following the teacher's instructions, which suggests that he has not yet internalized the purpose of the genres in the same way. Whether the purpose has been presented to him clearly enough, or whether he understands the intentions, or if that is not essential to him at the moment, is unclear. The findings from the conversation with him are, however, highly interesting from a teaching perspective. Ivanić [8] points out that in order to move on to the next discourses – the social practices discourse and the sociocultural discourse – the pupil must see writing as a meaningful and goal-oriented activity. The genre discourse forms a foundation for further development by giving the pupil the tools to understand how texts can shape and be shaped by the social situations they are a part of. Without a fundamental understanding of the genre discourse, the pupil risks seeing writing as a mechanical process rather than a creative and communicative practice. This is fundamental for engaging in writing in a way that goes beyond merely satisfying the teacher's expectations and instead aims to understand and apply writing in a broader social and cultural context, as described in Ivanić's other discourses.

Conclusion

Ivanić's [8] discourses provide a comprehensive framework for reflecting on and improving teaching practices because they emphasize the multidimensional nature of writing. By considering cognitive, social, and political aspects of writing, Ivanić's integrated approach enables teachers to address various aspects of pupils' development, including how they perceive writing within different contexts and purposes. This broad perspective encourages educators to recognize the tensions between discourses, such as creativity versus structure, and to use these as opportunities to offer pupils a more nuanced understanding of writing. Teachers can reflect on their own teaching methods, exploring how they might balance these competing demands to better support individual pupils.

Myhill et al.'s [14] focus on metalinguistic understanding and the use of metalanguage complements Ivanić's framework by equipping pupils with the tools to consciously analyze and improve their own texts. By making explicit the grammatical and linguistic elements of writing, pupils can better grasp how their choices impact meaning and effectiveness. This awareness empowers them to reflect on their writing process and make informed revisions, contributing to their overall writing proficiency.

In the case of Pupil A and Pupil B, both demonstrate different stages of writing development. Pupil A's strong genre knowledge and reflective ability suggest that he would benefit from further metalinguistic awareness to refine his writing. Pupil B, on the other hand, with his creativity and imaginative capacity, may require more support in understanding how to structure his ideas and transfer his oral creativity into written form. By applying both Ivanić's discourse framework and Myhill et al.'s emphasis on metalinguistic skills, educators can tailor their instruction to meet the diverse needs of pupils, helping them overcome specific challenges while fostering creativity and independent reflection.

This dual approach encourages a balanced development of writing skills, where pupils not only learn how to write effectively but also understand why they make particular linguistic and structural choices. Thus, teachers can more effectively guide their pupils through the writing process by addressing both the creative and technical dimensions of writing.

REFERENCES

- [1] Clark, R. (1992) Principles and practice of CLA in the classroom. In N. Fairclough (ed.) *Critical Language Awareness*. London: Longman.
- [2] Clark, R. and Ivanić, R. (1991) Consciousness-raising about the writing process. In P. Garrett, and C. James (eds) *Language Awareness in the Classroom*. London: Longman.
- [3] Clark, R. and Ivanić, R. (1998) Critical discourse analysis and educational change. In L. van Lier and D. Corson (eds) *The Encyclopedia of Language and Education, Volume 6: Knowledge About Language*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- [4] Clark, R. and Ivanić, R. (1999) Guest editors, and Introduction: Raising critical awareness



of language: A curriculum aim for the new millennium. *Language Awareness* 8 (2), 63–70.

[5] Cope, B. and Kalantzis, M. (eds) (2000) *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*. London: Routledge.

[6] Fairclough, N. (ed.) (1992b) *Critical Language Awareness*. London: Longman.

[7] Fontich, X., & Camps, A. (2014). Towards a rationale for research into grammar teaching in schools. *Research papers in education*, 29(5), 598-625.

[8] Ivanič, R. (2004). Discourses of writing and learning to write. *Language and education*, 18(3), 220-245.

[9] Iversen, H. M., & Otnes, H. (2016). *Å lære å skrive. Tekstkompetanse i norskfagets skriveopplæring*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

[10] Janks, H. (2000) Domination, access, diversity and design: A synthesis model for critical literacy education. *Educational Review* 52 (2), 175–86.

[11] Kress, G. (1994). *Learning to write*. London: Routledge Kringstad, T & Kvithyld, T. (2013). Fem prinsipper for god skriveopplæring. *Bedre skole*, 2, 71-79.

[12] Littlejohn, A. (2000) *Company to Company. A Communicative Approach to Business Correspondence in English* (3rd edn). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[13] Myhill, D., Jones, S., & Lines, H. (2018). *Supporting less proficient writers through linguistically aware teaching*. *Language and Education*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1438468>.

[14] Myhill, D., Jones, S., & Wilson, A. (2016). *Writing conversations: fostering metalinguistic discussion about writing*. *Research Papers in Education*, 31(1), 23-44.

[15] Myhill, D.A., Jones, S.M., Lines, H., & Watson, A. (2012). *Re-thinking grammar: the impact of embedded grammar teaching on students' writing and students' metalinguistic understanding*. *Research Papers in Education*, 27(2), 139–166.

[16] Traavik, H. og Alver, Vigdis R. *Skrive- og lesestart. Skriftspråkutvikling i småskolealderen*. Fagbokforlaget 2008