

Original Paper

A Study on the Instructional Design of Continuation Writing in Junior Secondary English under the Differentiated Production–Oriented Approach

Jiayi Cong¹

¹ Qufu Normal University, Jining, Shandong, China

Received: June 19, 2026

Accepted: July 12, 2026

Online Published: August 3, 2026

doi:10.22158/wjer.v13n4p13

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/wjer.v13n4p13>

Abstract

*In junior secondary English continuation writing instruction, students exhibit considerable variation in ability, and the conventional one-size-fits-all classroom model struggles to accommodate the developmental needs of learners at different proficiency levels. This study therefore attempts to integrate the Production–Oriented Approach with differentiated instruction, proposing a tiered POA–based instructional design for continuation writing applicable to the junior secondary context, and provides a detailed illustration using the text *The Gifts from the Shanghai Education Press Grade 9 first–semester textbook*. The design activates learning needs through a mini-productive task in the motivating stage, provides differentiated support through three-tier scaffolding in the enabling stage, and promotes self-revision through a tiered assessment scale and sample comparison in the assessment stage, ensuring that differentiated thinking runs through the entire teaching process. The study offers a referential practical framework for junior secondary English continuation writing instruction.*

Keywords

junior secondary English, continuation writing, differentiated instruction, Production–Oriented Approach

1. Introduction

The integration of reading and writing in junior secondary English has become a key pedagogical route for realizing subject-specific core competencies. Among the various task types that serve this end, continuation writing stands out as a comprehensive language activity that weaves together text interpretation, logical structuring, and creative expression. It represents a concrete operational form through which reading–writing integration can be put into practice. The Compulsory Education English

Curriculum Standards (2022 Edition) explicitly calls for a departure from the conventional separation of reading and writing instruction, advocating instead for an integrated approach grounded in diverse text types. The underlying expectation is that students should be able to transform their reading experience into coherent, logically structured, and creatively articulated written production. This curricular direction underscores the value of continuation writing in fulfilling the broader educational goals of fostering moral character and developing core competencies within the junior secondary English classroom (Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2022). Yet in everyday teaching contexts, a marked polarization tends to emerge in students' performance on such tasks. Those at the lower end often find it difficult to handle the interpretive demands of the source text or to sustain a plausible narrative line, while those at the upper end are seldom presented with sufficiently demanding tasks that push their abilities further. A one-size-fits-all instructional model thus falls short of meeting the developmental needs of learners across the proficiency spectrum. The question of how to address the diverse learning requirements of students at different levels consequently emerges as a central concern in continuation writing pedagogy.

In view of the weak linkage between input and output that currently characterizes much continuation writing instruction, the present study adopts the Production-Oriented Approach (POA) as a theoretical framework for instructional refinement. POA is built around the principle of "integrating learning and use," and operates on the premise that productive tasks can serve as effective drivers of learning motivation, while well-targeted input facilitates the transfer of linguistic knowledge into usable skills. In this way, it offers a potential remedy to the long-recognized problem of disconnection between learning and application in foreign language education (Wen, 2015). The theoretical underpinnings of POA resonate closely with the internal logic of continuation writing, which likewise hinges on the reciprocal relationship between reading and writing. Within this framework, students are encouraged to engage more deeply with the source text during the reading phase, to trace the development of its plot, and to draw upon the information and language resources acquired through reading when composing their own written responses. Moreover, POA is sufficiently flexible to accommodate classroom realities: teachers are able to adapt task design in light of specific class profiles, and to embed differentiated instructional thinking across all stages of the POA process. This makes it possible to tailor teaching to actual student conditions and to provide learning support that corresponds to the needs of learners with varying levels of prior attainment (Zhang, 2025).

The study is oriented towards the improvement of current continuation writing instruction through a threefold strategy of differentiated motivation, differentiated enabling, and differentiated assessment. The objective is to offer tiered learning support to students with differing English proficiency levels, reduce the performance gap in reading and writing within the class, and strengthen students' capacities in text interpretation, discourse construction, and creative written expression. The study also aspires to furnish a viable practical framework for integrated reading-writing instruction in junior secondary English, and to contribute reference points for further research on differentiated literacy instruction

oriented towards core competencies.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Research on the Application of POA to Continuation Writing

The Production–Oriented Approach (POA) is a locally developed pedagogical theory constructed by Wen Qiufang in response to the persistent problem of “separation of learning and use” in foreign language teaching in China. Its core objective is to bridge the gap between language input and output, thereby achieving the integration of learning and use. The theory comprises three major components: teaching principles, teaching hypotheses, and teaching procedures. At the level of teaching principles, it upholds the core tenets of learning–centeredness, integration of learning and use, and whole–person education. At the level of teaching hypotheses, it is underpinned by the theoretical pillars of output–driven learning, input–enabled learning, and selective learning. At the level of teaching procedures, it operates through three practical stages—motivating, enabling, and assessing—which together form a complete instructional cycle through context creation, targeted input, and teacher–student collaborative assessment. The core features of the approach are closely aligned with the internal logic of continuation writing, which likewise rests on the principle of “promoting writing through reading and linking reading with writing.” This alignment also creates room for the integration of differentiated instruction within the POA framework.

As continuation writing has become a significant task type in both the senior secondary school entrance examination and the college entrance examination, POA has gradually been introduced into reading–writing classrooms, with research efforts mainly focusing on two directions: adaptation across educational stages and optimization of instructional design. In terms of stage distribution, research on POA–based continuation writing has been predominantly conducted at the senior secondary level. Cai (2019) conducted a parallel–class controlled experiment at the senior secondary level, demonstrating that POA significantly outperforms traditional model–recitation instruction in enhancing students’ plot construction and language expression in continuation writing, and subsequent studies have largely continued within this framework (Cai, 2019). A smaller number of studies have begun to attend to the junior secondary stage; for instance, Wang (2024) investigated the feasibility of POA with eighth–grade students and confirmed its applicability at this level (Wang, 2024). Nevertheless, research at the junior secondary stage remains scarce overall, and teaching frameworks that are responsive to the specific characteristics of junior secondary learners and to the requirements of the national curriculum standards are still in need of further development. With regard to instructional design, existing POA–based continuation writing studies have largely adopted uniform task settings. Both Cai (2019) and Wang (2024) conducted instruction at the whole–class level and did not accommodate students’ differential abilities. In recent years, some scholars have begun to incorporate differentiated elements at certain points in the teaching process. For example, Zhang (2025) introduced differentiation in the motivating stage by dividing students into tiers according to their learning profiles and matching them with

differentiated continuation writing requirements. Xiong (2026) extended this approach to the enabling stage, providing tiered language resources to students (Xiong, 2026). However, these attempts at differentiation have been confined to individual stages of instruction and have all been conducted within senior secondary classrooms. They have not yet developed into a systematic design that integrates differentiation across the entire motivating–enabling–assessing process, nor have they produced frameworks adapted to the cognitive characteristics of junior secondary learners. Overall, research on the integration of POA and continuation writing still leaves considerable room for exploration in both the junior secondary context and in the dimension of differentiated design, which provides a foundation for the subsequent introduction of research on differentiated instruction into this area.

2.2 Research on Differentiated Instruction in English Writing

Differences in students' language accumulation and written expression ability mean that uniform writing tasks and assessment criteria often fail to accommodate the needs of learners at different proficiency levels. Such an approach tends to generate anxiety and frustration among weaker students while offering insufficient challenge to those with stronger abilities. Zhang (2026) points out that the Compulsory Education English Curriculum Standards (2022 Edition) explicitly requires instruction to attend to individual student differences, and that differentiated instruction can provide learners at different levels with support and guidance aligned with their zones of proximal development, thus fulfilling the educational principle of catering to all students (Zhang, 2026). Compared with conventional prompted writing, continuation writing demands competence in both text interpretation and creative expression, where student variation tends to be more pronounced, and uniform instruction is more likely to widen the gap between stronger and weaker students. Consequently, the need for differentiated design is more pressing in continuation writing instruction, and differentiation offers a viable pathway for addressing the diverse needs of students across proficiency levels.

Research on differentiated instruction in English writing in China has accumulated a certain body of findings in both practical model construction and empirical validation of instructional effectiveness. However, in terms of the populations studied, empirical evidence is more substantial at the senior secondary level. For instance, Qian (2022), through a parallel–class controlled experiment at the senior secondary level, demonstrated that differentiated instruction positively enhances both writing performance and learning interest across student tiers (Qian, 2022). In recent years, some studies have also begun to attend to differentiated practices in junior secondary English instruction. Zhang (2025), through a junior secondary English writing intervention, reported that a differentiated model can effectively mitigate the polarization of performance within the class (Zhang, 2025). Nevertheless, research at the junior secondary level remains relatively fragmented and has yet to produce a coherent and well–established framework. In terms of task types, existing research has predominantly focused on conventional prompted writing. Zhu (2023) constructed a differentiated framework for conventional writing that covers the entire process from student stratification to classroom guidance to assignment

design, but did not address the text interpretation and plot inference abilities specific to continuation writing (Zhu, 2023). Given that continuation writing involves both reading input and writing output, a differentiated design for this task type needs to attend simultaneously to both text interpretation and language expression—two dimensions for which experience from conventional writing differentiation cannot be directly transferred. This underscores the urgent need for specialized research on differentiated instruction tailored to this specific task type.

2.3 Research on Differentiated Instruction in English Continuation Writing

Specialized exploration of differentiated instruction in continuation writing started relatively late, and the existing body of work has largely been conducted within senior secondary classrooms. Dong (2023) constructed an intra-class differentiated instruction model featuring gradient tasks across three dimensions—plot construction, language scaffolding, and writing standards—and confirmed its effectiveness in narrowing the writing performance gap within the class (Dong, 2023). However, this model was designed as an independent differentiated framework and was not integrated with instructional approaches such as POA. Feng (2025) extended the application by embedding differentiated principles throughout the entire POA process of motivating, enabling, and assessing, thereby demonstrating the feasibility of integrating the two approaches (Feng, 2025). Nevertheless, this study was likewise conducted with senior secondary students and did not extend to the junior secondary level. These observations reveal a notable gap in the coverage of educational stages within the current research. In response, the present study attempts to build upon previous research by extending the differentiated POA instructional framework to the junior secondary context and exploring its applicability in junior secondary continuation writing classrooms.

3. Instructional Design

3.1 Analysis of the Teaching Material

Selected for this instructional design is the narrative text *The Gifts from the Reading* section of Module 4, *A Taste of Literature*, in the Shanghai Education Press (Shanghai Edition) textbook for the first semester of Grade 9. Adapted from O. Henry's classic short story *The Gift of the Magi*, the text runs to approximately 350 words and is narrated in the simple past tense. It tells the story of a poor couple, Della and Jim, who, on the eve of Christmas, each sell their most prized possession—Della her long hair and Jim his gold watch—to buy a gift for the other, only to find that both presents have become useless. The text ends abruptly with Jim's words, "I sold the watch to get the money to buy your combs." This unexpected reversal not only constitutes the climax of the story but also leaves considerable room for continuation writing, as it presents students with precisely the moment when emotional complexity and dramatic irony are most acute.

The text lends itself well to use as a continuation writing task for students at the Grade 9 level. Its narrative line is clearly drawn and the characters' motivations are readily identifiable, enabling students to complete reading comprehension and grasp the direction for continuation within the constraints of a

single lesson. The text is also richly supplied with dialogue and action descriptions, offering students an ample store of linguistic models to draw upon when imitating the style of the source material in their own writing. Furthermore, the theme of “love and sacrifice” resonates with students’ emotional experience and cognitive development, providing them with substantive content to develop in their continuations. These features are consistent with the essential requirements of a suitable source text for continuation writing—namely, a clear logic of plot progression and an extensible set of character relationships.

3.2 Student Profile and Rationale for Differentiation

The instructional design is intended for students at Grade 9 level, who possess basic competence in reading narrative texts and fundamental writing skills. However, when faced with the integrated task of continuation writing, a proportion of the class encounter difficulties in both text interpretation and creative expression.

Prior to instruction, a comprehensive assessment was conducted, drawing on students’ final examination results from the previous semester, their performance on two unit writing tasks in the current semester, and the outcomes of a diagnostic continuation writing pre-test. On the basis of this assessment, students were divided into two proficiency levels. Those at the foundational level are able to grasp the general meaning of the text but experience difficulty in analyzing character motivation, constructing a coherent plot for continuation, and diversifying their linguistic expression. Those at the higher level demonstrate a reasonably solid command of the basic plot and the emotional trajectory of the characters, and are generally able to produce continuations with plausible storylines, though there remains room for improvement in terms of linguistic variety and descriptive detail.

In lesson preparation, the teacher makes a clear distinction between the two levels and devises differentiated task requirements and forms of instructional support for each group during classroom teaching. When explaining the rationale for differentiation to students, the teacher frames it in terms of “varying degrees of familiarity with this type of task, and therefore different focal points for practice,” so as to avoid placing undue psychological pressure on foundational-level learners. The rationale for differentiated instruction rests on the principle that learners at different starting points require different types of support to move from their current level to their potential level of development. Since continuation writing simultaneously demands text interpretation and language production, weakness in either dimension will prevent students from independently completing a high-quality continuation task.

3.3 Teaching Objectives

The overall objective of this lesson is for students to produce a logically coherent and linguistically accurate continuation paragraph based on the existing plot of *The Gifts*. For foundational-level students, the specific requirements are as follows: they should be able to identify the key plot elements of the text and accurately recount the story’s ending; their continuation should not contradict the final sentence of the original text, and should extend to six to eight sentences incorporating dialogue and basic action descriptions; sentence-level grammar should be largely accurate, with the use of

fundamental cohesive devices such as *and*, *but*, and *then*. For higher-level students, the expectations are more demanding: they should be able to detect subtle shifts in the characters' emotional states as presented in the text, and on that basis, reasonably infer and depict the subsequent psychological responses and interaction between the two protagonists; their continuations should deploy two to three distinct types of cohesive devices and exhibit some variation in sentence structure; they should also demonstrate the ability to convey emotion through specific actions and descriptive details rather than through direct statements of feeling.

The rationale for differentiating these objectives lies in the need to establish varied criteria of attainment for students with different starting points (Zhou, 2026). The foundational-level objectives are oriented towards completion and accuracy, ensuring that students can produce a grammatically sound and plot-consistent piece of writing. The higher-level objectives build on this foundation by placing additional emphasis on coherence and expressiveness, pushing students to attend more deliberately to how their writing is organized and how effectively it communicates emotional nuance.

3.4 Teaching Procedure

3.4.1 Motivating

The teacher begins by presenting the full text of the story. Students read it quickly and then respond to two guiding questions: What did Della sell and why? What Christmas present did Jim give Della? The rationale behind these questions is that students need to put together the two facts—Della selling her hair to buy a watch chain and Jim selling his watch to buy combs—before they can fully grasp what each character has given up and what each has gained in return, and thereby recognize where the “surprise” in the story's ending actually lies. Only when students truly understand that both characters have sacrificed their most prized possessions for the other, without the other's knowledge, can they accurately capture the emotional states and behavioral logic of the characters in their continuations.

The teacher then presents the continuation writing task in the following terms: “Read the material below, and on the basis of its content and the given opening sentences for each paragraph, write two paragraphs to complete the story. The number of words should be around 100.” The given opening sentences are then provided:

Paragraph 1: Della looked at Jim, tears welling up in her eyes.

Paragraph 2: Jim sat down slowly and took her hand.

Following the task instruction, students are asked to attempt the first paragraph of the continuation within five minutes, without recourse to any reference materials. The purpose of this mini-productive task is not to evaluate the quality of their writing, but to enable students to experience the task without support, and through this experience to become aware of the limitations of their current ability, thereby generating a genuine learning need. The output-driven hypothesis of POA holds that when students realize that “I know what I want to write, but I cannot write it adequately,” their receptivity to subsequent input materials is significantly enhanced. For foundational-level students, the first sentence, “Della looked at Jim and said...,” is provided as additional starting support. Higher-level students, by

contrast, are given the open task and must determine their own starting point for continuation.

3.4.2 Enabling

The enabling stage provides students with the support necessary to complete the continuation writing task through the use of three-tiered scaffolding. At each level, students are offered a range of resources from which they may select according to their own needs, rather than being required to use all of the materials provided. This design is consistent with the POA principle of “selective learning,” which holds that students should identify and adopt the most useful elements from the input materials rather than passively absorb everything presented to them.

The first level of scaffolding focuses on determining the direction of the plot. The teacher guides students to review the central actions of the two characters in the original text, and then poses the key question that the continuation must address: “When they discover that the gifts they have given each other have both become useless, what will they do next?” Two possible plot directions are offered. Option one involves an emotional resolution, in which the two characters come to realize that their love for each other is more valuable than any gift. Option two takes a lighter approach, using humor to defuse the awkwardness and ending with laughter. Foundational-level students, after selecting a direction, are provided with a template of event sequences that breaks the continuation down into three or four smaller events in chronological order. Higher-level students, after making their choice, are expected to design their own event sequences without such a template.

The second level of scaffolding addresses linguistic support. The teacher provides three sets of language resources. The first set consists of emotion-describing chunks, such as tears came to her eyes, a smile spread across his face, in a low voice, she could hardly speak, and his eyes were fixed on her. The second set comprises cohesive devices, including those that signal temporal progression (then, after a moment, next), contrast or transition (to her surprise, instead of, however), and cause-effect relationships (so, as a result). The third set offers dialogue-introducing expressions, such as she whispered, he replied, Della said softly, and Jim asked in surprise. Foundational-level students are encouraged to prioritize the first and third sets, whereas higher-level students are expected to make use of all three.

The third level of scaffolding concerns the overall structure of the continuation. The teacher suggests a basic organizational framework: the first paragraph, building on the given opening sentence, should depict the characters’ immediate reactions upon discovering the truth; the second paragraph should focus on their further interaction; and the third paragraph should conclude with an emotionally resonant ending. Foundational-level students are guided to follow this three-part structure—reaction, interaction, and closure—step by step. Higher-level students are invited to refer to this structure but are not required to adhere to it strictly.

The three-tier scaffolding is arranged sequentially from plot direction to linguistic expression to textual structure, breaking the continuation task into three progressively more demanding levels and thereby reducing its overall cognitive complexity. Foundational-level students receive more concrete and more

constrained scaffolding at each level, giving them a clear point of reference at every step. Higher-level students, in contrast, are given scaffolding that preserves greater room for choice, allowing those who already possess basic continuation-writing competence to retain autonomy in planning and expression.

3.4.3 Assessing

The teacher selects two typical samples from students' writing and, without altering the plot framework of the original text, revises them at the linguistic level. The original versions and the revised versions are presented side by side, and students compare the two versions sentence by sentence, identifying the differences between them.

As students examine the two versions, they are asked to point out, one by one, where adjustments have been made and what effects these adjustments produce: converting direct emotional statements into concrete actions, conveying emotion through vocal qualities, inserting pauses at key junctures, and implying feelings through subtle movements rather than explicit statements. After completing the comparison, the teacher guides students to address two questions: in what respects has the revised version become more coherent? And in what respects has it achieved better expressive effect? Following this discussion, students are instructed to select one paragraph from their own writing and revise it accordingly.

Foundational-level students focus their attention during this stage on replacing dialogue-introducing verbs and adding emotional actions. Higher-level students, building on these basic adjustments, also attend to sentence variation and the rhythmic arrangement within paragraphs. This differentiated focus of assessment ensures that students at different starting points can identify direction for improvement that is appropriate to their current level of ability.

3.5 Assessment Design

A differentiated assessment scale is adopted for evaluation, with distinct assessment dimensions and criteria for the two proficiency levels Table1.

Table 1. Differentiated Assessment Scale for Continuation Writing

Assessment Dimension	Foundational Level	Higher Level
Content (Plot)	The continuation does not contradict the final sentence of the original text, and character behaviors remain consistent with the original portrayal.	The continuation conforms to the logic of character motivation, and plot development follows a clear causal structure.
Structure (Coherence)	Sentences are sequenced in a discernible order, and basic cohesion is maintained within paragraphs.	Three or more types of cohesive devices are used, paragraph rhythm is natural, and both foreshadowing and

	closure are present.
Language (Expression)	Grammar is largely accurate, Sentence length varies, and and the writing makes use of emotional expression is dialogue and simple action conveyed through specific descriptions. actions or descriptive details.

The assessment scale is distributed to students alongside the writing task before they begin composing. After students complete their first drafts, the teacher evaluates their work against the scale, assigning performance levels (for foundational-level students: “Achieved” or “Not Yet Achieved”; for higher-level students: A, B, or C). Students then select one paragraph from their own writing for revision based on the feedback received. The core function of assessment lies in providing students with specific and actionable directions for revision; the differentiated scale ensures that learners at different starting points can identify areas for improvement that are appropriate to their level. The teacher is also expected to synthesize the overall performance of the class after evaluation, documenting common language-related issues arising in both groups, so as to inform subsequent instructional adjustments.

4. Possible Issues in Implementation and Suggestions for Optimization

The instructional design presented above may encounter certain practical problems when implemented in actual classroom settings. These problems do not necessarily indicate flaws in the design itself, but rather represent common challenges that tend to arise in the process of implementing differentiated instruction within an integrated reading-writing framework. The following discussion addresses three such issues.

4.1 The Effectiveness of the Mini-Productive Task in the Motivating Stage

The motivating stage requires students to attempt writing without support, so that they become aware of their limitations in language expression and plot construction before proceeding to the subsequent learning phases with a clear sense of purpose. The effectiveness of this approach depends on the alignment between task difficulty and students’ current capabilities. If the task is too demanding, foundational-level students may disengage before they have even begun; if it is too easy, higher-level students may not feel a sufficient sense of urgency to learn further. Teachers therefore need not require all students to produce a complete paragraph. For foundational-level students, the value of the initial attempt lies not in producing a finished piece of writing, but in developing an awareness of the problems they encounter during the process. At the end of the five-minute period, the teacher need not ask directly whether students have finished, but should instead guide them to reflect on the difficulties they experienced and to articulate where they got stuck. For higher-level students, if they complete the task quickly and feel confident about their writing, the teacher might follow up with a question such as,

“If you were to continue from here, what would you write next?”—prompting them to realize that sustaining a coherent continuation may not be as straightforward as they initially assumed.

4.2 The Problem of Foundational-Level Students' Over-Reliance on Scaffolding in the Enabling Stage

The enabling stage provides foundational-level students with more specific and more tightly constrained scaffolding. The intention behind this design is to help these students establish a clear point of departure and reduce the perceived difficulty of the task. However, it also brings with it a potential problem: some students may treat the scaffolding as a fixed template to be filled in mechanically, without engaging in independent thinking. In such cases, the resulting continuation writing tends to fall short of reflecting students' true level of ability, nor does it lend itself readily to transfer to subsequent independent writing tasks. Therefore, when presenting the scaffolding, the teacher should make it clear that the resources provided are options for reference rather than prescribed answers. After foundational-level students have completed their first drafts following the template, the teacher may, during classroom monitoring, identify one instance of mechanical expression and prompt the student to consider alternative formulations, or to try combining two short sentences into one, thereby gradually encouraging greater autonomy in expression. When evaluating students' work, if any instance of independent adjustment is observed, even a single one, it should be acknowledged positively in the feedback. Through this repeated affirmation, students can gradually come to recognize that the very act of revision and substitution is itself a manifestation of progress in writing proficiency.

4.3 The Limitations of Sample Selection and Classroom Feedback in the Assessment Stage

In the assessment stage, the effectiveness of selecting and comparing representative samples depends on how well the samples represent the range of student performance and on the degree of student engagement in the process. A sample preselected by the teacher can only illustrate one type of writing profile and is unlikely to capture the full variety of problems that students actually encounter. If the comparison is led by the teacher each time, with students merely listening, the assessment stage will have limited impact on their actual writing. To address this, the teacher may vary the sources of samples: in addition to preselected examples, a piece of writing completed during the class can be randomly selected as a supplement, so that the assessment better reflects the authentic output of that particular lesson. The teacher may also gradually shift the agency of assessment from teacher to students—for instance, by having students exchange their work and identify both strengths and areas for improvement in each other's writing. Foundational-level students may begin with the former task only, developing a sense of evaluative awareness through recognizing strengths in others' writing; higher-level students may undertake both tasks, sharpening their understanding of their own areas for improvement through analyzing others' weaknesses.

Whether the issues discussed above can be adequately addressed in practice depends on the teacher's ability to make on-the-spot judgements and flexible adjustments based on students' responses and output quality, rather than relying solely on predetermined lesson plans. This requires the teacher to maintain ongoing attention to student learning conditions throughout implementation, and to strike a

balance between the planned framework and in-the-moment responsiveness, so that differentiated instruction genuinely serves students' actual needs rather than becoming a fixed set of procedures.

5. Conclusion

This study, grounded in the practical challenge of addressing differentiated student needs in junior secondary English continuation writing classrooms, attempts to integrate the Production-Oriented Approach with differentiated instruction and proposes a pedagogical design pathway for tiered POA-based continuation writing applicable to the junior secondary context. At the theoretical level, the study identifies the points of convergence between the POA framework and the principles of differentiated instruction, arguing that their integration can provide differentiated support for students across proficiency levels. At the practical level, using the text *The Gifts* from the Shanghai Education Press Grade 9 first-semester textbook as instructional material, the study presents a complete teaching plan encompassing student stratification, objective setting, teaching procedures, and assessment design. The plan activates learning needs through a mini-productive task in the motivating stage, offers differentiated support through three-tier scaffolding in the enabling stage, and promotes self-revision through a tiered assessment scale and sample comparison in the assessment stage, thereby embedding differentiated thinking throughout the entire teaching process. This study carries both theoretical and practical significance: theoretically, it offers a new perspective for research on the integration of POA and differentiated instruction in junior secondary English continuation writing; practically, it provides a referential teaching framework for frontline teachers. Nevertheless, the study has certain limitations. As the proposed design has not yet been implemented in an actual classroom setting, its instructional effects and potential implementation problems remain theoretically derived and lack empirical support. Future research may put the design into practice, examining its effectiveness through classroom observation and pre- and post-test comparisons, and may also test the applicability of the framework across different text types.

References

- Cai, C. G. (2019). *An experimental study on the application of Production-Oriented Approach to continuation task teaching in senior high school* (Master's thesis, Zhejiang Normal University).
- Dong, N. (2023). *A study on the application of hierarchical instruction to English continuation writing teaching in senior high school* (Master's thesis, Northwest Normal University).
- Feng, Y. Q. (2025). *Action research on stratified teaching of English continuation writing in senior high school from the perspective of the Production-Oriented Approach* (Master's thesis, Southwest University).
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2022). *Compulsory Education English Curriculum Standards* (2022 Edition). Beijing Normal University Press.

- Qian, G. Z. (2022). *The application of hierarchical teaching method in English writing teaching for senior high school students* (Master's thesis, Southwest University).
- Wang, M. F. (2024). *The influence of continuation writing based on Production-Oriented Approach on junior high school students' English writing* (Master's thesis, Qufu Normal University).
- Wen, Q. F. (2015). Developing the theoretical system of Production-Oriented Approach. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 47(4), 547-558.
- Xiong, H. (2026). Teaching practice of continuation writing in senior high school English based on Production-Oriented Approach: A case study of the 2025 New College Entrance Examination II English test. *HuaXia JiaoShi*, (18), 52-54.
- Zhang, J. (2025). Implementation of differentiated instruction in junior secondary English writing classrooms. *English Journal for Middle School Students*, (12), 161-162.
- Zhang, T. C. (2026). Differentiation and individualization: A study on differentiated instruction strategies for junior secondary English writing. *Examination Weekly*, (10), 99-102.
- Zhang, Z. Q. (2025). A study on teaching strategies for continuation writing in senior high school English from the perspective of Production-Oriented Approach. *English Teachers*, 25(16), 42-45.
- Zhou, P. J. (2026). Implementation and effectiveness of differentiated instruction strategies for junior secondary English writing. *Read, Write and Count*, (4), 154-156.
- Zhu, X. (2023). Application of differentiated instruction in senior high school English writing teaching. *English on Campus*, (45), 133-135.