



NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

---

**Diagnostic assessment within the *Skills for Life* strategy**

Julie Sewell

National Foundation for Educational Research

**Paper presented at the conference of the International Association for  
Educational Assessment**

Philadelphia, June 2004

National Foundation for Educational Research  
The Mere  
Upton Park  
Slough  
SL1 2DQ  
England  
j.sewell@nfer.ac.uk



## **Diagnostic testing within the *Skills for Life* strategy**

This paper aims to outline the development and application of diagnostic assessment materials for adult learners in the UK. It therefore has clear links with the theme of the 2004 International Association for Educational Assessment conference, 'Assessment in the Service of Learning, because it concerns both literacy for all and the use of assessment as a diagnostic tool. The paper will focus primarily on the development of the materials developed for adults who are speakers of English as a second or other language (ESOL) and it will illustrate the application of diagnostic tools to free writing tasks.

The background to the development of these materials is the introduction of the *Skills for Life* strategy in the UK. This strategy was launched by the British government in March 2001 to tackle the literacy, language and numeracy needs of adults. It was a result of the Moser Report, *A Fresh Start – Improving Literacy and Numeracy*, which was itself a response to the *Adult Literacy in Britain* survey. The Moser Report drew on some of the evidence in the survey to estimate that approximately 20 per cent of the UK population (as many as seven million people) apparently had problems with functional literacy and / or numeracy. This was defined as 'the ability to read, write and speak in English and use mathematics at a level necessary to function at work and in society in general'. The aim of the strategy was that 750,000 adults would have improved their literacy and numeracy by 2004. In order to achieve this the Adult Basic Skills Strategy Unit was established to co-ordinate developments, including national standards for adult literacy and numeracy and core curricula designed to clarify the skills, knowledge and understanding that learners need in order to reach the national standards.

An additional recommendation of the Moser report was the establishment of a review group to consider the specific needs of learners whose first language is not English. This review group produced a report, *Breaking the Language Barriers*, which recommended the development of a specific ESOL (English for speakers of other languages) core curriculum. The curriculum that was developed emphasised the paramount importance for ESOL learners of mastering oracy (listening and speaking) to communicate in everyday life, in addition to literacy (reading and writing) skills.

The *Skills for Life* strategy comprises interlinked elements deriving from national standards which provide the basis for the whole learning infrastructure. These standards, produced by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, are set for Entry levels 1 to 3 and Levels 1 and 2 of the national qualifications framework, thus covering the whole range of learners from total beginners in terms of literacy and / or numeracy up to the standard expected of a school leaving age student in the UK. The standards inform the core curricula for each strand of the strategy (literacy, numeracy and ESOL), providing a progression framework and clear goals for learners and their teachers. They also provide nationally agreed benchmarks against which these skills can be assessed through national tests and qualifications.

In order for learners to progress they enter a process whereby they are initially screened to identify their learning needs. Tools for this include 'Fast Track' materials developed by the Basic Skills Agency and revised in 2004 to take into account the latest developments; a screening tool specifically for ESOL learners is also currently under development. Following the screening process learners are assessed in order to help place them in learning programmes at the appropriate level and this is usually followed by detailed diagnostic assessment.

The diagnostic assessments are designed to provide a detailed assessment of a learner's skills and abilities in the context of the requirements set out in the national standards and national curriculum documents. The results can then be used to inform the development of an individual learning plan (ILP) and learning programme. The idea of an individually tailored learning programme for each student is central to much current thinking in the UK, and is an essential component of the *Skills for Life* strategy. In order for this to be designed, diagnostic assessment is essential. The Adult Basic Skills Strategy Unit therefore commissioned a consortium of the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) and Be Consultancy, led by the Basic Skills Agency, to develop diagnostic materials for literacy, numeracy and ESOL learners, as well as some materials relating to the identification of dyslexia indicators.

The materials were developed in the early part of 2002 and were released in 2003. The NFER developed the paper based assessments for literacy and ESOL, including assessments of speaking and listening skills for the latter. Trials were conducted in April and May of 2002 and the results of these were used to assist in the selection of

final items for the diagnostic materials. Learners for the trials were drawn from a range of institutions in order to include the full range of providers of Adult Basic Skills, but the samples could not be representative as there is no national database with which to make comparisons. Samples were specified as 100 learners at each level and numbers close to this were achieved. Learners were asked to give information on their sex, age group and, for the ESOL sample, first language in order to make comparisons between different groups of learners possible.

Some description of the ESOL sample is relevant, because some of the work of the learners from this sample provides the basis for an analysis of the free writing diagnostic tasks. The information relating to age and sex is summarised for each level in Table 1. It can be seen from this table that females outnumbered males at all levels, with the imbalance being greatest in the Level 1 sample. Numbers in each age group are similar at each level, with the majority being between 21 and 40. At Level 2, however, there were substantially more in the oldest age group than at other levels, and at Entry 1 there were more in the lowest age group.

---

**Table 1 Summary of ESOL sample by gender and age**

---

<b>Sex</b>	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Not given</b>	
	<b>no.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>no.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>no.</b>	<b>%</b>
Entry 1	50	45.0	59	53.2	2	1.8
Entry 2	40	32.0	85	68.0	-	-
Entry 3	50	43.1	66	56.9	-	-
Level 1	18	20.9	67	77.9	1	1.2
Level 2	23	35.9	40	62.5	1	1.6

  

<b>Age</b>	<b>16-20</b>		<b>21-30</b>		<b>31-40</b>		<b>41+</b>		<b>not given</b>	
	<b>no.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>no.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>no.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>no.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>no.</b>	<b>%</b>
Entry 1	23	20.7	36	32.4	25	22.5	26	23.4	1	0.9
Entry 2	17	13.6	56	44.8	39	31.2	13	10.4	-	-
Entry 3	13	11.2	48	41.4	35	30.2	20	17.2	-	-
Level 1	13	15.1	35	40.7	30	34.9	8	9.3	-	-
Level 2	9	14.1	19	29.7	16	25.0	20	31.3	-	-

---

Nearly 50 different first languages were represented in the samples, with Indo-European languages accounting for over half the sample (59 per cent). Of these, most were either the Iranian group of languages (including Kurdish, Persian and Dari) or the Indo-Aryan group, which includes Punjabi, Gujurati and Hindi. Italic languages were also fairly frequent, but the contents of the free writing often made it clear that

the learners were from previous European colonies such as Mozambique. One other language group, the Afro-Asiatic, accounted for just over 12 per cent of learners; the learners from this language family were all speakers of Arabic or Somali. Other language families were also represented; they included Dravidian languages such as Tamil and Malayam, Altaic languages such as Turkish and Mongolian and language isolates such as Japanese. The range of languages meant that no one level was dominated by learners from a single language family.

Materials developed for the diagnostic assessments for ESOL learners were designed to be equally accessible for all language groups; they were related to the relevant core curricula (DfES, 2001a), based on the national standards. The ESOL curriculum is divided into four skills: speaking, listening, reading and writing. Speaking and listening are combined because these skills are almost always used together in communication. Both the ESOL and Literacy curricula for reading and writing are informed by the National Literacy Strategy which has been in use in schools in the UK since 1998; the curricula follow this strategy in dividing reading and writing skills into word, sentence and text levels. Broadly, word level is concerned with the structure, spelling and meaning of individual words; sentence level is concerned with grammar, sentence structure and punctuation and text level addresses the overall meaning of the text. It is understood that conveying meaning involves operating at these three levels simultaneously, but diagnostic assessments focus on individual skills within these categories.

While the majority of the tasks in the diagnostic assessment were multiple choice or other closed formats (for example, cloze procedures with a choice from a limited number of words), the ESOL materials included more open writing tasks as these provide more opportunity for the identification of a learner's particular strengths and weaknesses. In all the entry levels (beginner learners up to the level expected of an 11 year old in the UK), the prescribed task is: Write a paragraph about yourself. The prompt is supported by some questions designed to help with content generation, including *Where are you from?*, *How is it different from England?* and *What do you like to do?* In the initial trial of the materials, there was one additional question, *Who is in your family?* but this was replaced for the final version of the materials by two questions relating to the learner's motivation to attend classes and learn English. The

level one and level two tasks provide a choice of topics. For level one, learners are offered a choice of writing about one of the following topics: *An important festival in your country, your favourite TV programmes* (with a prompt to elicit explanations) or a letter of complaint about a delayed train (with a prompt identifying information to be included in the letter – what happened and what action the train company should take). The topics for the level two task are more discursive, ranging from advice to a friend who is about to visit the learner's country of origin, a change that the learner would like to make in his or her life, or a piece of writing about someone who has been a personal inspiration.

In spite of the choice offered, many learners chose the same topic: at level one nearly half of all learners chose to write about a festival. This was consistent for both men and woman (50 per cent and 48 per cent respectively), but showed a slight bias towards the two older age categories. The letter of complaint and the description of a favourite television programme were each chosen by approximately one quarter of the learners overall, although the letter of complaint was slightly more popular with men, whereas a higher proportion of women chose to write the letter. At level two the preferred choice was advice to a friend visiting the learner's country of origin. Ninety-two per cent of the women chose this option and nearly 60 per cent of the men. At both these levels, however, the low numbers of men mean that any findings about their preference for different tasks should be seen purely as descriptive rather than predictive of the characteristics of other samples or in practice.

As already indicated, the free writing tasks were assessed according to the relevant curriculum strands - at word, sentence and text level. In the trial, the relevant strands were amalgamated to provide descriptive paragraphs about the standard of writing expected at each level, and markers assigned an overall mark of between one and three for the piece of writing. The mark was therefore a 'best fit' when all the curriculum strands were considered. The three marks represented a judgement about the piece of writing: a mark of one indicated that it was below the level expected and a mark of three indicated that the writing exceeded the criteria for the level. A mark of two was given to writing that was appropriate for the level. The free writing mark schemes for Entry levels 2 and 3 are presented in Figures 1.1 and 1.2. The

progression between the levels can be seen from the criteria for 2 marks at each level.

**Figure 1.1 Free writing mark schemes for entry level 2**

<b>Mark scheme for entry level 2</b>	
<b>3</b>	The level is higher than that described below.
<b>2</b>	The writing meets some of the criteria in each of these three areas:
<i>Text features</i>	A short simple text with some logical connection between sentences. Most can be understood, although this may need some effort by the reader.
<i>Sentences, Grammar &amp; Punctuation</i>	Simple sentences are used with mainly correct word order, capital letters and full stops. There are some examples of common conjunctions. (e.g. <i>and, but, as</i> ). Simple verb tenses are mainly correct, but there are numerous basic grammatical errors. (e.g. <i>straightforward verb tenses, subject/verb agreement, singular/plural nouns, determiners such as some / any, articles</i> ).
<i>Vocabulary &amp; Spelling</i>	Some common words with regular spelling patterns are correctly spelt and used correctly, but some may have errors in usage or spelling.
<b>1</b>	The level is lower than that described above.

**Figure 1.2 Free writing mark schemes for entry level 3**

<b>Mark scheme for entry level 3</b>	
<b>3</b>	The level is higher than that described below.
<b>2</b>	<p>The writing meets some of the criteria in each of these three areas:</p> <p><i>Text features</i> Sentences are organised into one or more recognisable paragraphs, with some discourse markers and / or conjunctions to link parts of the text. (e.g. <i>however, in addition, finally, then</i> etc.) Most can be understood, although there may be some lack of clarity when expressing more complex ideas or attempting to use more complex grammatical structures.</p> <p><i>Sentences, Grammar &amp; Punctuation</i> Simple and compound sentences are used with mainly correct word order and sentence punctuation. There are attempts at more complex sentences with at least one subordinate clause. (e.g. using <i>although / when / which / because / etc.</i>) There may be some errors in basic grammar (e.g. <i>straightforward verb tenses, subject/verb agreement, singular/plural nouns, determiners such as some / any, articles</i>).</p> <p><i>Vocabulary &amp; Spelling</i> Common words are mainly spelt and used correctly. There may be less common words, although they may not be used appropriately or spelt correctly.</p>
<b>1</b>	The level is lower than that described above.

Markers were instructed to award a mark of 2 if the piece of writing broadly matched the description in each of the three categories: text features; sentences, grammar and punctuation; vocabulary and spelling. These areas relate to the text, sentence and word level strands of the curriculum. The markers were further instructed to award a mark of 3 if the writing was judged to be at a higher level than the description, and a mark of 1 if the writing did not fit all three parts of the description. If it was impossible to understand the writing then a mark of 0 could be awarded.

This method of marking the trial materials summarised the curriculum strands, which were then separated to provide the basis for the diagnostic marking strategy. For example, for Entry 3, the sentence, grammar and punctuation category becomes three curriculum elements, each of which could be assessed separately to indicate the level of skill and understanding demonstrated in the piece of writing. The level of understanding would be shown by a label that broadly equated to the three marks used for the trial:

Emerging (eM) would be used where there is little or no evidence of the skill in the writing, i.e. where the learner is ready to start the level. This is equivalent to a mark of one in the trial;

Consolidating (C) would be used where some aspect of the skill is demonstrated, albeit inconsistently throughout the piece of work. The tutor would then identify those aspects of writing needing to be improved in order for the learner to have mastered the particular skill. This is equivalent to a mark of two in the trial;

Established (E) would be used if secure understanding is evident. This label would indicate that the learner would be ready to start a higher level.

In the final version of the diagnostic materials, the occasion of many features in the emerging or established category would be an indication to tutors to investigate the skills relating to the level below or above.

There is a clear relationship between the marking for the trials and the more developed diagnostic framework, with the curricular strands being central to both. For example, reference to sentence structure appears in both the summarised mark scheme used in the trials (Figure 1) in the sentences, grammar and punctuation section, and also in the checklist provided in the final version, where each element of the trial mark scheme is separated and related to the ESOL standards and core curriculum.

In the curriculum each component skill is given a curriculum reference number which can be used to identify progression from level to level. It is also related to a level descriptor from the national standards. Thus, for all levels, in the curriculum

document skills related to sentence structure are identified as Ws(writing at sentence level) *Level.1* – hence for Entry 2, the full reference becomes Ws/E2.1. The progression between Entry 1 and Entry 2 can be seen in the following definitions of component skills, stating that ‘Adults should learn to:

Ws/E2.1      Construct simple and compound sentences using grammar suitable for the level

Ws/E3.1a     Write using complex sentences.

Similar attainment targets for Level 1 and Level 2 would thus be identified as Ws/L1.1a and Ws/L2.1a. This consistency allows both learners and tutors to navigate the levels and strands of the curriculum more easily.

The attainment targets in the form shown above appear relatively straightforward to apply, but both statements have additional references attached to them: a list of grammar forms for Entry 2 and sentence types for Entry 3. These are detailed in the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* and are designed to supplement attainment targets by identifying particular grammatical or linguistic features of each level. For Entry 2, for example, this list specifies the syntax of compound sentences and the use of co-ordinating conjunctions to link clauses. Therefore there is a considerable range of grammatical features that tutors need to identify at each level in order to ascertain if attainment targets have been met. Once learners have achieved these targets, they can take the associated formal assessment in order to gain the relevant qualification and move on to the next level of attainment.

In practice the precise curriculum strands enable teachers to construct profiles of individual learners free writing skills, thus enabling the development of a learning plan, the ILP, tailored to the needs of each particular learner. This can be seen more clearly if exemplar scripts are examined. In order to keep these to a manageable length, only four scripts originally presented as entry 2 in the trial have been selected for detailed analysis. They are attached as appendix 1. Four further scripts (scripts 5 to 8) together with an table indicating whether the skills detailed for the level are emerging, consolidated or established are attached as Appendix 2. All scripts have had personal details deleted and all have been typed to preserve anonymity. They

are the work of a range of learners with differing first languages and from different age groups.

Scripts 1,2 and 3 were originally awarded a mark of 2 as part of the Entry 2 sample, while script 4 was given a mark of 3, indicating that the writing is generally above entry 2. When the scripts are examined in terms of the curriculum strands, clear differences can be seen in terms of whether the skills are emerging (eM), consolidated (C) or established (E). Table 3 shows the rating given to each strand for the four scripts selected from the Entry 2 sample:

**Table 3 Analysis of Entry 2 scripts by curriculum strand**

<b>Curriculum reference</b>		<b>Script 1</b>	<b>Script 2</b>	<b>Script 3</b>	<b>Script 4</b>
Wt/E2.1a	Compose simple text (e.g. with some logical and/or grammatical connections between sentences or ideas)	C	E	E	E
Ws/E2.1	Construct simple and compound sentences using grammar suitable for the level	eM/C	C/E	C/E	C/E
Ws/E2.2	Use common adjectives (e.g. to describe people, places, feelings or objects, including comparative forms)	eM	eM/C	eM	C/E
Ws/E2.3	Use punctuation correctly (e.g. capital letters, full stops and question marks)	eM	C	C/E	E
Ws/E2.4	Use a capital letter for proper nouns	C	E	E	C/E
Ww/E2.1a	Spell correctly the majority of personal details and familiar common words	E	C	E	E
Ww/E2.2	Produce legible text	<i>Not assessed as exemplar scripts have been typed</i>			

Clearly, the diagnostic profiles of these students differ, with the first script showing evidence of a learner just into Entry level 2, while script 4 shows evidence of a learner whose Entry level 2 skills are well established and who would benefit from Entry level 3 diagnostic assessment. In terms of text organisation (Wt/E2.2), Script 1 has a logical sequence of development but grammatical connections between sentences need to be clearer: for example, it is not entirely clear whether *This country* refers to England or Macedonia. The other scripts are logically organised and clearly exhibit Entry level 2 skills. These learners would benefit from work on topic sentences and paragraphing in order to extend their writing.

In terms of sentence structure, the four scripts exhibit different features: script 1 uses simple sentences, some compound sentences and a complex sentence with a *because* clause, but not all clauses are securely constructed. A subject is omitted in one case (*but doesn't matter*) and a redundant pronoun, creating a 'double' subject, is inserted in another (*This country it is...*). The simple present tense is used throughout, with some use of verb plus infinitive constructions (*I like to studying, I hope to do*) although the former confuses the infinitive construction with the *-ing* from of the verb. Scripts 2, 3 and 4 also use simple and compound sentences, with script 4 including a correctly constructed subordinate clause of reason (*because sometimes it's raining*) – a marker of Entry level 3. Script 2 makes use of the simple past tense with a time marker (*I came...two years ago*) but other than this, all three scripts are positioned in the present in terms of tense: all three learners should be further assessed to establish their skill with other verb forms appropriate to the level.

In terms of the ability to use adjectives (Ws/E2.2), script 1 has no evidence of their use, other than in the use of *different* which is used in a similar construction in the instructions for the task (*How is it different?*). The learner's skill in this area must therefore be deemed to be emerging and it would require further investigation. The same is true of script 3, where there is one instance of an adjective modifying a noun (*good books*). Scripts 2,3 and 4 all indicate that the learners need either to demonstrate competence with comparative forms (script 4) or do further work on the ways in which they are formed, as the attempts to use them do not indicate that the skill is consolidating.

In a very short piece of writing, it is difficult for learners to demonstrate the full range of punctuation specified for the level, and, as a result, none of them has demonstrated the use of a question mark, so this skill would need to be investigated in other pieces of writing or through the diagnostic assessment of punctuation in the Literacy materials. In spite of the lack of question marks, script 4 includes commas in lists (an Entry 2 skill), and evidence of more advanced understanding shown by the use of a comma to separate clauses in order to show contrast and a colon to structure information. The only major punctuation problem shown in script 4 is the persistent use of capital letters for *LONDON*, which may simply be a stylistic quirk. Until this is resolved, there would be some doubt about whether the use of capital letters for proper nouns (Ws/E2.4) could be safely described as established. In script 1 the use of full stops and capital letters to demarcate sentences is not secure, and no other sentence punctuation is used, hence the understanding demonstrated is designated emerging, suggesting the learner would need a good deal more practice in recognising complete sentences. However, the use of capital letters for proper nouns is more consistent, with the only issue being the capitalisation of some common nouns (*Country, Computer*). This could be the result of poor formation of the letter 'c', in which case some handwriting practice based on differentiation of letter forms when capital and lower case letters have essentially the same pattern. This would be addressed under curriculum reference Ww/E2.2.

In three of the four scripts the spelling of familiar words is correct; in script 3, there are errors with an addition 'e' on the word *work* and mistakes with the vowel sounds in *husband* [*husband*] and *daughter* [*douther*]. This learner would need to spend some more time consolidating familiar words and simple spelling rules.

It can be seen from the above analysis that detailed understanding of learners' strengths and weaknesses can be built up as a result of these diagnostic assessments. The resulting information would be recorded on a marking checklist which is similar in appearance to table 3 above and would be used to inform the development of an individual learning plan, as indicated above. The plan would take into account the 'spiky' profile of skills across the in order to target the appropriate areas.

There is some evidence that the approach taken by the strategy is working: by the end of July 2003, it is estimated that 1.8 million individuals had been engaged in basic skills literacy learning (DfES, 2003a) and it is estimated that there were 550,000 'achievements' for the twelve months to that date – ahead of the milestone of 470,000 set for the year. Although these figures relate to literacy and numeracy, at least some of the achievements were those of ESOL learners. This is estimated to be between four and seven percent, so a considerable number of learners have advanced towards functional literacy in their command of English as a second or other language.

Even when the numbers are impressive, some of the stories behind the achievements are even more so: there is one class in Sheffield where the average age of the learners is 75 (Tickle, 2004). The men in the class are all originally from the Yemen and came to the UK in the 1950s in order to work in the steelworks. In the last year, the desire to become self-reliant and communicate in English has inspired them to attend classes four days a week, even though some of them acknowledge that learning is difficult at their age. When they first arrived they were keen to learn English, but the opportunity was denied them, and the only English they learnt was the minimum needed to operate in the workplace. As a result, the English that they spoke when they began classes was made distinctive by the constant use of the imperative mode: as they had only heard orders in the various industrial settings. Now, in their later years, they are seeking to overcome the limitations imposed on them by circumstances in order to communicate with all the people in the country in which they have lived for 40 years. If the strategy can offer such opportunities to all ages, it can only be hoped that more and more people will be as inspired as this group.

## Bibliography

CAREY, S., LOW, S. and HANSBRO, J. (1997). *Adult Literacy in Britain: a Survey of Adults Aged 16-65 in Great Britain*. London: The Stationery Office.

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2001a). *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum*. London: DfES.

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2001b). *Skills for Life: the National Strategy for Improving Adult Literacy and Numeracy Skills*. London: DfES.

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2003a). *Skills for Life: Annual Review 2002-2003. Achievements So Far*. London: DfES

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2003b). *Skills for Life: ESOL Diagnostic Assessment Materials*. London: DfES.

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2003c). *Skills for Life: the National Strategy for Improving Adult Literacy and Numeracy Skills. Focus on Delivery to 2007*. London: DfES.

MOSER REPORT. DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT. WORKING GROUP ON POST-SCHOOL BASIC SKILLS (1999). *A Fresh Start: Improving Literacy and Numeracy*. London: DfEE.

TICKLE, L. (2004). 'Better late than never', *Education Guardian*, 20 April, 14.

WORKING GROUP ON ENGLISH FOR SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES (ESOL) (2000). *Breaking the Language Barriers*. London: DfEE.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Entry 2 free writing scripts**

### **Script 1**

I am from Macedonia

It is different because in England there is a lot of traffic but it doesn't matter. This country is which I like. My family is in my country in Macedonia

I like to study. I want to learn English and after do a course for Computer. I hope to do that.

### **Script 2**

I am [name deleted] from Saudi Arabia. My country is different from England, it is bigger than here and has a nice weather.

We have a lot of things to do after work and the shops open later than here. I have a nice family me, my husband, 3 boys and 2 daughters. I would like to be a good English speaker and I hope to learn IT very well.

### **Script 3**

My name is [deleted].

I come from South Korea.

I came to England about two years ago.

I live in a flat with my husband and a daughter. I enjoy here but I can't speak English.

I like reading good books, cooking and talking with my friends.

England is more quiet than my country. but I don't like the weather. I hate windy.

#### **Script 4**

My name is [*deleted*]. I come from Azerbaijan. There are many theatres, museums, schools, parks, universities and other interesting places in my country. The weather is very cold in winter, but hot in summer. Now I live in LONDON. LONDON is a big city of Great Britain. There are many different people in LONDON. The weather is not nice, because sometimes it's raining. There are a lot of sightseeing in LONDON.

I have a family: a brother and a mother.

I like go shopping, walking in the park and studying English.

## **Appendix 2**

### **Entry 3 free writing scripts**

### **Script 5**

I am from Iraq. My country is in middle east. It is in the north of arab gulf. It is verely hot on sumer attend to 50 degrees. It is famouse with date palm becouse three quarte the date palms of the world grown thair and more than 450 kinds. My family live thair. My wife, my doughter and my two sons will go to live with me in the future. I like my family verely much and I miss them. I like to learn English vere well.

### **Script 6**

I come from India. England life's different. different Language, different people. My husband, Mother-in-law, father-in-law is my family .

I like England, but sometime I feel very lonley. I miss my family, my sister, my brother, my mum dad I miss a lot. I come in last Suptamber and I feel so bed becaus two cold, but now I am very happy because I have some friends. I speck to English. I like cooking. I like halliday. I visit my uncals house and I feel so good. Some time we go to the cinema. I like film is good fun.

### **Script 7**

My name is [deleted]. I'm come from Bangladesh. Bangladesh is normal country. England is difarant country. For example, in this country weather not good sometimes very cold and hot. My family is big. I have four brothers and three sisters who are younger than me. My father is a businessman and my mother is house wife. I went to school when I was 6 years old. I liked music and hairdressing lessons best. Now I'm studying English at college. At first I didn't like London but then I began to enjoy it more.

## Script 8

I come from Somalia, there are some difference between the two countries. I think they are different in culture, language, education, weather, and also standard of living.

My family are still in Somalia. I like to continue my studying and to improve my English. And then I like to go to work.

I believe if I work hard and try to learn more, I should get or have a certificate which could facilitate to me to get a job easily. Also I have in mind, even if I go to work, I should still have to continue my studies in at evening times or any time that I got a chance.

**Table 4 Analysis of Entry 3 scripts by curriculum strand**

<b>Curriculum reference</b>		<b>Script 5</b>	<b>Script 6</b>	<b>Script 7</b>	<b>Script 8</b>
Wt/E3.1	Plan and draft writing	C	C	C	C
Wt/E3.2	Organise writing in short paragraphs	eM	C	eM	C
Wt/E3.3a	Sequence chronological writing through the use of discourse markers and conjunctions	eM	C	E	C
Ws/E3.1a	Write using complex sentences using sentence types suitable for the level	eM/C	C	C	C/E
Ws/E3.2	Use correct basic grammar suitable for the level	eM	eM/C	C/E	C/E
Ws/E3.3	Use punctuation correctly, e.g. capital letters, full stops, question marks, exclamation marks)	C	C	C	C/E
Ww/E3.1a	Spell correctly common words and relevant key words	eM	eM/C	C	E
Ww/E2.2	Produce legible text	<i>Not assessed as exemplar scripts have been typed</i>			