

SUMMARY – ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

<p>Content. Style.</p> <p><i>0-4 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - addressing all content points, development of argument, faithfulness to the original - readable / unreadable
<p>Organisation and cohesion.</p> <p><i>0-4 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - introduction, main part, conclusion -clearly organized into paragraphs with appropriate linking devices (<i>adding extra information, contrasting information, introducing the results of previous information, giving reasons for sth, expressing a sequence of events, comparison, enumeration, etc</i>) - word count
<p>Vocabulary, register.</p> <p><i>0-4 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consistently formal or informal - appropriate C1 vocabulary - correct use of synonyms
<p>Accuracy.</p> <p><i>0-4 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - target reader would / would not be informed - legible / illegible
<p>Grammar.</p> <p><i>0-4 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - grammar at level C1 - spelling - punctuation

Content. Style.	Organization and cohesion.	Vocabulary and register.	Accuracy.	Grammar.	Mark awarded.
<i>0-4 points</i>	<i>0-4 points</i>	<i>0-4 points</i>	<i>0-4 points</i>	<i>0-4 points</i>	

ASSESSMENT SCALE

A	20-19
B	18-17
C	16-15
D	14-13
E	12
F	11-0

Educating migrant children

Huddled classes

Sep 11th 2008

From *The Economist* print edition

How migrants fare in school, and what schools can learn from them

MOST teachers admit that occasionally, when a lesson is going badly, they suspect the problem lies not with the subject or pedagogy, but with the pupils. Some children just seem harder to teach than others. But why? Is it because of, say, cultural factors: parents from some backgrounds place a low value on education and do not push their children? Or is it to do with schools themselves, and their capacity to teach children of different abilities?

It might seem impossible to answer such a question. To do so would require exposing similar sorts of children to many different education systems and see which does best. As it happens, however, an experiment along those lines already exists—as a result of mass migration. Children of migrants from a single country of origin come as near to being a test of the question as you are likely to find.

Every three years, as part of its Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, a Paris-based think-tank, measures how 15-year-olds in around 50 countries do in their own languages, mathematics and science. The OECD recently sorted the data from its 2006 study of science performance according to the countries of origin of children and their parents. Four places—Turkey, China, the former Soviet Union and ex-Yugoslavia—have each sent enough citizens to enough countries for conclusions to be drawn about the quality of schooling in their host countries.

Almost everywhere immigrant students fare worse than locals—unsurprisingly, as they are often the children of poor, ill-educated parents and do not speak the local language. When data are adjusted to take account of these disadvantages, much but not all of the gap is closed (see chart). More interestingly, children from the same country do very differently, depending on where they end up.

One reason is connected with how much countries “track” pupils (ie, sort them into ability groups and teach them separately). Large numbers of first- and second-generation Turkish children go to school in Austria, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland and Denmark. In the first four countries, pupils are tracked on leaving primary school. But those in Austria and Germany do worse than those in Belgium and Switzerland because, it seems, tracking is earlier and more rigid in the first two, and a child’s socio-economic status has a very large effect on the track he ends up on. Most Turkish kids go to technical schools that don’t fit them for university.

Their poor showing in Denmark’s comprehensive schools, where there is no tracking and all children should in theory have access to equally good education, is a little more puzzling. Andreas Schleicher, the OECD’s head of education research, speculates that their chances are damaged by the way in which poor Danish children are heavily concentrated in some schools, rather than scattered around the place. In general, countries where there is considerable difference in intake between schools tend to do worse in PISA.



Grouping children by ability is not necessarily a bad idea, though, as the experience of mainland Chinese children shows. Those who migrate to Hong Kong do very well despite being poor—and despite the fact that Hong Kong tracks school-children early and often. But there, which track a child ends up on has less to do with the parents’ wealth and education. Moreover, children can move to a different track if they do better than expected. “In general, socio-economic status has less impact in East Asian countries than in western European ones,” says Mr Schleicher.

Among the world’s best performers are Chinese children taught in Australia. The average Chinese first- or second-generation immigrant there outperforms two-thirds of all Australians (themselves no mean performers), and three-quarters of all the children who take the PISA test worldwide. Mr Schleicher praises the Australian school system for its diversity—within schools, not between them—and ability to capture the talents of all students.

The contrasting fates of children from the former Soviet Union and ex-Yugoslavia provide extra proof that the host country makes a difference, over and above the intellectual baggage immigrant children bring with them. Kids who arrive in Kyrgyzstan from other ex-Soviet lands do badly, albeit better than the locals; those who go to successful little Estonia do far better. By contrast, Yugoslav kids do much the same pretty well everywhere—whether they move to another post-Yugoslav state or some richer and more stable place. The difference is timing: the Soviet


Union imploded earlier than Yugoslavia, so “ex Soviet” children spent less time in education in their home country; those from Yugoslavia less in the host one.

Wrong sort of migrants or schools?

At least in theory, the new findings should help counter some of the sillier things that policymakers say about the influence of migrants on a country’s overall attainments. “When we started to do the PISA rankings in 2000, many countries were shocked at how badly they did,” says Mr Schleicher. “And excuses we often heard were: ‘We get too many migrants,’ or, ‘we get the wrong sort of migrants.’”

Although immigrant children typically do worse at school than locals, there is no country-wide effect. The OECD’s analyses show an insignificant correlation between the number of immigrant children a country has and the average pupil’s attainment—and it is countries with more immigrant children that do (slightly) better.

As well as testing children on what they know, PISA also asks them how motivated they are: whether they think they will need the subject in question (most recently, science) for their future, and whether they like to study it for its own sake. In most countries, first-generation immigrant students are more motivated than second-generation ones, who are in turn more motivated than the children of the native-born. Germany is a striking exception: new immigrants turn up with the usual ambitions and dreams, but by the age of 15 their children have already given up hope.

That suggests that any country that figures out how to let incomers shine will reap big benefits. Immigrants, however poor, are a self-selected bunch of ambitious, hard-working people, and their children usually know that, lacking the informal networks that let locals get ahead, they must study hard to succeed. Their varying fates—helped to the top in some places, consigned to the scrapheap in others—show that although what happens outside the school gates is important, what happens in classrooms is too. 

SAMPLE SUMMARIES AND CORRESPONDING MARKS

MARK A

Huddled classes

How migrants fare in school, and what schools can learn from them

If teachers are not satisfied with a course of their lesson, they tend to put the blame on less intelligent students who are increasingly likely to come from foreign countries. It is not easy to decide whose fault this really is. To find out the true cause, the PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) measures how teenagers from all over the world fare in different subjects and how schools deal with migrant kids.

In general, newcomers tend to achieve lower results than locals but there are remarkable differences in how different nationalities fare in different countries. In Western Europe students are put into ability groups in their early schooling years. As migrant kids often come from impoverished backgrounds and are not familiar with the local language upon their arrival at the host country, they often end up in a low performing group. In a country where students are not able to change tracks this may mean they will never receive instruction which would later enable them to study at university. In Hong Kong, students are tracked too but they are allowed to proceed to a higher group when they reach the level of desired knowledge. Chinese students are believed to be thriving on this system but they perform remarkably well in Australia too. Here their success is attributed not only to their brains and hard work but also to the great Australian school system. The role of the host country school system together with the age of the migrant kids and their ambition to succeed represent another important research areas investigated. Here the PISA perhaps unsurprisingly concludes that younger kids are able to adapt to different schooling systems more easily than their older colleagues and the level of instruction tends to vary enormously across the globe. As far as the motivation levels of students are concerned, migrant kids usually display high levels of motivation and ambition.

To sum up, migrant kids are not responsible for low national results in the PISA tests. If offered good study conditions, they actually tend to become high achievers very fast. Every country which will understand this and act accordingly, is bound to reap huge benefits in the future.

Content. Style.	Organization and cohesion.	Vocabulary and register.	Accuracy.	Grammar.	Mark awarded.
<i>1-4 points</i>	<i>1-4 points</i>	<i>1-4 points</i>	<i>1-4 points</i>	<i>1-4 points</i>	
4	4	4	3.5	3.5	19/B

Assessment scale

A	20-19
----------	--------------

B	18-17
C	16-15
D	14-13
E	12
F	11-0

MARK B

Huddled classes

How migrants fare in school, and what schools can learn from them

To determine the quality of education of each country we can apply the results of the survey made by an internationally standardised assessment programme called PISA, which is done every three years by the OECD. They have collected enough information about how 15-year-old immigrant pupils from Turkey, China, former Soviet Union and ex-Yugoslavia fared in their host countries.

In general, immigrant students fare worse than locals. They are disadvantaged by their poverty, ill-educated parents and no knowledge of the local language. However there are big differences between immigrants from the same country, depending on where they end up. One reason is grouping of pupils known as “tracking” where students are put into ability groups and are taught separately. (cohesive device missing) Turkish immigrant children in Europe are the victims of this system. In Denmark, the problem lies in the fact that underperforming pupils are put into worse schools.

Chinese children who emigrate to Hong Kong do very well despite their poverty and early tracking. This is also caused by the possibility of changing track if they do better. Anyway, Chinese children are very hardworking and the most successful ones worldwide. Many of them go to Australia. Here, thanks to a diversified school system within schools, they outperform three-quarters of all the local children who take the PISA test.

PISA also asks immigrant pupils about their motivation to study. This shows up that immigrant students are more motivated than the native-born children.(cohesive device missing) Policymakers should stop blaming immigrants for a bad country’s overall achievement. Instead, they should support them, because they have willingness to study hard and work well.

Content. Style.	Organization and cohesion.	Vocabulary and register.	Accuracy.	Grammar.	Mark awarded.
1-4 points	1-4 points	1-4 points	1-4 points	1-4 points	
3	3	3,5	3,5	4	17/B

Assessment scale

A	20-19
B	18-17
C	16-15
D	14-13
E	12
F	11-0

MARK D**Huddled classes****How migrants fare in school, and what schools can learn from them**

The article deals with the idea/issue of educating migrant children and their influence on the education system. The main point is to get an answer to the question: why do some immigrant children learn more easily than others? The answer can be found in mass migration as a real life experiment. The PISA and the OECD gather information about how well fifteen- year-old children from four different places- Turkey, China, the former Soviet Union, ex-Yugoslavia- do at three main subjects- their own language, mathematics and science. The results the pupils achieve are more likely to depend on a place, where they end up, than on the country they came from. Some countries sort pupils by (wrong information here I think, they sort them by ability) and don't take into account their skills(????). According to Andreas Schleicher-the head of OECD's education research- poor immigrant children in Denmark are disadvantaged by being put in just some schools. In Hong Kong pupils are tracked very early, but if they show some talent, they can move to another track. Best foreign learners are Chinese in Australia, because of the great Australian school system. The biggest proof of dependence on intellectual skills is difference between children from the former Soviet Union and ex-Yugoslavia(what does this sentence mean?). Mr Schleicher said that countries were trying to find excuses for bad results in PISA ranking. Research shows that countries with larger amount of immigrants do better than others. PISA is also interested in motivation of children. Immigrants are better motivated than the native-borns. It means that a country that finds a way of how to let immigrants show their potential will make a fortune.

Content. Style.	Organization and cohesion.	Vocabulary and register.	Accuracy.	Grammar.	Mark awarded.
<i>1-4 points</i>	<i>1-4 points</i>	<i>1-4 points</i>	<i>1-4 points</i>	<i>1-4 points</i>	
2,5	- lack of cohesive devices - no paragraphs 1,5	3	2,5 - wrong information - lack of clarity	2,5	12/E

Assessment scale

A	20-19
B	18-17
C	16-15
D	14-13
E	12
F	11-0

MARK F**Huddled classes****How migrants fare in school, and what schools can learn from them**

Some children tend to do better at school than others. One of the reasons may be a different cultural background. A real-life experiment about this problem has been already performed as a consequence of mass migration. Every three years the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) with their Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) tests abilities of 15-year-olds in 50 countries to learn different subjects. In 2006 they realized study where students from several countries were sent to many other countries to test level of their schooling (wrong information). The result was that immigrants passed worse than locals, but they compete differently, depending on the country where they were. This is caused by their diverse classification them into aptitude groups and consecutive education. The study find out, that countries where there is considerable difference in intake between schools tend to do worse. When people see rangings of PISA, they are shocked how poorly their county did. Countries prevaricate that they have lots of migrants or “wrong sort” of them, but research show the opposite. Countries with more immigrant children did a little bit better in it. Analyses also shown that often first-generation immigrant students are more motivated than second-generation ones, who are altered more motivated than the native children. The fates of immigrants are various, nd what happens in schools specially influence them.

Only the first third of the summary has been marked as it contains wrong information (distorts or changes the original text) and examples of inaccuracy of grammar and vocabulary which impede understanding.

Content. Style.	Organization and cohesion.	Vocabulary and register.	Accuracy.	Grammar.	Mark awarded.
<i>1-4 points</i>	<i>1-4 points</i>	<i>1-4 points</i>	<i>1-4 points</i>	<i>1-4 points</i>	
1	- lack of cohesive devices - no paragraphs 1,5	2 - good level vocabulary but wrongly used	2 - wrong information - lack of clarity	1 - wrong word order - improper use of tenses	7,5/F

Assessment scale

A	20-19
B	18-17
C	16-15
D	14-13
E	12
F	11-0