

Addressing the needs of international students with academic writing difficulties: Pilot Project 2010/11

Strand 2: Examining the predictive validity of IELTS scores

Ema Ushioda and Claudia Harsch

Centre for Applied Linguistics

University of Warwick

Project aims

This paper reports on Strand 2 of the pilot phase (2010/11) of a long-term research-and-development project to investigate academic writing difficulties experienced by international students. The aim of Strand 2 is to explore the predictive validity of international students' English language entry scores as indicative measures of how well students are likely to cope with the assessed writing demands of their academic courses of study. Strand 1 focuses on analysing first year undergraduates' academic writing in assessed disciplinary writing tasks in the Departments of Law and Statistics and is reported in a separate paper (Wharton, 2011).

In the longer term, the project seeks to address the needs of international students whose English language skills hamper their academic progress in their courses of study. It aims to understand the specific nature of students' difficulties in disciplinary writing tasks, track their writing development through the year, and explore the kinds of feedback, intervention and support that are optimal in helping them to improve their writing. It also aims to generate guidance on what departments may reasonably expect of international students' academic writing abilities based on their initial English language entry scores.

Project context and rationale

With the continued growth in the international student population in Higher Education (HE), the traditional UK academic environment is rapidly evolving into a culturally diverse international academic community. As Montgomery (2010, pp.3–4) notes, internationalisation in academic learning has a long and venerable history dating back to the tradition of 'wandering scholars' in medieval times. However, as she observes, current forces of globalisation are contributing to international student mobility on an unprecedented scale, and are shaping contemporary discourses of internationalisation in HE. Such discourses are reflected in the University of Warwick's Vision 2015 University Strategy, which highlights the importance of 'embedding a global perspective into the experience of all of our students' and of promoting a culture of 'every student an international student' (University of Warwick, March 2011, p. 7).

Yet at a practical level, the integration of increasing numbers of international students studying alongside home students poses various pedagogical challenges and concerns (see for example the collection of papers in Carroll & Ryan, 2005; also Trahar, 2007). This is not least because, within this internationalised and culturally diverse academic environment of UK HE, the principal linguistic medium of teaching and learning remains, of course, English. At Warwick, concerns have been raised in various departments and across University management about international students who seem to lack a sufficient level of English to cope with the demands of academic study here, despite meeting English language admissions criteria. These include concerns about the perceived lowering of academic standards and quality affecting teaching and learning and the Warwick degree, and concerns about extra demands being placed on academic staff obliged to deal with students' language and communication difficulties. There are also concerns in some quarters about the reliability of applicants' IELTS and TOEFL test scores as measures of their actual English proficiency, and concerns about whether English language entry requirements need to be set substantially higher, thus jeopardising recruitment levels. From a more positive perspective, there are concerns to provide an academic environment, support systems and resources which enable all students (home and international) to develop and thrive at Warwick, reflecting the University's commitment to equality and diversity across the academic community and its Vision 2015 goal 'to ensure that the most able students can benefit from a Warwick education irrespective of their backgrounds' (University of Warwick, March 2011, p. 7).

It is in the context of these local concerns that the Centre for Applied Linguistics is undertaking the current project, focusing in particular on issues around international students' academic writing skills in view of their paramount importance across most assessed coursework. Strand 2 of the project considers the questions above relating to English language entry levels, and explores to what extent students' certified English language test scores bear any relationship with their subsequent performance in assessed written coursework. While the gatekeeping role of English language tests is gaining increasing importance at various points of entry to life, study and work in the UK, the predictive validity of such tests (i.e. the degree to which they can predict performance levels in a target behavioural domain of language use) is by no means a straightforward issue.

Predictive validity of English language tests: A brief review of the literature

Since a variety of factors are reported to influence academic success or failure (see e.g. Bayliss & Ingram, 2006), we will concentrate on factors which can be trained and addressed in order to facilitate academic success. Hence, we will be looking at linguistic and academic skills, while fully acknowledging the influence of other variables, which are beyond the control of the present study. We will examine to what extent language test entry scores, such as the IELTS scores, and scores gained from language assessment during the pre-session course can predict academic success as measured by coursework grades gained for academic assignments.

Previous studies into the predictive validity of university entrance language test scores have resulted in contradictory findings. Several studies found that language entry test scores were not a good

predictor of academic success (e.g. Cotton & Conrow, 1998 or Dooley & Oliver, 2002). Other researchers found a moderate predictive effect (e.g. Ingram & Bayliss, 2007), while yet others found a positive relationship between test scores and academic performance (e.g. Feast, 2002; Hill, Storch & Lynch, 1999; Huong, 2000; Kerstijens & Nery, 2000).

Nevertheless, such quantitative studies can be used as a first general indicator, which then can be complemented by qualitative approaches which examine the nature and effects of linguistic competences on academic success. Such approaches have been taken, for instance, by Bayliss & Ingram (2006) or by Paul (2007), who found test entry scores a valid prediction of students' linguistic behaviour during their academic studies. The small numbers of participants in these studies, however, make it hard to generalise the findings (Bayliss & Ingram looked at 28 students; Paul investigated four cases).

Our study represents a first step to investigate what sort of information readily available quantitative test and examination data can provide. We also aim to establish what additional quantitative and qualitative data we would need in order to address our concerns more effectively.

Participants, methodology and research administration

To explore the predictive validity of English language entry scores, Strand 2 focused on the cohort of students undertaking Phase 2 of the Pre-Sessional English Language Programme at Warwick in August–September 2010. The reasons for selecting pre-sessional students were primarily the following:

- They represent a wide range of academic departments, courses of study, nationalities and first languages.
- The majority are students identified as being at or just below the minimum IELTS or TOEFL levels required for their courses of study. Hence analysing the subsequent trajectories of their assessed writing performance may be useful in evaluating whether these minimum levels are generally appropriate.
- Students' English language entry scores can be further supplemented and compared with teacher evaluations of their English skills during the pre-sessional course.
- The cohort constitutes a readily accessible intact group, facilitating the practical process of recruiting participants and of collecting relevant demographic information from the pre-sessional course database.
- In addition, we were interested in evaluating the pre-sessional assessment procedures, since these were in the process of being redeveloped.

The research was designed to be minimally intrusive in terms of participating students' time and commitment. Essentially, for all Phase 2 pre-sessional students who gave informed consent, the following data were collected from the pre-sessional course database:

- Demographic information (gender, nationality, academic department, course of study)
- English language entry grades (IELTS or TOEFL) comprising overall scores and scores for listening, speaking, reading and writing components

- Pre-sessional teacher assessment grades for listening, speaking, reading, writing, library project and oral presentation

Subsequently, participating students were emailed individually during the year and asked to submit their grades for assessed coursework assignments they had completed. The process of gathering students' reported coursework grades continued until Term Three (April–June 2011).

In accordance with the University's statement on the ethical conduct of research¹ and its ethical scrutiny framework, informed consent was obtained from all participating students. This was achieved by borrowing part of a pre-sessional lecture session to enable the principal investigator (first author) to address the whole cohort, talk to them about the research project, respond to queries and invite participation. Students were informed that all data would be completely anonymised and remain absolutely confidential, so that none of the findings or questions they raised could be traced back to individual participants. All those in attendance (estimated 200 students) were given two copies of a combined information sheet and consent form, and those who volunteered to participate signed and returned one copy. Only data from students who gave signed consent were included in the project. Furthermore, English language entry scores and pre-sessional data for students who gave consent but subsequently did not submit coursework grades and effectively withdrew from the project were eliminated from the research database. Ethical approval for the project was sought and obtained from the University's Humanities and Social Sciences Research Ethics Sub-Committee (Ethical Application Reference 03/10–11; Info-Ed Reference 28633).

158 pre-sessional students gave consent for their data to be used in the project. However, not all students responded to subsequent emails in Term Two requesting them to submit coursework grades. By the end of Term Three (June 2011), the total number of students who had submitted coursework grades (ranging from one to eight assessment grades per student) was 113. Of these, 7 students were eliminated because of missing data, as they had not been required to undertake IELTS or some elements of pre-sessional assessment. The final dataset comprised 106 students, 95 of whom had undertaken IELTS and 11 TOEFL. We therefore concentrate on the IELTS cohort to gain robust results. Further information on participants' background (gender, nationality and department) can be found in appendix 1. All 95 were enrolling in postgraduate courses at Warwick University.

Instruments and Data analysis

Brief description of the instruments

The IELTS test consists of four components testing the four linguistic skills of reading, listening, writing and speaking; an overall score is also reported. Scores are reported on a 9-band scale with intermediate 0.5 levels. For all further details on the IELTS test, we refer the reader to <http://www.ielts.org/>.

¹ http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/services/rss/apply_funding/ethics_governance/statement

As noted above, the pre-sessional assessment procedures were in the process of being re-developed. At the end of the pre-sessional course in 2010² here at CAL, University of Warwick, the linguistic skills were assessed as follows: Reading and listening skills were tested by using IELTS practice tests, while speaking and writing tests were developed in-house and marked by CEFR assessment grids from the Manual (Council of Europe, 2009). During the pre-sessional course, students are also assessed on two projects: One is the so called library project, a written assignment over the duration of the course, with feedback and guidance from tutors, which is marked for range and accuracy of structures, use of source materials, vocabulary, organisation and cohesion, and learner independence, resulting in grades from A (highest) to D (lowest). The other project is the oral presentation, a prepared presentation on a topic which has been researched as part of the assignment; it is marked for grammar, pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, and verbal communication and interactive skills, resulting in grades from A (highest) to D (lowest). The following assessment plan (table 1) gives an overview of the PS assessment components (from handbook, internal document):

Table 1: Assessment plan Pre-sessional 2010

	Objective tests	Library project	Presentation
Listening	IELTS practice test		
Speaking	Oral interview assessed using CEF grid		Use CAL grading guidelines
Writing	Brief p&p test assessed using CEF grid	Use CAL grading guidelines	
Reading	IELTS practice test		
Grammar and vocabulary			Use CAL grading guidelines
Study skills			

The academic coursework grades are based on departmental written assignments. Due to the fact that different departments vary considerably in the times when these assignments are set, marked and reported to students, we contacted students during Terms Two and Three to collect their grades. Students reported different numbers of coursework grades, ranging from one to eight assignment grades, at different points in time. These differences make it hard to compare the reported grades and limit the reliability of these data. Under the circumstances, we used the mean of the reported grades as best estimate for our analyses.

The different test components are scored and graded quite differently. To illustrate the differences, and assist with interpreting the different score systems, table 2 gives an overview of the different scoring systems of the different test components employed in this study:

² The pre-sessional test suite is still under re-development, following the results of this research project and the new UK Border Agency regulations. One of the aims is to develop tests in alignment with the CEFR.

Table 2: Scoring systems

Test component	Grading / scoring system
IELTS Listening score	IELTS band scores from 1 to 9, with intermediate 0.5 steps
IELTS Reading score	IELTS band scores from 1 to 9, with intermediate 0.5 steps
IELTS Writing score	IELTS band scores from 1 to 9, with intermediate 0.5 steps
IELTS Speaking score	IELTS band scores from 1 to 9, with intermediate 0.5 steps
IELTS Overall English score	IELTS band scores from 1 to 9, with intermediate 0.5 steps
Pre-sessional Library Project	Marks from D (lowest, coded 1) to A (highest, coded 4), incl. +levels (e.g. B+ = 3.5)
Pre-sessional Oral Presentation	Marks from D (lowest, coded 1) to A (highest, coded 4), incl. +levels (e.g. B+ = 3.5)
Pre-sessional listening score	Equivalent to IELTS bands 1 to 9, with intermediate 0.5 steps
Pre-sessional reading score	Equivalent to IELTS bands 1 to 9, with intermediate 0.5 steps
Pre-sessional writing score	CEF levels (A1 to C2, coded 1-6, incl. +levels, e.g. A2+ = 2.5)
Pre-sessional speaking score	CEF levels (A1 to C2, coded 1-6, incl. +levels, e.g. A2+ = 2.5)
Coursework grade mean	MA marking system, percentage marks from 0 to 100 for each assignment

The following table 3 provides descriptive statistics for the test scores gained in our sample. The scores, as explained above, cannot be compared directly, but have to be interpreted by using the above table 2.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
IELTS Listening score	95	4.5	8.5	6.647	.7504
IELTS Reading score	95	4.5	9.0	6.737	.8500
IELTS Writing score	95	5.0	7.5	6.026	.5124
IELTS Speaking score	95	5.0	7.5	6.100	.5996
IELTS Overall English score	95	5.5	7.5	6.453	.4787
Pre-sessional Library Project	95	1.0	4.0	3.032	.7502
Pre-sessional Oral Presentation	95	2.0	4.0	3.095	.5756
Pre-sessional listening score	95	5.0	9.0	7.158	.8031
Pre-sessional reading score	95	4.0	8.5	6.505	.8827
Pre-sessional writing score	95	2.0	5.0	3.779	.7604
Pre-sessional listening score	95	2.5	6.0	4.000	.6684
Coursework grade mean	95	48.0	74.0	60.507	5.4097

Data analysis and findings

We aimed at examining the relationship between the available test and assessment scores and the academic coursework grades via correlation analysis, as well as establishing which test(s) could best predict the academic coursework grades via regression analysis.

1. Correlations

We first looked at correlations between test scores encompassing **linguistic components**, i.e., the five available IELTS scores and the four pre-sessional (PS) linguistic skills assessment scores, as one step towards checking for concurrent validity amongst the two sets of tests (IELTS and pre-sessional). We expected to find closer relationships between test components addressing the same skills area. We also expected to find a relation between components and the overall score, especially for the IELTS components, as they constitute the overall score.

We used Spearman's rho for ordinal data to correlate IELTS scores (component and overall) with the PS scores for each of the four skills to establish whether IELTS components and PS skill assessment bear a certain relation (concurrent validity). The following tables 4-7 present the correlation coefficients:

Table 4: Correlations Reading

Reading		Pre-sessional reading score	IELTS Overall English score
IELTS Reading score	Correlation Coefficient	.406**	.759**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
Pre-sessional reading score	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.423**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5: Correlations Listening

Listening		Pre-sessional listening score	IELTS Overall English score
IELTS Listening score	Correlation Coefficient	.365**	.747**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
Pre-sessional listening score	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.320**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 6: Correlations Writing

Writing		Pre-sessional writing score	IELTS Overall English score
IELTS Writing score	Correlation Coefficient	.252**	.428**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
Pre-sessional writing score	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.441**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 7: Correlations Speaking

Speaking		Pre-sessional speaking score	IELTS Overall English score
IELTS Speaking score	Correlation Coefficient	.334**	.482**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000
Pre-sessional speaking score	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.209*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.042

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

All correlations are significant. We found moderate correlations between the skills components, with writing showing the lowest correlations. The highest correlations exist between IELTS overall scores and the reading and listening components. This relationship is less pronounced for the PS components. Interestingly, of all PS components, writing shows the strongest relation with the overall IELTS score, higher than with the IELTS writing component.

In a next step, we examined correlations between the **academic coursework grades** and the IELTS scores, as well as the academic coursework grades and all available pre-sessional assessments. We

expected a certain amount of relation between academic grades and the reading and writing components, as well as the library project, since it closely resembles the academic assignments.

We again used Spearman's rho to correlate the academic coursework grades (mean of reported grades) with A) IELTS (all components and overall) and B) PS assessments (all components). Table 8 presents the results for the IELTS scores:

Table 8: Correlations Academic grades and IELTS

A) Coursework / IELTS		IELTS Listening score	IELTS Reading score	IELTS Writing score	IELTS Speaking score	IELTS Overall English score
Coursework grade mean	Correlation Coefficient	.375**	.503**	.472**	.264**	.577**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

All correlations are highly significant, with the highest correlation between the academic coursework grades and IELTS Overall, followed by IELTS reading and IELTS writing, in line with our expectations, given the nature of academic assignments.

Table 9 shows the correlations for the pre-sessional assessments and academic grades:

B) PS assignments		Pre-sessional Library Project	Pre-sessional Oral presentation	Pre-sessional listening score	Pre-sessional reading score	Pre-sessional writing score	Pre-sessional speaking score
Coursework grade mean	Correlation Coefficient	.288**	.077	.305**	.187	.275**	.241*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.458	.003	.070	.007	.019

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Here, we found a modest relation between academic grades and PS listening, followed by the library project and PS writing. All coefficients are lower than with the IELTS tests. Surprisingly, PS reading is not significantly correlated with the academic grades; PS oral presentation shows no significant relation either, though this is a different academic skill not needed for academic written assignments.

2. Regression Analysis

In a next step we carried out regression analyses to establish which of the available tests (IELTS parts, overall, all assessments during pre-sessional) could best explain the variance in the academic coursework grades.

The explanatory variables used to predict the variance of the outcome variable (coursework grades) are all ordinal and show an acceptable amount of variance; the outcome variable is continuous with acceptable variance. To further check whether assumptions of the regression analysis are met, we established that there are acceptable linear relationships between the explanatory and the outcome variables (except for the PS oral presentation and PS reading). Scatterplots and R^2 (coefficients of

determination) of all pair-wise correlations suggested using the following explanatory variables: all components of the IELTS test (though speaking is weak at $R^2 = 0.05$); all components of the PS assessment except for oral presentation ($R^2 = 0.01$), which we excluded from the analysis. Scatterplots also suggested excluding the five outliers at the top and bottom end of the academic coursework scale³. Regression analysis was done with the remaining 90 cases. Multicollinearity (correlation between explanatory variables) may exist for IELTS Overall and IELTS Listening / Reading (.747 and .759), which will be checked during the analysis.

First, we analysed which of the available test and assessment scores individually could best predict academic coursework grades. Simple linear regression was used to determine the best fitting models. This analysis resulted in the best model using the IELTS overall score as explanatory variable. This model predicted 30.3% of the variance. The model was a good fit for the data ($F = 38.31, p < .000$). Table 10 shows the coefficients:

	B	Std. Error	Beta
Constant	24.525	5.849	
IELTS Overall English score	5.574	.901	.551

In comparison, the "best" fitting model for the PS assessment parts was the one using the PS library project as explanatory variable, predicting 8.3% of the variance. The model fitted the data just within the acceptable boundaries ($F = 8.01, p < .006$). The coefficients are presented in table 11:

	B	Std. Error	Beta
Constant	55.300	1.944	
Pre-sessional Library Project	1.766	.624	.289

Multiple linear regression analysis was then carried out to ascertain which combination(s) of the different test scores could best predict academic assignment grades. This resulted in the best fitting regression model using the IELTS overall score and the IELTS writing score as independent variables. The model predicted 33.6% of the variance, and it was a good fit for the data ($F = 21.97, df = 2, p < .000$). The coefficients for the explanatory variables are presented in table 12:

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	18.643	6.417		2.905	.005
IELTS Overall English score	4.763	.969	.471	4.918	.000
IELTS Writing score	1.839	.895	.197	2.056	.043

On the basis of our data, it appears that the IELTS overall and writing scores can best predict academic coursework grades. On the other hand, the pre-sessional assessment grades could not, individually or in combinations with other components, contribute substantially to predicting academic coursework grades.

³ Three students (IDs P010, 064, 138) reported only one grade of 48; two students (IDs 035 and 047) reported only one grade of 74 and 73 respectively.

3. Group comparisons

Given the sample sizes of our possible sub-groups (gender, nationality, departments), such a comparison would only make sense for gender, but as this is not our main focus, we would need to increase the sample size for either nationality or department to gain reliable results⁴.

4. Students with writing difficulties

In order to examine whether we could recommend a minimum entry score threshold necessary for academic studies, we took a closer look at the relation between IELTS scores and academic grade means. Previous studies (e.g. Bayliss & Ingram, 2006; Feast, 2002; Yen & Kuzma, 2009) suggest that this relation is highly contextual, depending on department and student background. As our data set is too small to get meaningful results for these contextual factors, we here look at the full sample, with the aim for future studies to gain a larger sample for different departments.

We divided the academic grade scale into 6 levels. The lowest level indicates failure (below 50 for M-level postgraduate courses), the second lowest indicates cases in need of support (50-55).

Table 13 displays a cross-tabulation of IELTS overall scores and the academic coursework grade means:

	5.5	6	6.5	7	7.5	total
<50	2	1	0	0	0	3
50-55	1	6	4	1	0	12
56-59	0	19	10	2	0	31
60-64	0	4	16	6	1	27
65-69	0	1	2	11	4	18
>70	0	3	0	1	0	4
total	3	34	32	21	5	95

It becomes apparent that in general, IELTS scores rise with the average academic grades. In the lower half of the academic grades scale, IELTS 6 predominates, albeit our data are too scarce in this region to make any clear recommendations towards a minimum cut score. In the middle region, an IELTS score of 6 seems to enable students to get along in their academic assignments, while in the upper part of the scale, an IELTS score of 7 is more frequent. We would need to enlarge participant numbers per department to gain a clearer picture of this relationship for different departments. We would also need to gain more participants at the lower end of the academic scale to examine the minimum entry score in more depth.

⁴ Field (2009) recommends a minimum of 15 cases per explanatory variable, which is only met by the WMG department.

Conclusion and implications

In this pilot study, we used readily available quantitative data on language entry test scores and pre-sessional assessment scores to examine the extent to which these data can predict academic success as reflected in average academic coursework grades. For our sample, we found that the overall IELTS score in combination with the IELTS writing score could explain 33.6% of the variance in the academic coursework grades, which is a substantial amount. On the other hand, none of the pre-sessional assessment scores could contribute significantly to this prediction, pointing to the need for continued re-development of the pre-sessional assessment instruments.

In 2010, we were trialling new test instruments to be used at the end of pre-sessional. Given these results, we are currently exploring possible reasons for the low predictive power of these instruments. One reason could be found in the use of IELTS practice tests, which have been published, the implication being that students may have had sight of these tests before. Another issue could be differences in how teachers have prepared students for the tests. We also feel that the rating scales employed in assessing the library project (and the oral presentation) may need to be revised and teachers' judgements may need to be standardised. In light of our research, new instruments to test the four skills are being developed, also taking into considerations the new UK Border Agency requirements to attest CEFR-level B2 at the end of pre-sessional courses. Moreover, the pre-sessional syllabus is being revised. The new instruments are constantly being monitored and the above described analyses are undertaken every year to ensure an adequate assessment quality.

When examining the lower end of the academic grade scale, we found a weak indication that students coming in with IELTS 5.5 overall could not cope with their academic studies despite having attended a pre-sessional course. However, as our data were too scarce, we need to further investigate this issue with larger student numbers, so that we can also examine whether students' background and academic department have a significant influence.

In the next step, we would like to collect quantitative data on a broader range of students across several departments; the data should encompass language test entry scores, pre-sessional assessment scores, and as far as possible all academic assignment grades throughout the students' studies. The quantitative data would be complemented by qualitative data; we aim to get teachers from specific departments involved, and collect feedback and interview data from them on students' assignments, with a specific focus on linguistic and academic writing issues relating to students in the lower end of the academic grade scale. We also intend to collect students' perceptions of their linguistic and academic writing difficulties to triangulate our findings.

Thus, we expect to be able to address several aims: First, we would like to identify specific areas in need of training, so that pre-sessional and in-sessional courses can be tailored to meet these needs. Second, we aim to evaluate the minimum English language entry scores currently used by specific departments and give guidance on their feasibility and appropriacy.

References

- Bayliss, A. & Ingram D.E. 2006. *IELTS as a Predictor of Academic Language Performance*. Paper presented at the Australian International Education Conference— www.idp.com/aiec, online: <http://www.aiec.idp.com/pdf/BaylissIngram%20%28Paper%29%20Wed%201630%20MR5.pdf>
- Carroll, J. & Ryan, J. (eds). 2005. *Teaching International Students: Improving Learning for All*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cotton, F. & Conrow, F. 1998. An investigation of the predictive validity of IELTS amongst a sample of international students studying at the University of Tasmania. *IELTS research reports (Vol.1)* Canberra: IELTS Australia, 72-115.
- Council of Europe. 2009. *Relating language examinations to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEF). A Manual*. Strasbourg: Language Policy Division.
- Dooley, P. & Oliver, R. 2002. An investigation into the predictive validity of the IELTS test as an indicator of future academic success. *Prospect* 17/1, 36-54.
- Feast, V. 2002. The impact of IELTS scores on performance at University. *International Education Journal* 3/4, 70-85.
- Field, A. 2009. *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS (3rd ed.)*. Sage: London.
- Hill, K., Storch, N. & Lynch, B. 1999. A comparison of IELTS and TOEFL as predictors of academic success. *IELTS research reports (Vol. 2)*. Canberra: IELTS Australia, 52-63.
- Huong, T.T. 2000. The predictive validity of the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) Test. *Post-Script* 2/1, 66-96.
- Ingram, D. & Bayliss, A. 2007. IELTS as a predictor of academic language performance, Part 1. *IELTS research reports (Vol. 7)* Canberra: IELTS Australia, 137-204.
- Kerstijens, M. & Nery, C. 2000. Predictive validity in the IELTS test. *IELTS research reports (Vol. 3)* Canberra: IELTS Australia, 85-108.
- Montgomery, C. 2010. *Understanding the International Student Experience*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Paul, A. 2007. IELTS as a predictor of academic language performances, Part 2. *IELTS research reports (Vol. 7)*. Canberra: IELTS Australia, 205-240.
- Trahar, S. 2007. *Teaching and Learning: The International Higher Education Landscape*. Bristol: Escalate, The Higher Education Academy Education Subject Centre.
- University of Warwick. March 2011. Vision 2015 University Strategy. <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/about/vision2015/>
- Wharton, S. 2011. Addressing the needs of international students with academic writing difficulties: Pilot Project 2010/11. Strand 1b: Analysis of writing by international students. Unpublished manuscript. Centre for Applied Linguistics, University of Warwick.
- Yen, D. & Kuzma, J. 2009. Higher IELTS score, higher academic performance? The validity of IELTS in predicting the academic performance of Chinese students. *Worcester Journal of Learning and Teaching* (3), 1-7.

Appendix

Appendix 1: Participants' background

Gender

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Female	55	57.9
Male	40	42.1
Total	95	100.0

Nationality

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Azerbaijani	1	1.1
British	1	1.1
Chinese	33	34.7
Cypriot	1	1.1
Georgian	1	1.1
Greek	1	1.1
Iranian	1	1.1
Japanese	5	5.3
Kazakhstan	4	4.2
Libyan	1	1.1
South Korean	7	7.4
Taiwanese	18	18.9
Thai	12	12.6
Turkish	8	8.4
Vietnamese	1	1.1
Total	95	100.0

Department

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Applied Linguistics	7	7.4
Biological Sciences	1	1.1
Centre for Cultural Policy Studies	5	5.3
Computer Science	1	1.1
Economics	1	1.1
Institute of Education	7	7.4
Law	5	5.3
Medical school	1	1.1
MOAC	1	1.1
PAIS	5	5.3
WBS	11	11.6
WMG	50	52.6
Total	95	100.0