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Research background

- Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia
- Instruction mainly in Russian
- “English for specific academic purposes” (3 credits)
- 4\textsuperscript{th}-year Ss of non-linguistic specialisms (A2-B2 CEFR)
- ILO: ‘Ss are able to structure and compose a 1500-2000 wds synopsis of their graduation project paper in English’
- Challenging task in terms of
  - Communicative task realization
  - Language-wise
Research question

How to ensure effective development of Ss’ writing skills?

• Re-think assessment!
• Assessment influences learning more than teaching
• Not for measuring, but for scaffolding
• Written feedback not effective enough
  • Ss may misinterpret
  • Ss may ignore
• Assessment of learning -> assessment for learning
Theoretical background

- Hattie (2013): “The most powerful single modification that enhances achievement is immediate and focused feedback”

- Marzano (2006): “Assessment should begin immediately within a learning episode and span its entire duration”

- Bloxam & Boyd (2007): “Feedback solely in the form of a grade contains no direction for where to aim…”

- Boud & Falchikov (2007): “Sustainable feedback has to be immediate, personalized, specific and constructive”
Flipped classroom?

- Setting classtime for interactive learning activities
- Class as the place to work out problems
- Offering feedback as a dialogue
- Aiming at reducing misinterpretation and/or ignoring comments
Hypothesis

- Immediate personalized specific constructive feedback
- given to students *in person* in the classroom
- could improve the achievement of the intended learning outcome.
Research context

- “English for specific academic purposes” (3 credits)
- 4th-year Ss of non-linguistic specialisms (A2-B2 CEFR)
- ILO: ‘Ss are able to structure and compose a 1500-2000 wds synopsis of their graduation project paper in English’
- Year One 27 Ss – FB: personalized, specific, constructive, but delayed
- Year Two 31 Ss – FB: + immediate
## Research design

Table 1. *Initial language mastery levels compared.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year One</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Two</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research procedure

Making Feedback **SUSTAINABLE:**

- **PERSONALIZED**
  - Aiming at what is relevant for each particular student
- **SPECIFIC**
  - Focused: you cannot assess everything
  - Clear criteria set and explicitly identified
- **CONSTRUCTIVE**
  - Stating what has been achieved (green pen technique)
  - Giving guidelines how to improve
- **IMMEDIATE**
  - On the day the task was due
  - In the form of a dialogue focused on achieving the LO set
  - Based on the known detailed criteria
  - Individually to offer non-stress learning environment
  - Possibility to clarify
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realization of communicative task</td>
<td>Focus of planned research\project, plan of action and anticipated results unclear</td>
<td>Focus of planned research\project, plan of action and anticipated results not always clear</td>
<td>Focus of planned research\project, plan of action and anticipated results generally clear</td>
<td>Focus of planned research\project, plan of action and anticipated results clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>No rationale</td>
<td>Rationale not logical or evident</td>
<td>Rationale logical enough</td>
<td>Rationale logical enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of purpose and specific objectives of planned research\project</td>
<td>Overall purpose and specific objectives of planned research\project not formulated</td>
<td>Overall purpose and specific objectives of planned research\project formulated clearly and logically enough</td>
<td>Overall purpose and specific objectives of planned research\project formulated clearly and logically enough</td>
<td>Overall purpose and specific objectives of planned research\project formulated clearly and logically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic of presentation</td>
<td>Objectives, methods and results not aligned</td>
<td>Objectives, methods and results not clearly aligned</td>
<td>Objectives, methods and results not aligned clearly</td>
<td>Objectives, methods and results aligned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year One</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Two</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final language mastery levels compared
Research results
In Year Two as compared to Year One
• most change happened at lowest initial language mastery level A2;
• failure rates decreased - no students failed;
• transitions from level B1 to B2 significant;
• the number of students improving from B2 to C1 insignificant;
• class flipped not only for students, but for teacher as well.
Conclusion

Hypothesis proved: immediate personalized specific constructive feedback given to students in person in the classroom could improve the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

Students’ reactions:
‘Very helpful’
‘Finished the course with a skill that is useful outside the university’
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