

2020

Developing a peer supported feedback model that enhances oral proficiency in French

Simon Bernard Bedford

Western Sydney University, Australia, S.Bedford@westernsydney.edu.au

Anu Bissoonauth

University of Wollongong, Australia, anu@uow.edu.au

Klem James

University of Wollongong, Australia, klem@uow.edu.au

Ray Stace

University of Wollongong, Australia, rstace@uow.edu.au

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp>

Recommended Citation

Bedford, Simon Bernard; Bissoonauth, Anu; James, Klem; and Stace, Ray, Developing a peer supported feedback model that enhances oral proficiency in French, *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 17(5), 2020.

Available at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol17/iss5/13>

Developing a peer supported feedback model that enhances oral proficiency in French

Abstract

This article investigates the process of development for a novel online peer-supported approach that enhances oral proficiency in French at an Australian university to cope with ever more complex challenges. These challenges include students with mixed ability in the same class, reduced teaching resources and student surveys identifying a lack of speaking practice affecting confidence and performance in oral assessments. A related aim of the present study was to facilitate assessment literacy of our students by encouraging them to make links between the skills practised in class and the requirements for the final oral summative assessment. Methodology draws on educational practice influenced by a social constructivist approach to develop a learning model using online peer feedback, where more advanced learners support less experienced peers outside the formal classroom. Preliminary results reveal that although the model was deemed to be 'generally effective' in enhancing speaking skills and developing a better understanding of assessment literacy, it needs to enable learners to build their meta-skills across the three-year degree program to be truly effective. The conclusion explores further development and expansion of the learning approach across the French undergraduate program and makes future recommendations.

Keywords

language learning, oral communication, social-constructivism, peer-support, assessment literacy

Cover Page Footnote

Our thanks go to Margaret Wallace for her comments on an earlier version of this article.

Introduction

At our university, language enrolments have steadily increased in the last decade with the implementation of a compulsory language component in the Bachelor of International Studies program since 2010. French and Spanish are the two languages with the highest student enrolments. The first year of French studies is the entry point to a French major or a French minor. As such, it assumes no previous language skills and students come from various Faculties and educational backgrounds with different levels of proficiency, which can vary between six years of secondary language study and none.

Following recent recommendations of a review of languages taught by the Faculty, face-to-face tuition hours in undergraduate subjects were curtailed. In French as well as Italian and Spanish, first-year students currently have four hours of weekly face-to-face tuition instead of the previous 6 hours. The second-year students have three hours of weekly face-to-face classes instead of four hours and the third-year students have three hours face-to-face teaching. The cascading effect of these changes has already affected the 2016 cohort of students who arrived in their third year of French studies in 2018 having received 16% less face-to-face tuition time than their predecessors.

Consequently, increasing numbers of students enrolling with a range of proficiencies and varying support needs, compounded by limited teaching resources challenged us to rethink our approach to delivering the French curriculum. In addition, student satisfaction surveys of students in our French beginner subjects highlighted a desire for more speaking practice in the tutorials. Indeed, students believed that more practice could help them improve their oral proficiency in assessed tasks as illustrated in this student's comment: 'Actually learning to speak what we have learned [sic] so when it comes time for the oral test it would be somewhat easier and with correct pronunciation'. Previous reductions in face-to-face hours had motivated us to find new ways to meet the needs of our students. One of these was to have increased time on tasks to support and enhance their language learning experience using online forum discussions and blogs (Jones & Bissoonauth-Bedford, 2008; Bissoonauth-Bedford & Stace, 2012; Bissoonauth-Bedford & Stace, 2015).

In this paper, we present and discuss the development of a peer-supported model to enhance oral proficiency in French. The novelty in our approach was for more advanced learners who had already achieved the learning outcomes to provide online formative feedback on oral tasks to less experienced peers in a regular and scaffolded manner. Moreover, this study fitted into the 'Curriculum Transformation' portfolio at our university, which aimed to develop students' assessment literacy defined as "understanding of the rules surrounding assessment in their course context, their use of assessment tasks to monitor or further their learning [...] to produce work of a predictable standard" (Smith et al. 2013: 46). Three research questions guided our study:

- (i) How do students perceive engaging in additional speaking practice and receiving formative feedback online?
- (ii) How does regular formative feedback aid understanding of what is expected in oral assessment?
- (iii) What are the perceptible effects of additional regular practice with feedback on performance at the oral summative assessment?

Literature Review

Recent studies into the learning habits of millennial students have highlighted the appeal of hybrid or blended learning environments that combine face-to-face education with new technologies,

particularly the social aspect of belonging to a community. In addition, the importance of creating a cohesive online community of learners, where students feel a sense of belonging and a corresponding need to contribute to that community, is also an important component to successful learning (Lord & Lomicka, 2008; Garrison & Vaughan, 2008; Bissoonauth-Bedford & Stace, 2015). Since students have a “decreased tolerance of lecture-style dissemination of course information”, they prefer “24/7 information connectedness [...], environments that support multi-tasking, gravitation toward group activity and appreciation of the social aspects of learning” (Roehl, Reddy & Shannon, 2013, pp. 44-45). This observation was further corroborated in our own pre-pilot project survey, carried out in 2015, in which 93% of the students (n = 106) affirmed that they would value the opportunity to complete online tasks in order to practise their oral language skills.

Critically, there is evidence to suggest that the use of a hybrid approach in second language (L2) acquisition can improve oral language skills. Yeh et al (2019) found that online peer feedback via blogging videos had a positive effect on speaking performance of college students studying English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Kim (2015) outlined the results of a project, which involved students communicating with one another asynchronously in Korean on the mobile phone application Kakaotalk. Learners of the L2 regularly recorded themselves online and were subsequently given feedback by native speakers. Whereas this method did improve aspects of the students’ speaking performance, such as pronunciation, Kim recommended face-to-face meetings to supplement students’ online exchanges, since a measure of synchronous communication allows for the spontaneous asking of questions (such as learners checking correct usage of a term) as well as instantaneous feedback. Kirkgöz (2011) reported that the regular recording of speaking tasks (via video), backed up by subsequent feedback and analysis, helped students to improve their oral proficiency in EFL (English as a Foreign Language), expanded their vocabulary, helped them to overcome their anxiety and fostered collaborative learning. In the context of our research, it was hoped that regular formative feedback would help students develop the necessary oral language skills and via increased assessment literacy feel better prepared for the summative assessment, and thus help mitigate the anxiety usually associated with this assessment.

Various studies have highlighted the benefits of regular feedback and support to students particularly when it is provided in a formative capacity from an early stage (Vonderwell & Boboc, 2013; Hattie, 2009, Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick 2006; Nicol & Milligan, 2006; Liu & Carless, 2006, Lawrie et al., 2013; Nader, 2019). As previously noted, it is not difficult to see why feedback from students at our institution has revealed a desire for more extensive speaking practice throughout the semester. However, regularly providing targeted individual feedback to all students in high enrolment subjects (such as in first year French) can be time-consuming, if not unfeasible, particularly as resources for teaching are being limited. Online peer supported review of oral tasks with individual feedback using students that have previously successfully completed the same learning objectives offered us a potential solution to these challenges, since it could be delivered and accessed flexibly online. In addition, it was hoped that all cohorts of students involved in the research (those receiving and those providing feedback) would benefit and consolidate their language learning. We had found that this was the case in a previous study where university students had peer tutored their high school peers (Bissoonauth-Bedford & Stace, 2017). The peer review activity in this paper is to be understood as being part of broader educational strategy known as peer learning defined as ‘students learning from and with each other in both formal and informal ways’ (Boud et al., 2001, p.4).

The present study adopted a blended approach combining traditional teaching methodology with online modality to provide additional opportunities to practise speaking and receive formative feedback. Providing aid in the form of ‘scaffolding’ through successful models allows learners ‘to accomplish tasks and develop understandings that they would not be able to manage on their own’

(Gibbons and Hammond, 2001, p.3), illustrates Vygotsky’s (1962, 1978) approach to language learning where social interaction and guidance by a more knowledgeable learner are key to cognitive development and successful learning.

Methodology and Data collection

Our study was divided into a number of phases. First, ethics approval was obtained from the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee on the condition that there would be no control group and that all students would equally benefit from the research. Phase 1 involved a proof of concept in 2016 with the first-year students, and was progressively rolled out in phases across 2017 and 2018 to the second and third-year students respectively as summarised in Figure 1a below. The present article focuses on phases one and two of the study, which consisted in identifying the problem, developing a solution to trial in a pilot phase and making recommendations for further development and expanding the study to the complete French undergraduate program in Figure 1b below. As such it aligns with principle 5 of LCNAU (Languages and Cultures Network for Australian Universities) which ‘fosters systematic review, reflection and monitoring of improvements in program design and pedagogy for university languages programs’ with a view to ‘provid[ing] a nation-wide focus for continuous sharing of good practice’ (<https://www.lcnau.org/about/>).

Figure 1a

Overview and timeline of the main phases of the study





Figure 1b

Peer review and formative feedback across the French undergraduate program



Pilot study phase one with first-year students

In the second semester of 2016, a pilot study was designed and implemented with first-year beginner level students to develop extra speaking practice with personalised feedback provided online. The first-year cohort consisted of 87 students in their second semester of study. They were aged between 18 and 41 years. Three additional online oral tasks were set as formative speaking activities in weeks 4, 8 and 11 of the semester. The three tasks were based on topics studied in the first-year curriculum such as: 1. *la routine* (daily routine); 2. *acheter un cadeau d'anniversaire* (shopping for a birthday present) and 3. *faire les courses pour une fête* (food shopping for a party). In the first task, students had to give a brief account of their daily routine over a typical week using the vocabulary learnt in class. In the second task, students had to work in pairs to create a dialogue around buying a birthday present for a family member or a friend with one acting as a customer and the other one as a shop assistant. In the third task, students were asked to create a conversation on food shopping for a party they were hosting. While the first task was completed individually, the remaining two were done in pairs, outside of formal classes and students had to record their conversations and upload them onto the LMS (Moodle) for teacher feedback. As such, the three oral tasks were not formally assessed or allocated marks within the subject.

Phase one of the pilot study was facilitated by the two academic staff who each taught one language tutorial of approximately 20 students enrolled in each class. The two remaining tutorials were taught by casual academics, but the students were given the same opportunity to do additional speaking and receive formative tutor feedback. Formative oral feedback in this phase was provided by the teachers to trial its feasibility and efficiency and was supported by using PoodLL functionality in the LMS on each of the three oral tasks. The teachers used the criteria required for oral assessment such as pronunciation, fluency, grammar, vocabulary and appropriate use of register (Appendix 1) in their formative feedback in the week following submission of additional speaking tasks. Students were encouraged to revise their speaking task in the light of teacher feedback and resubmit within a week if they so wished.

Qualitative data on perceptions of the additional speaking tasks in the pilot phase and their impact on helping students prepare for their end of semester final oral assessment were collected via semi-structured interviews (Appendix 2). Sixteen students voluntarily stayed behind after the oral assessment to participate in the evaluation of phase one of the pilot study. Since the final oral assessment was conducted in pairs, the students were interviewed in their respective pairs. Responses were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Evaluation of phase one with first-year students

Data for question 1 (Appendix 2) on the usefulness of formative feedback indicate that students perceived regular personalised feedback from teachers as 'helpful, especially for pronunciation' because 'it is good to know what you are pronouncing right and wrong'.

Data for question 2 (Appendix 2) on the effectiveness of the tasks in preparing for the oral assessment shows that the three additional oral tasks were perceived as 'good' and 'actually useful' in preparing for their final oral assessment. Reasons given were that 'we had a bit of anxiety about what kind of questions would be asked', but 'you had to prepare for it [...] one can contribute at one's leisure' and 'I acquired like a confidence boost' and 'the plugin [PoodLL installed in a Moodle environment] was good'. The drawback for some was 'finding someone to work with [in weeks 8 and 11] was not always easy because of our various commitments'.

Question 3 (Appendix 2) asked students to elaborate on what else could have helped them improve their language proficiency. Responses for this question varied. Some admitted that ‘additional speaking in class’ would have helped more’ whilst some others admitted ‘I hate computer stuff’, but nonetheless conceded ‘I see value in them...I just hate doing them’. Some thought that ‘the size of the class could be smaller’ with ‘a little more like on the spot practice’ because ‘I still need to speak more French not only to understand when someone asks me something but also to reply in the right way like instead of lingering answers’.

On the other hand, some participants admitted they ‘cannot interact with people very well’. Others ‘liked it when you [the teacher] had time in class to come round and give us instant feedback’ whilst acknowledging at the same time that ‘I guess it worked the same when you had that [the feedback] recorded’.

These valuable comments and learnings from the first-year students informed development of phase two of the pilot study in which some of them participated as second-year volunteers in semester one of 2017 as described in the next section.

Pilot study phase two with first- and second-year students

In 2017, there were 144 students enrolled in the first year of the French beginners’ class and 72 students in the second year of French Studies in semester one. In the second-year cohort, 70 students had completed the 2016 phase one. Twelve second-year students (17%) volunteered to participate in the next phase of the study, which consisted in reviewing the additional oral tasks set by the teachers, providing formative feedback using the teachers’ assessment criteria in (Appendix 1) and ending the feedback with a model answer to their first-year peers. To have a representative and yet manageable sample, each of the twelve participants was randomly allocated four first-year students through the LMS. Thus, 48 first-year students (33%) and 12 second-year students (17%) participated in phase two. The first-year students had to complete two additional speaking tasks in week 5 (describing one’s daily routine) and in week 8 (describing one’s hometown) based on topics studied in the first semester. The first task was carried out individually whilst the second one was completed in pairs to encourage dialogue and discussion.

At the beginning of semester one in 2017, a face-to-face induction with the twelve participants from the second year on how to give constructive formative feedback online was organised by the academic staff conducting the study. Another component included in the induction of these students related to how they could support the development of assessment literacy in their peers. Best practice was modelled by the academic staff demonstrating how they use the marking criteria (Appendix 1) to provide constructive feedback. The academics emphasised that it is important to start with positive reinforcement then highlight two to three areas that needed improving upon before ending the review with a suggested model answer to the conversation topic. Participants were reminded to upload their oral formative feedback onto the LMS within a set timeframe, usually within a week of posting to allow their first-year peers enough time to improve their performance considering the feedback they had received.

Evaluation of phase two with first- and second-year students

At the end of semester one in 2017, both first- and second-year participants evaluated phase two. The twelve second-year volunteers completed a short survey as a focus group (Appendix 3) on the perceived effectiveness of providing formative feedback to first-year students. The forty-eight first-

year participants also completed a written questionnaire (Appendix 4) reporting on what had worked well and not so well when receiving feedback from their second-year peers.

The next section analyses data relating to giving and receiving formative feedback.

Student Perceptions of giving feedback to first-year students

Data from the twelve second-year participants for question 1 reveal that giving feedback to first-year peers was generally viewed as a positive experience since ‘everything worked well except for some technical issues when recording’. In response to question 4 on the amount of time spent to review and give feedback on the two speaking tasks, participants claimed they took ‘less than an hour’ over the semester, which was ‘very doable’.

In terms of issues encountered, the main pedagogical issue with the first-year students was that students often focused on reading their prepared responses instead of interacting with their partner when speaking in pairs. The second issue was technical and related to uploading audio files and quality of audio recordings, and web browser compatibilities that did not allow participants to post their oral feedback to their first-year peers, which was the basis of the current model.

Useful suggestions and recommendations for improving peer-supported feedback included having face-to-face meetings between mentors and mentees at the beginning of the semester. The face-to-face meetings, it was felt, would enhance the social learning aspect of the interactions because it would ‘create a mentoring bond’ and ‘make students less intimidated of the markers’.

The other suggestion endorsed by all twelve participants during the focus group was that extra oral practice which involved peer feedback should be formalised and count as a class participation mark. Perceived benefits from this activity included revisiting prior learning that ‘would encourage us to practise our speaking more’ and ‘think about revising ‘old grammar’ that we may have forgotten’.

Student perceptions of receiving feedback from second-year students

The forty-eight first-year participants had mixed opinions on the pedagogical benefits of the additional tasks and contribution of formative feedback in improving their speaking skills. Results for question 1 in Appendix 4 on the effectiveness of the additional speaking tasks showed that 29% found the activities “quite effective” in improving their speaking skills and helping them prepare for their oral examination, with a small minority (10%) rating them as “very effective”. Another 40% claimed they were “ineffective” at improving oral conversation skills.

Results for question 5 on the impact of the tasks on their speaking skills revealed that 26% of students perceived the feedback from the second -year students as having neither a particularly positive nor a particularly negative impact on their oral skills. Reasons given were diverse, ranging from not receiving quality feedback in time to prepare the next activity, non-completion of online tasks due to workload implications, especially as they were not formally assessed (casual employment, family obligations, students enrolled in Science, Law and Engineering with intensive academic workload). Some felt that the time taken to complete the recordings because of technical issues could be reduced if there were more face-to-face interactions with mentors instead of online exchanges only.

The feedback from all students was included in the current results because they allowed us to test and evaluate weaknesses and deficiencies in our pilot study that were subsequently taken into account for improving the peer support and learning experience.


Perceptible effects of formative feedback on oral assessment results

While the research is still in its implementation and evaluation phase, preliminary results from phases one and two of the pilot study revealed a small trend in improvement in the 2017 first-year students' oral examination scores (post-study cohort) when compared to the 2015 scores (pre-study cohort). A comparison between both sets of marks showed a slight improvement in the high end of the scale (80-100% range) together with a slight dip in the lower end of the scale (40-70% range). The frequency distribution of marks in both years is shown in figure 2 below.

It needs to be highlighted that the second-year cohort in 2017 had completed the pilot phase of the study in 2016 and that the second-year mentors had reviewed speaking tasks that they themselves had completed previously as first-year students. Further research is required in the future however, to determine how technology that offers more opportunities for students to practise speaking skills independently coupled with peer formative feedback might help improve the spoken proficiency of students as they progress through their course.

Figure 2

Comparison of first-year oral examination results in 2015 and 2017



Discussion

Based on these preliminary results, some pedagogical implications can be drawn. Our results corroborate previous findings in the literature that scaffolding tasks and using evaluation criteria to provide constructive feedback (Shephard, 2005: 66) are valuable strategies to fill in the 'cognitive gaps' (Spycher, 2017: 6) in students' zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). A key component in the peer feedback was to end the review of the oral task with a model answer.

Data also highlighted students' meta-learning in terms of what strategies were identified that can aid their own language learning (Biggs, 1985). For the first-year students, the importance of social interactions with second-year mentors at the start of the semester was viewed as conducive to rapport-building and motivation for learning. For the second-year students, providing feedback and modelling answers to their less advanced peers were considered as two approaches that helped

consolidate and/or raise awareness of their own learning needs. For both groups however, there was a clear indication that the additional activities outside of the classroom should be integrated in the assessment system.

The results from the pilot phase however, also pointed to issues with the quality of peer feedback, particularly in the case of second-year students who were less proficient than some first-year students, which highlights the teaching and learning context in our institution. Guidelines have been prepared by teachers to explain the context of the formative peer feedback at our university and how it can support student learning. Teachers will provide modelling examples at the start of the semester to show students what is considered as constructive feedback by using the evaluation criteria for assessing oral performance to develop students' assessment literacy.

Conclusion

This research investigated the development of additional speaking practice supported by formative feedback to enhance oral proficiency in French by:

- engaging students in additional online oral activities to give and receive formative feedback from peers;
- gauging whether regular formative feedback allowed a better understanding of what was expected in the oral assessment, and
- finding out the effects of additional practice combined with formative feedback on oral performance at the end of semester.

Preliminary findings indicate that both first and second-year students perceived benefits, albeit different, of additional speaking practice in terms of learning strategies and language learning. The majority of the students thought that the extra activities should also count in the assessment weighting.

The associated benefits for the teachers were that peer-supported feedback helped alleviate teachers' marking workload at no extra cost and share this responsibility with more advanced students. With reduced teaching hours, it allowed teachers to provide opportunities for extra practice of speaking outside of formal classes via online technologies to both first- and second-year students.

Although results showed benefits for both groups in terms of language learning, there were nonetheless technological and pedagogical issues highlighted by the students that were taken into consideration to formulate recommendations for the future as highlighted in the discussion above.

Although the results highlighted a small increase in students' examination grades in the post-study cohort at first year level, further research is required to correlate the impact of additional online tasks in enhancing oral proficiency and performance in final oral assessments for second and third year students. As pointed out previously (figure 1.b), the study has now been rolled out to the whole undergraduate French program. Evaluations will be carried out to find out to what extent engaging with regular formative student feedback from more advanced learners can contribute towards successive learning and improving students' understanding of assessment literacy.

References

- Biggs, J. (1985). The role of meta-learning in study processes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 55, 185-212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1985.tb02625.x>

- Bissoonauth-Bedford, A. & Stace, R.J. (2012). Grappling with grammar on a virtual learning platform: the case of first year French students at the University of Wollongong. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 9(1), 1-18.
- Bissoonauth-Bedford, A. & Stace, R.J. (2015). Building a writing community through learning of French. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 12(2), 1-22.
- Bissoonauth-Bedford, A. & Stace, R.J. (2017). University Student Ambassadors Bring Languages Back to their High School Peers. *Journal of Peer Learning*, 10, 18-40.
- Boud, D., Cohen, R. & Sampson, J. (2001). *Peer Learning in Higher Education. Learning from and with each other*. Kogan Page. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315042565>
- Garrison, D.R., & Vaughan, N.D. (2008). *Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines*, John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118269558.ch6>
- Gibbons, P. & Hammond, J. (Eds) (2001). *Scaffolding: Teaching and learning in Language and Literacy Education*. PETA, Newtown.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of over 800 Meta-analyses Relating to Achievement*, Routledge, Abingdon. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203887332>
- Jones, H.J. & Bissoonauth-Bedford, A. (2008). Developing a bilingual blog as a platform for language learning in French: a pilot study. *International Conference on Information and Emerging Technologies, University of Wollongong, 18-21 June, 2008*, pp.112-119.
- Kim, H.K. (2015). A blended learning scenario to enhance learners' oral production skills. *The EuroCALL Review*, 23(1), 17-23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4995/eurocall.2015.4655>
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2011). A blended learning study on implementing video recorded speaking tasks in task-based classroom instruction. *TOJET*, 10(4), 1-14.
- Lawrie, G., Wright, A., Schultz, M., Dargaville, T., O'Brien, G., Bedford, S.B, Williams, M., Tasker, R., Dickson, H. & Thompson, C. (2013). Using formative feedback to identify and Support first year chemistry students with missing or misconceptions. A practice report. *The International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*, 4(2), 111-116. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5204/intjfyhe.v4i2.179>
- Liu, N.F. & Carless, D. (2006). Peer feedback: the learning element of peer assessment'. *Teaching in Higher education*, 11(3), 279-290. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680582>
- Lord, G., & Lomicka, L. (2008). Blended learning in teacher education: An investigation of classroom community across media. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 8(2), 158-174. <http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3242.8008>
- Nader, A. (2019). Challenging, Supporting, and Empowering students in IWLP beginners' classes: a teaching and learning response to internationalisation. In N. Becerra, R. Biasini, H. Magerea-Hofhansi and A. Reimão. (Eds.), *Innovative language teaching and learning at university: a look at new trends* (pp. 83-93). Research Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2019.32.905>
- Nicol, D.J. & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199-218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
- Nicol, D. & Milligan, C. (2006). Rethinking technology-supported assessment practices in relation to the seven principles of good feedback practice. In C. Bryan and K. Clegg (Eds), *Innovative Assessment in Higher Education*, (pp.64-77), Taylor and Francis Group Ltd.
- Roehl, A., Reddy, S.L. & Shannon, G.J. (2013). The flipped classroom: An opportunity to engage millennial students through active learning. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, 105(2), 44-49. <https://doi.org/10.14307/jfcs105.2.12>
- Shepard, L.A. (2005). Linking formative assessment to scaffolding. *Educational Leadership*, 63 (3), 66-70.

- Smith, C.D., Worsfold, K.A., Davies, L., Fisher, R. & McPhail, R. (2013). Assessment literacy and student learning: the case for explicitly developing students ‘assessment literacy’. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(1), 44-60.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.598636>
- Spycher, P. (2017). *Scaffolding writing through the ‘teaching and learning cycle*. WestEd, San Francisco, CA.
- Universities Australia, Higher Education and Research Facts and Figures, November 2015
<https://www.universitiesaustralia.edu.au/ArticleDocuments/169/UA%20Higher%20Education%20and%20Research%20Facts%20and%20Figures%20November%202015.PDF.aspx> [accessed 5 December 2016]
- Vonderwell, S.K., & Boboc, M. (2013). Promoting formative assessment in online teaching and learning. *TechTrends*, 57(4), 22-27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-013-0673-x>
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and Language*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4>
- Yeh, H.C., Tseng, S.S., & Chen, Y.S. (2019). Using Online Peer Feedback through Blogs to Promote Speaking Performance. *Educational Technology & Society*, 22(1), 1-14.

Appendix 1

FREN152 Oral Assessment Marking Criteria

	1	2	3	4	5
Pronunciation , including – vowel sounds – silent final consonants – use of English sounds	poor	limited	fair	good	excellent
Fluency – sentences pronounced as a whole; limited number of hesitations – student is articulate – student does not remain silent	poor	limited	fair	good	excellent
Grammatical accuracy , including – genders, articles, verb tenses – sentence construction – question construction	poor	limited	fair	good	excellent
Lexical range – topic-related vocabulary – general vocabulary	poor	limited	fair	good	wide
Use of appropriate register – tu / vous – no use of colloquialisms	poor	limited	fair	good	excellent
Total	/25				

Additional comments:

Appendix 2

Semi-structured questions to students who had participated in the pilot study after first-year oral examination in 2016 (week 12)

1. As you know, we set 3 additional speaking tasks (called hurdle tasks) this semester to encourage you to practise your speaking outside class and we gave you formative feedback. Did you find the hurdle tasks with individual feedback useful?
2. In your view, how well did the hurdle tasks on Moodle help you prepare for the final oral exam today?
3. Is there anything else that could have helped you?

Appendix 3

Phase 2 Evaluating second-year students' feedback to first-year students

As you are aware, we are running this pilot study in order to find out whether formative feedback from peers can improve students' speaking skills. This study was designed in response to student feedback who wanted more speaking practice in French. We would be very grateful if you could spare a few minutes to answer the following questions as your responses would allow us to enhance our teaching and learning model in the future.

Name (optional): Studies (Major):

FREN241 Pilot study phase 2 student evaluation	
1. What worked well and what did not work so well?	
2.a. Were there any technical issues you encountered when leaving the feedback? (if yes, can you please explain). b. Were those technical issues resolved in the end? c. Are there any tips you'd share with other students to help them solve potential technical difficulties?	
3. a. Did you feel you were sufficiently well briefed to leave feedback for your group of first year students? If not, which other information/preparation could have made the process of correcting/leaving feedback better? b. Did you find the discussion Blog on FREN241 Moodle site intended for sharing your experience/issues useful? Can you please explain?	
4. a. Was the amount of work required to complete feedback of the 2 oral tasks manageable? (did this task for example 'sit well' alongside your other study commitments?). b. How long did you spend giving feedback for each hurdle task?	
5. Do you think that it would be a good idea to include this type of activity in FREN241 participation mark? Can you please explain?	
Do you have any suggestions on how this project could be improved in the future?	

Appendix 4

Questionnaire for the first-year students

SPEAKING TASKS YOU COMPLETED

1. How would you rate the effectiveness of the hurdle tasks (daily routine, your hometown, shopping scenarios) you completed in improving YOUR **French speaking skills**?

i. Description of daily routine

Did not contribute to the development of my speaking skills	Did little to improve my speaking skills	Did not have a particularly positive or negative effect on my speaking skills.	Quite effective in improving my speaking skills	Very effective in improving my speaking skills
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

ii. Description of your home town/city

Did not contribute to the development of my speaking skills	Did little to improve my speaking skills	Did not have a particularly positive or negative effect on my speaking skills.	Quite effective in improving my speaking skills	Very effective in improving my speaking skills
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

iii. Videos of shopping scenarios

Did not contribute to the development of my speaking skills	Did little to improve my speaking skills	Did not have a particularly positive or negative effect on my speaking skills.	Quite effective in improving my speaking skills	Very effective in improving my speaking skills
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. How well did these hurdle tasks help to prepare you for the final oral exam?

Not very well	Not particularly well	No particular impact on my preparedness for exam	Fairly well	Very well
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. How well did the hurdle tasks demonstrate to you how the final oral exam would be assessed (including which assessment criteria would be used)?

Not very well	Not particularly well	No particular impact on my understanding of	Fairly well	Very well
---------------	-----------------------	---	-------------	-----------

assessment criteria				
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. Overall, would you say that the preparation provided by the hurdle tasks helped to increase your confidence in the oral exam?

No, not at all	Not particularly well	No particular impact on my level of confidence in exam	Somewhat	Yes, greatly
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. **Now thinking about the FEEDBACK, that YOU received from the 2nd year students** on your hurdle tasks (description of your daily routine, description of your home town/city).

Did you receive feedback on all your hurdle tasks from your 2nd year mentor?

No	Yes	Other (please explain)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain:

6. Did you receive feedback from your 2nd year mentor in good time?

Yes	No	There was a short delay.	Other (please explain)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain:

7. How effective was the feedback you received in **helping you** improve your speaking skills?

Did not contribute to the development of my speaking skills	Did little to improve my speaking skills	Did not have a particularly positive or negative effect on my speaking skills.	Quite effective in improving my speaking skills	Very effective in improving my speaking skills
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Do you think that a personal meeting with your 2nd year mentor at the start of the semester was helpful? If you did not have a meeting please explain?

9. Overall, what were the main advantages of doing the hurdle tasks?

Please explain:

10. Overall, what were the main disadvantages of doing the hurdle tasks? How do you think they can be improved?

Please explain:

TECHNOLOGY

11. Did you encounter any technical issues when attempting to use the inbuilt 'record' function within Moodle forums?

- No
- Yes

If yes, please explain what you did to get round these issues and to leave an audio posting (if you were unable to find a work-around, please say so).

12. Did you have any other technical problems completing ANY of the tasks? If so, please explain.

13. Please indicate which device(s) you used to complete the hurdle tasks (multiple devices can be selected).

- a smartphone
- tablet
- a laptop
- a PC
- a Mac

14. Please indicate which browser you used to complete the hurdle tasks.

- Internet Explorer
- Microsoft Edge
- Firefox
- Chrome
- Opera
- Safari
- Don't know
- Other (please specify)