CLASSROOM FEEDBACK DYNAMICS

Viorela-Valentina DIMA
Marina Luminta MILITARU
Dana Mihaela COCARGEANU

Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest

Abstract

The article presents a case study undertaken by the authors, all academic staff members of the Department for Modern Languages and Professional Communication within the Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies. The focus of the case study was the feedback exchange between teacher and students as well as between peers, feedback on two major types of activities designed to develop ASE students' English speaking skills: job interview simulations and oral presentations. In a nutshell, the paper presents the responses obtained from the participating teachers and students both as concerns interviews/ oral presentations and as regards giving and receiving feedback.

Key-words: feedback exchange, oral presentations, job interview simulations, enhancing English speaking skills

1. Preliminary remarks

A number of papers dedicated to improving the quality of the teaching and learning processes taking place in ESP classrooms (and not only) have highlighted the significance of feedback exchange between the participants in the respective processes. In a 2004 study Wiggins distinguishes between feedback, evaluation and guidance. In a nutshell, he argues

that feedback is "useful information about what was and was not accomplished, given a specific goal. It thus is not guidance (advice based on feedback) or evaluation (a value judgment about the meaning of the results)". Consequently, giving feedback on a task to the participants means offering them an objective description of what happened, i.e. of the aspects which show that the task was accomplished (and to what degree), as well as of the aspects which show that the task was not accomplished. Ultimately, emphasizing task accomplishment will help reinforcing this behaviour, whereas pointing to non-accomplishment will trigger an investigation of what had caused the latter and, once causes are identified, they may be dealt with accordingly.

Research has pointed to the fact that effective (language) learning depends on effective feedback exchange (cf. Day 1995, Santhanam 2000, Tutuianu 2007 a.o.). There are two main 'parties' in language teaching and learning: the teachers and the learners. Each of the 'parties' should benefit from feedback from (at least) three main sources: from self, from peers and from the other 'party' (for details regarding the feedback strategies for each source discussed in the literature, cf. Dima 2007 and references cited therein).

Using feedback exchange as a means of enhancing language learning has also been a matter of intense debate in the Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies. One occasion for such a debate was a Workshop held in ASE, Bucharest, in January 2010, organized as a National Event within the Framework of the ECML Project "Quality training at grassroots level".

On that occasion, two of the authors of the current article (Viorela Dima and Marina Militaru) participated in a group discussion with two other colleagues (Antonia Enache and Antoaneta Lorentz) focussing on the topic "Who's (not) afraid of feedback?". At that time, the group acknowledged the importance of giving and receiving feedback in language learning contexts and identified a series of problematic aspects which might impede on the feedback exchange processes (among them, we mention: fear of being criticized, maladaptiveness to communication, fear of negative response, fear of poor assessment etc.). Nonetheless, the group decided that it was worthwhile trying to increase students' awareness of the advantages of feedback exchange. Consequently, an action plan was devised so that throughout the 2010-2011 academic year students and teachers reciprocate feedback on interview simulations and oral presentations. Ultimately, the group pledged to report on the case study at the "Youth on the move. Teaching languages for international study and career-building" Conference in May 2011 (for more details on the workshop discussion from January 2010, cf. Dima et al. 2010).

2. Stages and processes

Upon the beginning of the 2010-2011 academic year, the group convened to design the practical stages of the case study. Due to objective reasons (the schedule), the initial group of four teachers was reorganized into a group of three teachers undertaking the case study, namely: Viorela Dima, Marina Militaru and Dana Cocargeanu (i.e. the authors of the present paper).

The newly formed group decided to focus on *job interview simulations* in the first semester and on *oral presentations* in the second semester. In what follows, we describe the actions taken in each of the semesters.

Job interview simulations

The authors of the case study chose interview simulations as occasions for students to provide and receive feedback on their English speaking skills hoping that learners would get actively involved due to the resemblance of this type of activity to real life performance. While preparing and holding job interviews, students learned:

- to prepare the job Application File (CV, Application Letter)
- to prepare the Interview itself (stages, questions and answers, body language etc.)
- to evaluate peer performance by means of
    - The interviewer's evaluation sheet (Appendix 1)
    - The interviewee's feedback form (Appendix 2)
- to express their positive and negative opinions related to their colleagues' performance as interviewers and/or interviewees
- to discuss the teacher's positive and negative comments on their performance as interviewers and/or interviewees
- to give their teacher feedback on how the activity had gone, by means of a post-activity questionnaire entitled "Improving English speaking skills – interview simulation" (Appendix 3)

Mention should be made that job interview simulations were held with 8 groups of students: 1 group from the Marketing Faculty (teacher: Dana Cocargeanu), 2 groups from the Faculty of Accounting and Management Information Systems (teacher: Viorela Dima) and 5 groups from the Faculty of Economic Cybernetics, Statistics and Informatics (teacher: Viorela Dima). During the respective seminars, students were encouraged to give and respond to feedback honestly, using one of the two questionnaires in Appendices 1 and 2. They were

explicitly informed that this exchange would not be marked by the teacher (i.e. it would not count towards the end-of-term mark). At this stage, the teachers felt that in this way students would be more prone to honesty if they were not confronted with potential poor assessment.

Moreover, during the respective seminars, the teachers and students were observed by a fellow teacher who filled in a Classroom Observation Form for Interview Simulations, given in Appendix 4. The latter would be the basis of peer feedback provided to the teacher on the way she had organized and run the job interview simulations as well as on how she had given and facilitated feedback. Teachers also received feedback from students by means of the questionnaire in Appendix 3, which was filled in by students in a seminar subsequent to the job interview simulations.

Oral presentations

For the second semester, the authors of the case study chose oral presentations as occasions for students to provide and receive feedback on their English speaking skills. After being instructed on how to make oral presentations in English, groups of 4-5 students were given two weeks to prepare a 10-minute presentation of a company of their choice. While preparing and holding oral presentations, students learned:

- to prepare an oral presentation (preparation techniques, delivery stages, body language etc.)
- to evaluate peer performance by means of the
    - Observation sheet for oral presentations (Appendix 5)
- to express their positive and negative opinions related to their colleagues' performance as presenters
- to discuss the teacher's positive and negative comments on their performance as presenters
- to give their teacher feedback on how the activity had gone, by means of a post-activity questionnaire entitled "Improving English speaking skills – oral presentations" (Appendix 6)

Oral presentations were held with 7 groups: 2 groups from the Faculty of Accounting and Management Information Systems (teacher: Viorela Dima) and 5 groups from the Faculty of Economic Cybernetics, Statistics and Informatics (teacher: Viorela Dima). During the respective seminars, students were again encouraged to be honest and instructed on taking

notes that would support their opinions. Furthermore, students were informed that the feedback exchange on oral presentations would be marked by the teacher (i.e. it would count towards the end-of-term mark in that students' opinions/ evaluation of their peers' performance could contribute to a higher mark awarded for the oral presentations, as long as they could justify their opinions). More specifically, students were asked to give a mark to their peers' oral presentations – where the students' mark was lower than the teacher's mark, the mark given by peer students was not taken into consideration (to prevent malevolence); where the students' mark was higher than the teacher's mark, the mark given by peer students could increase the final mark only if peer students could point to significant positive aspects of their peers' oral presentations (to prevent overestimation).

Furthermore, when the oral presentations took place, the teachers and students were observed by a fellow teacher, who filled in a Classroom Observation Form for Oral Presentations, given in Appendix 7. The latter was used as a means of providing peer feedback to the teacher on the way she had organized and run the oral presentation seminars, as well as on how she had given and facilitated feedback. Teachers also received feedback from students on this type of activity by means of the questionnaire in Appendix 6, which was filled in by students in a seminar subsequent to the oral presentations seminars.

3. Outcomes

At the end of each semester, the authors of the case study analized the information received by means of the questionnaires given in Apendices 3, 4, 6, 7 (i.e. students' and peer teachers' overall fedback on the two types of activities). In what follows, we present the findings for each semester, grouped by feedback source.

Job interview simulations

The questionnaires provided useful hints into what the students and peer teachers observed about the way this activity was organized and run, as well as on the feedback exchange between teachers and students, on the one hand, and students and their peers, on the other hand.

Feedback on *the way job interview simulations were conducted* can be classified into six categories, if we take into account the need for each participant 'party' to receive feedback from three sources (from self, from peers and from the other 'party'). For reasons of space, we only concentrate on four out of the six categories and quote some of the responses we obtained in Table 1 below:

Students' evaluation of self	- I tried to prepare the Application file as instructed. - I didn't try too much. - I improved vocabulary. - I improved public speaking skills/ listening and speaking skills. - The activity was an opportunity for me to communicate with a colleague in English. - The activity helped me find out what an interview is about in English. - I had the occasion to structure my interview.
Students' evaluation of peers	- Some of my colleagues' comments helped me improve my English skills. - Not all colleagues were serious enough.
Students' evaluation of teachers	- The instructions were clear. - The teacher should be more authoritary. - Better organization is necessary. - There wasn't enough time for everyone to participate/ for the questions. - All students should be involved (observers "don't gain anything"). - There was a lot of noise in the classroom. Therefore, it was difficult for me to understand the task that was explained once or twice and quite briefly.
Teacher's evaluation of peers	- The teacher had a good overall command of the classroom and tried to explain each step in detail. - The teacher should insist on the fact that each interview should take no longer than 5 minutes to make sure everyone gets interviewed.

Table 1. Feedback on the way job interview simulations were conducted

The end-of-activity questionnaire given in Appendix 3 was a significant means of gathering feedback on *the way feedback exchange happened* on the occasion of job interview simulations. Some of the respondent's notes are quoted in Table 2 below:

Students' evaluation of self	- I identified my strong and bad points. - I understood what I did wrong. - I could analyze myself and identify the things I have to improve. - I gained self-confidence. - The activity gave me more confidence and it was very attractive. - I was able to identify areas for improvement. - The activity facilitated self-assessment.
Students' evaluation of peers	- I was able to identify my strong points because I heard them from other students. - I could express myself clearly and without mistakes because the atmosphere was OK and I wasn't nervous. - I was able to speak more fluently and without shame thanks to my interviewer. - Colleagues should have been more critical, if it had been the case. - My colleagues showed me my weakness. - My colleagues were honest/objective, they told me what I should improve. - Some of my colleagues' comments helped me improve my English skills. - The activity provided opportunity to know each other better. - Students should have more patience. - Students should listen more to each other.
Students' evaluation of teachers	- We discussed the mistakes and the good things that interviewees did.
Teacher's evaluation of peers	- A stronger hand required to guide students when exchanging feedback. - More time should be alotted to giving individual feedback.

Table 2. Feedback on feedback exchange on job interview simulations

As we can see from Tables 1 and 2 above, students were extremely serious in answering the feedback questionnaire entitled "Improving English speaking skills – interview simulation" (Appendix 3). They highlighted both the positive and the negative aspects about themselves, their peers or their teacher's bevahiour.

To summarize the positive aspects, students considered that the activity gave them the chance to examine their own behaviour and identify their own strong or weak points both as language learners and as feedback givers. As regards their peers, students found colleagues extremely helpful either as intervewer's/ interviewee's or as feedback givers. In a nutshell, students consider their colleagues an important feedback source, expecting honesty and rigurousness, and being grateful for the friendly atmosphere created. As concerns students' opinion of teachers as facilitators, the former expressed satisfaction with the fact that the latter's instructions were clear and they provided feedback both on the participants' achievements and on their mistakes.

When considering the negative aspects highlighted by students, these reflect awareness of their own faulty behaviour (e.g. not preparing for the job interview simulations), as well as of their peers' (not being serious enough, being too lenient or impatient). As for the activity itself and their teachers, sometimes students felt the need for more time to be alloted both to job interview simulations and to the feedback exchange. Moreover, some of them expressed disappointment with not being interviewed and being just observers.

Interestingly, peer teachers' feedback matches students' responses in highlighting the positive atmosphere and the observed teacher's overall command of the seminar. Moreover, peer teachers also recommend that more time should be allocated for interviewing every student as well as for providing individual feedback. A note should be made, though, that 20-25 students participate in 80-minute ESP seminars in ASE, Bucharest, which is an objective reason for which more time is hard to be alloted for either of the two aspects.

All in all, a total of 161 respondents gave feedback on the questionnaire given in Appendix 3 and their answers show the students' high satisfaction with the activity. Apart from making comments, students were invited to mark each aspect with marks from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). As evident from Table 3 below, there were approximately 74% positive feedback responses. In detail, the majority of the marks were either 4 or 5 (amounting to roughly 43%), to which we add circa 31% of students who answered 'yes' instead of giving a mark. Approximately 26% of the respondents gave negative feedback responses. Thus, there were very few marks between 1-3 (amounting to roughly 4%) and 22% of students who answered 'no' instead of giving a mark.

Interview simulations Students' feedback														
Groups	Mark 1	Percentage	Mark 2	Percentage	Mark 3	Percentage	Mark 4	Percentage	Mark 5	Percentage	NO	Percentage	YES	Percentage
CIG I 609 22 respondents	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	16	9	43	5	23	3	16
CIG I 611 - 25 respondents	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	19	9	35	6	25	5	19
CSIE I 1000 - 18 respondents	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	9	6	30	4	25	5	30
CSIE I 1004 - 20 respondents	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	11	7	37	4	21	6	28
CSIE I 1005 - 18 respondents	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	17	4	22	4	23	6	32
CSIE I 1008 - 17 respondents	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	9	7	39	3	17	4	26
CSIE I 1013 - 24 respondents	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	6	24	6	25	10	43
MARKETING I 1707 - 17 respondents	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	8	3	17	3	17	9	52
TOTAL Average		0		0.75		3		12		30.87		22		30.75

Table 3. Interview simulations - Student's general feedback

Oral presentations

The questionnaires given in Appendices 6 and 7 provided insight into what the students and peer teachers observed about the way oral presentations were organized and run, as well as on the feedback exchange between all the parties involved.

There are six categories of feedback on *the way oral presentations were conducted*, if we acknowledge the need for each participant 'party' to receive feedback from three sources (from self, from peers and from the other 'party'). For reasons of space, we only concentrate on four out of the six categories and quote some of the responses we obtained in Table 4 below:

Students' evaluation of self	- I was able to improve my oral skills/ pronunciation.
	- I liked the fact that we were able to speak in front of the colleagues.
	- I liked the fact that we could use PowerPoint presentations.
	- I liked the fact that we could practice our public speaking.
	- I learned how to explain charts orally.
	- I didn't like graph presentations.
	- I liked working in groups/ teamwork.
	- It wasn't boring.
	- I liked researching for the presentation.
	- It was entertaining.
	- It was interactive, informative and fun.

	- It wasn't so interactive as expected.
	- I liked being an observer.
Students' evaluation of peers	- Some of my colleagues didn't listen to me.
	- I didn't like that some of my colleagues were too serious.
Students' evaluation of teachers	-The activity wasn't very well organized.
	- We didn't have enough time and space.
	-There should be better planning for the time allocated for each group.
	- This kind of activities prepare us for the future.
	- The teacher was very strict with the timing.
	- There is nothing I could suggests to make this activity better. / It's perfect as it is.
Teacher's evaluation of peers	- The teacher gave clear instructions to students on how to deliver their presentations.
	- The teacher penalized the students who were disturbing their colleagues' presentations.

Table 4. Feedback on the way oral presentations took place

The end-of-activity questionnaire given in Appendix 6 was also a significant means of gathering feedback on *the way feedback exchange happened* on the occasion of oral presentations. Table 5 below records some of the respondent's comments:

Students' evaluation of self	- I became more confident in my spoken English.
	- I discovered that I am not so good at speaking in front of others and I must improve that.
	- I identified my areas for improvement.
	- I know my mistakes better.
	- I liked giving marks.
	- I didn't know that I was able to speak so freely.
	- I understood I have to work a lot.
	- I am able to use terms to discuss a graph.
	- The activity was somewhat helpful for me to asess my strong points.
Students' evaluation of peers	-We were able to point to the good and bad points of the groups.
	- The activity facilitated peer assessment, but my colleagues were very silent.

	- I liked the activity because I was congratulated by my colleagues after the classes. - The discussion was important because we saw our mistakes. - I would recommend not listening to the other groups' opinions. - There weren't so many comments. - There were some haters out there. - All comments were helpful. - I had something to learn from the feedback. - I didn't like the feedback, the students were not so interested in this. I think that feedback should represent a very important subject in the final discussion.
Students' evaluation of teachers	- The teacher didn't acknowledge individual student performance; we were all treated as a group, even though I didn't choose that particular team. - My colleagues' comments were useful but the teacher's comments were more useful. - Some of the teacher's comments were not always specific. - It was helpful to find out what we had done wrong. - The teacher highlighted good and bad performance as well as areas for improvement. - I would really have enjoyed hearing more constructive criticism. - The teacher highlighted pros and cons very well. - The teacher should highlight individual student performance more to help us improve our skills.
Teacher's evaluation of peers	- All groups obtained group feedback (for the team performance). - There wasn't enough time for individual feedback.

Table 5. Feedback on feedback exchange on oral presentations

As evident from Tables 4 and 5 above, students were again serious in answering the feedback questionnaire given after the oral presentations had taken place. Their comments show that they were aware of both the positive and the negative aspects about themselves, their peers or their teacher's bevahiour.

As regards the positive aspects, students firstly considered that the activity gave them the chance to reflect upon their own behaviour both as language learners and as feedback givers. Consequently, they were able to identify their own strong or weak points. Secondly, some students found their peers' comments extremely helpful, saying that they had something to learn form their colleagues' feedback. Thirdly, many students were content with the way the activity had been organized and liked the fact that the atmosphere was "interactive, informative and fun". Significantly, a great number of respondents were satisfied with the way their teacher had highlighted good and bad performance as well as areas for improvement.

As concerns the negative aspects mentioned by students, these reflect awareness of their own weaknesses (e.g. not being comfortable when speaking before an audience), as well as of their peers' (not being serious enough, being uninterested or revengeful in providing feedback). When considering the activity itself, sometimes students felt the need for more time to be alloted both to oral presentations and to the feedback exchange. Moreover, some of them wrote that they would have liked to be assessed as individuals and not as members of their teams, either because they were discontent with their colleagues' involvement in their team's work, or because they simply wanted their own performance to be highlighted more than that of their group.

As in the first semester, peer teachers' feedback matches students' feedback on the teacher's performance. Thus, both 'parties' emphasise the positive atmosphere and the observed teacher's overall command of the seminar. Furthermore, both 'parties' recommend that more time should be alloted for providing individual feedback.

In sum, a total of 132 respondents gave feedback on the questionnaire given in Appendix 6 and their answers show the students' high satisfaction with the activity. Apart from making comments, students were again invited to mark each aspect with marks from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). Table 6 below shows that there were approximately 76% positive feedback responses. In detail, the majority of the marks were either 4 or 5 (amounting to roughly 57%), to which we add circa 19% of students who answered 'yes' instead of giving a mark. Approximately 24% of the respondents gave negative feedback responses. Thus, there were very few marks between 1-3 (amounting to roughly 5%) and circa 19% who answered 'no' instead of giving a mark..

Oral Presentations Students' feedback														
Groups	Mark 1	Percentage	Mark 2	Percentage	Mark 3	Percentage	Mark 4	Percentage	Mark 5	Percentage	NO	Percentage	YES	Percentage
CIG I 609 22 respondents	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	8	38	4	19	6	31
CIG I 611 - 25 respondents	0	1	0	0	1	4	3	17	6	34	5	24	4	20
CSIE I 1000 - 18 respondents	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	16	9	56	3	16	1	8
CSIE I 1004 - 20 respondents	0	1	0	0	1	6	3	18	7	38	4	19	4	19
CSIE I 1005 - 18 respondents	0	1	0	2	1	7	5	30	6	38	2	15	1	8
CSIE I 1008 - 17 respondents	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	12	6	31	5	22	7	32
CSIE I 1013 - 24 respondents	0	1	0	1	0	2	3	15	9	44	4	20	3	17
TOTAL Average		0.71		0.42		3.85		16.85		39.85		19.28		19.28

Table 6. Oral presentations - Student's general feedback

4. Final remarks

As it has become apparent from this article, the case study undertaken by the authors in the 2010-2011 academic year was extremely elaborated and time consuming but, at the same time extremely rewarding. The occasions to exchange feedback were generally considered by teachers and students as opportunities to help themselves and fellow colleagues identify areas of good performance as well as of improvement.

Apart from isolated cases, students tackled the activity with full responsibility. Although initially they were afraid of each other's opinions, their professionalism helped them overcome their fears and stress. Moreover, the students' comments reflect the fact that they enjoyed giving marks and voicing their opinions on their peers'/teacher's performance, on the one hand, and that they expected the latter to be more critical of their own performance, on the other hand. Furthermore, they confess that the feedback exchange continued after the seminar dedicated to it had finished, with some students saying this helped them bond to one other.

In conclusion, the teacher's decision to combine feedback (objective reporting on task performance) and evaluation (giving marks) when analysing the performance of all participants appears to have been a felicitous choice. All parties envolved increased awareness of the advantages of reciprocating feedback, as well as of the seriousness and maturity required for such an activity.

Bibliography

1. Asan, Doina – *A corecta sau a nu corecta: rolul greselilor în îmbunatatirea deprinderii de a vorbi în limba engleza*, paper presented at Universitatea Nationala de Aparare CAROL I, Sesiunea de Comunicari Stiintifice „STRATEGII XXI": *Spatiul Sud-Est european în contextul globalizarii*, Bucuresti, 12-13 aprilie 2007

2. Cosconel, Cristiana Ileana, Sfetea, Roxana Corina, Matros, Raluca Ionela – *Autoevaluarea – un pas necesar in invatarea de-a lungul vietii*, paper presented at Universitatea Nationala de Aparare CAROL I, Sesiunea de Comunicari Stiintifice „STRATEGII XXI": *Spatiul Sud-Est european în contextul globalizarii*, Bucuresti, 12-13 aprilie 2007

3. Day, Kate – "Feedback on Teaching", in *Tutoring and Demonstrating: A Handbook*, Fred Forster, Dai Hounsell and Sheila Thompson (eds), Centre for Teaching, Learning and Assessment, The University of Edinburgh, 1995, available online at http://www.tla.ed.ac.uk/resources/ tut-dem/Chap10.pdf

4. Dima, V.V. "Language learners feed off feedback", *"The Knowledge based Organization" Conference Proceedings*, Editura Academiei Forţelor Terestre, Sibiu, ISBN 978-973-7809-71-1, 978-973-7809-97-1, 2007

5. Dima, V.V., Enache, Antonia, Lorentz, Antoaneta, Marina Militaru. " 'Who's (not) afraid of feedback?' Case Study Outline within the Framework of the ECML Project 'Qualitraining at Grassroots Level' ", ECLM Project "QualiTraining at Grassroots Level", National Event: 28-29 January 2010, ASE Bucharest PROSPER-ASE Language Centre and QUEST Romania, workshop overview published in Laura Muresan, Marina Militaru (ed.) *Proceedings of the International Conference on Languages for Specific Purposes "Languages as a Lifeskill – New Perspectives on LSP Teaching & Learning"*, Editura ASE, Bucuresti, 2010, ISBN 978-606-505-363-2, pp. 451-455

6. Dumitrescu et al. *Mind Your Steps to Success. English for Students of Cybernetics*, Editura Uranus, Bucuresti, 2005, ISBN 973-7765-12-5

7. xxx *Evaluation Feedback for Effective Learning and Accountability*, OECD Publications Service, 2001, available online at http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/10/29/2667326.pdf

8. xxx *Gathering your own student feedback*, Institute for Teaching and Learning, University of Sydney available online at http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/feedback/gatherstu feed.htm

9. xxx "Getting feedback from students", in *Issues of Teaching and Learning* 9(6), 2003, available on the internet at http://www. catl.uwa.edu.au/publications/ITL/2003/6/feedback

10. xxx *Teaching and Learning. Peer Observation of Teaching*, University Teaching Development Centre, Victoria University of Wellington, 2004, available on the internet at http://www.utdc.vuw.ac.nz/resources/ guidelines/PeerObservation.pdf

11. xxx "Peer Feedback on Teaching", in *Evaluation of Teaching Unit*, The University of Western Australia, Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, available on the internet at http://www.catl.uwa.edu.au/__data/page/75634/peerfeedback.pdf

12. xxx "Peering in: the value of using peer reviews to reflect on your teaching", in *Issues of Teaching and Learning* 9(6), 2003, available on the internet at http://www.catl.uwa.edu.au /publications/ITL/2003/6/peer

13. xxx "Planning ahead for feedback gathering", in *Issues of Teaching and Learning* 9(6), 2003, available on the internet at http://www.catl.uwa.edu.au/publications/ITL/2003/6/gathering

14. xxx *Preparing for Peer Observation. A Guidebook*, The Center for Teaching Effectiveness, The University of Texas at Austin,available online at http://www.utexas.edu/academic/cte/ PeerObserve.html

15. Santhanam, Elizabeth (ed,) – *Student Feedback On Teaching: Reflections And Projections*, Refereed Proceedings of *Teaching Evaluation Forum*, 28-29 August 2000, Perth, Western Australia, The University of Western Australia, 2001 available on the internet at http://www.csd.uwa. edu.au/spot/forum/forum_monograph.pdf

16. Tutuianu, Diana – *Asistenta la clasa – instrument eficient al dezvoltarii profesionale*, paper presented at Universitatea Nationala de Aparare ,CAROL I", Sesiunea de Comunicari Stiintifice, ,STRATEGII XXI": *Spatiul Sud-Est european în contextul globalizarii*, Bucuresti, 12-13 aprilie 2007

17. Wiggins, Grant. "Assessment as Feedback", 2004, http://education.jhu.edu/newhorizons/strategies/topics/Assessment%20Alternatives/wigg ins.htm

Viorela-Valentina Dima is a university lecturer at the Academy of Economic Studies in Bucharest. She has a BA degree in Romanian and English, an MA degree in Theoretical

Linguistics and a PhD degree in Philology, all from University of Bucharest. Her research interests include: contrastive linguistics, teaching methodology, translation studies. She has authored more than 30 articles on these topics and has co-authored two ESP textbooks (*Mind Your Steps to Success. English for Students of Cybernetics* and *Practical English for Finance and Accounting*).

Dana-Mihaela Cocargeanu

Has a BA degree in English and French from the University of Bucharest (2001), an MA degree in British Cultural Studies (University of Bucharest, 2002) and one in Research and Teacher Education for Business and Economics (Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies, 2009). Currently she is studying for a PhD degree in Translation Studies at the School of Applied Language and Intercultural Studies, Dublin City University.

Her research interests include: translation studies (especially children's literature translation), cultural studies, ESP and EFL teaching.

Marina-Luminita Militaru is a Lecturer at the Academy of Economic Studies in Bucharest. She holds a PhD in Linguistics and has written several articles on *political communication and discourse analysis* as well as on *political advertising*. She is also a co-author of two ESP (text)books (*Management Issues* and *Improve Your Business English Vocabulary*).

INTERVIEWER'S EVALUATION SHEET

Candidate: ………………………………………………………………

PREPARATION	*Mark*	*Comments*
- Knowledge about the company:		…………………………………………
- Knowledge about the position:		…………………………………………
- Answers to set questions:		…………………………………………
- Own questions:		…………………………………………

BEHAVIOUR	*Mark*	*Comments*
- Handshake:		…………………………………………
- Posture:		…………………………………………
- Gestures:		…………………………………………
- Eye contact:		…………………………………………

QUALITIES	*Mark*	*Comments*
- Communication skills:		…………………………………………
- Interpersonal skills:		…………………………………………
- Enthusiasm:		…………………………………………
- Maturity:		…………………………………………

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: …………………………………………

CONCLUSION: …………………………………………

Instructions for interviewers – First read the CVs and the covering letters of the candidates, and think about the questions you would like to ask and about the importance you would assign to the aspects included in the evaluation sheet. Then conduct the interview, and, when you have finished, complete the sheet. Mark each item with a plus (+) for a positive impression, a minus (-) for a negative impression or a question mark (?) where you are uncertain. Use the supplementary space for positive or negative observations about the candidate, and finally indicate your opinion about the person's suitability. Based on your marks and comments, choose the candidates you would shortlist for the job. At the end, announce the results together with your observations to the rest of the class.

---

[1] The *Interviewer's Evaluation Sheet* was taken from Dumitrescu et al. (2005) *Mind Your Steps to Success. English for Students of Cybernetics*, Editura Uranus, Bucuresti, 2005, p.76

INTERVIEWEE FEEDBACK FORM

Interviewee's Name: _____
Position interviewed for: _____

Instructions for interviewees – After you are interviewed, complete the form below, assigning a mark for each aspect*. Use the supplementary space for positive or negative observations about the interviewer(s), and finally indicate your opinion about how the interview could be improved. At the end, announce the results together with your observations to the rest of the class.

*KEY: 1) Poor - 2) Satisfactory - 3) Average - 4) Good - 5) Excellent

Interview aspect	Mark	Comments
Did the interview start in time?		
What was your reception like when you got to the venue?		
Were the interviewers organized?		
How would you rate the manner in which interviewers handled themselves in general?		
Were the questions related to the job opportunity in question?		
How prepared were interviewers for the interview?		
Were the interviewers audible enough?		
Did the interviewers handle themselves professionally?		
How were the methods used to conduct the interview?		
Would you feel comfortable having the same people in the interview panel around for the second interview if you get called back?		
What would you advice on the whole session that we probably need to observe or note?		

IMPROVING ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILLS – INTERVIEW SIMULATION

Students' Name: _____

Faculty, year, group number: _____

Teacher's name: _____

Date of the interview simulation: _____

Role played in the interview simulation: Interviewer ☐   Interviewee ☐   Both ☐

Instructions: After performing class interviews, complete the form below, assigning a mark for each aspect*. Use the supplementary space for positive or negative observations about the way this activity has helped you improve your English speaking skills and finally indicate your opinion about how this activity could be improved. At the end, discuss the results with the teacher and the rest of the class.
*KEY: 1) Poor - 2) Satisfactory - 3) Average - 4) Good - 5) Excellent

English speaking activity - Interviews		Mark	Comments	English speaking activity - Interviews		Mark	Comments
Preparation of the activity	Did the teacher encourage students' attendance?			**After the activity**	Did the teacher discuss the interviewer's evaluation sheet/ the interviewee's feedback form with the rest of the class?		
	Did the teacher tell you to prepare the Application File (CV and Covering Letter) for the interview?				Did you find the discussion helpful? (Did it highlight good and bad performance as well as areas for improvement?)		
	Did the teacher instruct you on how to prepare the Application File?				Has the teacher acknowledged individual student performance?		
	Did you prepare the Application File as instructed?				Did the activity facilitate self-assessment? (Were you able to identify your own strong points and areas for imporvement?)		
	Did the teacher explain the interview simulation task clearly? (Did you understand what interviewers and interviewees should do, how long the interview should last etc.?)				Was the activity useful for the development of your English speaking skills? How?		
During the activity	Did you have enough time to perform the activity?				Did the activity facilitate peer-assessment? (Did you find your colleagues' comments helpful?)		
	Were you interrupted by your teacher during the activity?				What did you like about this activity?		
	What was the reason for the interruption? Was the interruption helpful for the smooth running of the interview?				What didn't you like about this activity?		
	Were you instructed on how to use the interviewer's evaluation sheet/ the interviewee's feedback form?				What suggestions do you have for the improvement of this activity?		
	Did you use the sheet/ form as instructed?						

IMPROVING ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILLS – INTERVIEW SIMULATION
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FORM

Observed teacher's name: _____
Faculty, year, group number: _____
Number of students: _____
Date of the interview simulation: _____
Observer's name: _____

Instructions: While performing classroom observation, complete the form below, assigning a mark for each aspect*. Use the supplementary space for positive or negative observations about the way this activity has helped students improve their feedback-giving and receiving skills and finally indicate your opinion about how Teacher-Students/ Student-Student feedback exchange could be improved. At the end, discuss the results with the observed teacher and the other observers.
*KEY: 1) Poor - 2) Satisfactory - 3) Average - 4) Good - 5) Excellent

	English speaking activity - Interviews	Mark	Comments		English speaking activity - Interviews	Mark	Comments
Preparation of the activity	Did the teacher explain the interview simulation task clearly? (Did the students understand what interviewers and interviewees should do, how long the interview should last etc.?)			**After the activity**	Did the teacher discuss the interviewer's evaluation sheet/ the interviewee's feedback form with the rest of the class?		
	Were the students instructed on how to use the interviewer's evaluation sheet/ the interviewee's feedback form?				Did the discussion highlight good and bad performance as well as areas for improvement?		
	Did the teacher incorporate students' suggestions in the feedback forms?				Did the teacher acknowledge individual student performance?		
					Did the activity facilitate self-assessment? (Were students encouraged to identify and point to their own strong points and areas for imporvement?)		
					Was the activity useful for the development of students' English speaking skills? How?		
During the activity	Did the students have enough time to perform the interview simulation?				Did the activity facilitate peer-assessment? (Did students express their level of satisfaction with their colleagues' comments?)		
	Were the students interrupted by the teacher during the interview simulation?				What did you like about this activity?		
	What was the reason for the interruption?				What didn't you like about this activity?		
	Was the interruption helpful for the smooth running of the interview?				What suggestions do you have for the improvement of this activity?		
	Did the students use the interviewer's evaluation sheet/ the interviewee's feedback form as instructed?						

OBSERVATION SHEET - ORAL PRESENTATIONS

While listening to your coleagues' presentation, note their performance as follows:

0. = fail
0.5= sufficient
1= satisfactory
1.5= good
2= very good

Name of Students							
PRESENTATION: Company name							
Total points	0	0.5	1	1.5	2	TOTAL	Max. 10
I. CONTENT							**4**
I.a. planning and organization							1
I.b. subject knowledge							2
I.d. signalling							1
II. DELIVERY							**6**
II.a. audience contact							1
II.b. voice quality							1
II.c. timing							1
II.d. visual aids							1
II.e. accuracy (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation)							2

IMPROVING ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILLS – ORAL PRESENTATIONS

Students' Name: _____

Faculty, year, group number: _____

Teacher's name: _____

Date of the oral presentation: _____

Role(s) played in the interview simulation:　　Presenter ☐　　　Observer ☐　　　Both ☐　　　None ☐

Instructions: After performing oral presentations, complete the form below, assigning a mark for each aspect*. Use the supplementary space for positive or negative observations about the way this activity has helped you improve your English speaking skills and finally indicate your opinion about how this activity could be improved. At the end, discuss the results with the teacher and the rest of the class.

*KEY: 1) Poor - 2) Satisfactory - 3) Average - 4) Good - 5) Excellent

	English speaking activity – oral presentations	Mark	Comments		English speaking activity – oral presentations	Mark	Comments
Preparation of the activity	1. Did the teacher encourage students' attendance?			**After the activity**	11. Did the teacher discuss the Observation Sheet for Oral Presentations with the rest of the class?		
	2. Did the teacher tell you to prepare the presentation (content and delivery)?				12. Did you find the discussion helpful? (Did it highlight good and bad performance as well as areas for improvement?)		
	3. Did the teacher instruct you on how to prepare the presentation (content and delivery)?				13. Has the teacher acknowledged individual student performance?		
	4. Did you prepare the Presentation as instructed?				14. Did the activity facilitate self-assessment? (Were you able to identify your own strong points and areas for improvement?)		
	5. Did the teacher explain the oral presentation task clearly? (Did you understand what each presenter/group should do, how long the presentation should last etc.?)				15. Was the activity useful for the development of your English speaking skills? How?		
During the activity	6. Did you have enough time to perform the activity?				16. Did the activity facilitate peer-assessment? (Did you find your colleagues' comments helpful?)		
	7. Were you interrupted by your teacher / colleagues during the activity?				17. What did you like about this activity?		
	8. What was the reason for the interruption? Was the interruption helpful for the smooth running of the presentation?				18. What didn't you like about this activity?		
	9. Were you instructed on how to use the Observation Sheet for Oral Presentations?				19. What suggestions do you have for the improvement of this activity?		
	10. Did you use the sheet as instructed?						

IMPROVING ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILLS – ORAL PRESENTATIONS
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FORM

Observed teacher's name: _____

Faculty, year, group number: _____

Number of students: _____

Date of the interview simulation: _____

Observer's name: _____

Instructions: While performing classroom observation, complete the form below, assigning a mark for each aspect*. Use the supplementary space for positive or negative observations about the way this activity has helped students improve their feedback-giving and receiving skills and finally indicate your opinion about how Teacher-Students/ Student-Student feedback exchange could be improved. At the end, discuss the results with the observed teacher and the other observers.

*KEY: 1) Poor - 2) Satisfactory - 3) Average - 4) Good - 5) Excellent

	English speaking activity – Interviews	Mark	Comments		English speaking activity – Interviews	Mark	Comments
Preparation of the activity	**1.** Did the teacher explain the oral presentation task clearly? (Did the students understand what each presenter/group should do, how long the presentation should last etc.?)			After the activity	**9.** Did the teacher discuss the Observation Sheet for Oral Presentations with the rest of the class?		
	2. Were the students instructed on how to use the Observation Sheet for Oral Presentations?				**10.** Did the discussion highlight good and bad performance as well as areas for improvement?		
	3. Did the teacher incorporate students' suggestions in the observation Sheet?				**11.** Did the teacher acknowledge individual student performance?		
					12. Did the activity facilitate self-assessment? (Were students encouraged to identify and point to their own strong points and areas for improvement?)		
					13. Was the activity useful for the development of students' English speaking skills? How?		
During the activity	**4.** Did the students have enough time to perform the oral presentation?				**14.** Did the activity facilitate peer-assessment? (Did students express their level of satisfaction with their colleagues' comments?)		
	5. Were the students interrupted by the teacher during the oral presentation?				**15.** What did you like about this activity?		
	6. What was the reason for the interruption?				**16.** What didn't you like about this activity?		
	7. Was the interruption helpful for the smooth running of the oral presentation?				**17.** What suggestions do you have for the improvement of this activity?		
	8. Did the students use the Observation Sheet for Oral Presentations as instructed?						