****

ST Day Online event: Wednesday 14 October 2020

**Working at the research-practice interface:**

**Drawing on ‘hard evidence’ using OASIS summaries**

The broad aims of the day are:

1) To feel more confident about distinguishing ‘peer-reviewed’ research from other uses of the word ‘research’.

2) To learn about some research into classroom practice, in order to begin to understand the findings from this research and what the studies themselves are like.

3) To identify any links between the research and the issues NCELP has had to consider.

There are three sessions throughout the day. Each session consists of a 20-minute opening discussion, time to read and answer questions about a small set of summaries centred around a theme, followed by a 20-minute discussion in a small group. There is then a wrap-up session to discuss some of the benefits and challenges of understanding research.

# Wednesday 14 October 09:30 – 15:30

 9:30 **Introduction**

 9:45 **Session 1:** *Effects of different ways of revisiting vocabulary and grammar*

11:15 15-minute break

11:30 **Session 2:** *Written corrective feedback*

12:50Lunch break (40 mins)

13:30 **Session 3** *Teaching methods and learner characteristics*

 15:00 **Wrap-up/general discussion: Working at the research-practice interface**

15:30 End of Day

**SESSION 1: EFFECTS OF DIFFERENT WAYS OF REVISITING VOCABULARY AND GRAMMAR**

This session looks at the effects on learning of how we structure (or ‘schedule’) practice. Two summaries (1 and 2) focus on grammar learning and two summaries (3 and 4) focus on vocabulary learning.

***Pre-reading group discussion (20 mins)***

When answering these two questions, if you are already adopting the NCELP year 7 & 8 SOW, then please think about your Hub schools (or your own years 9-11) instead. If you are using your own SOW (including adapting it), then think about those when answering the questions.

1. Do all teachers know ‘what’, ‘how often’, and ‘in what combinations’ they revisit:

*specific* vocabulary,

*specific* grammar features,

*specific* sound-symbol correspondences?

2. Is this information laid out in your scheme of work? At what level of detail?

***Post-reading group discussion (20 mins)***

Make notes on each of the following points so you are ready to discuss them.

1. Are there any main ‘take-away’ points from the totality of all the summaries?

2. Has reading the summaries made you think differently about pedagogy (in your own or your Hub schools)? If so, how? Are there any *potential* implications to consider for your classroom practice or SOW (in your school or your Hub schools)?

***Summary 1*** [How should grammar practice be sequenced to maximize learning?](https://oasis-database.org/concern/summaries/qv33rw77z?locale=en)

1. How many groups were in the study and what was the difference between them?

2. How would you change the design of the study if you could do a follow-up study?

***Summary 2***[Interleaved (mixed) grammar practice can assist learners with weaker working memory](https://oasis-database.org/concern/summaries/0k225b13n?locale=en)

1. What task was used in the practice phase?

2. How did working memory interact with practice? Why might this be?

***Summary 3***[The long-term benefits of making the simple change from non-cumulative to cumulative weekly vocabulary quizzes](https://oasis-database.org/concern/summaries/m613mx741?locale=en)

1. How many words were included in the complete set?

2. Why is it important to measure learning immediately and also ‘a bit later’?

***Summary 4***[The benefits of teaching vocabulary before a reading activity](https://oasis-database.org/concern/summaries/sx61dm473?locale=en)

1. Here is an example of each of the vocab tests. Match the examples to the types of vocabulary test mentioned in the summary.

* Test 1

*Please choose the right spelling for the following words that appeared in the story (only one is correct)*

1. a) glage b) glave c) glabe d) glube

* Test 2

*What is the meaning of the following words? Write as much as you remember about them.*

**1. glabe: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

* Test 3

*Please select one of the following definitions. Only one is correct. If you don’t know the meaning of the word, please select option e) “I don’t know”.*

**1) glabe**

 **a) basement**

 **b) house**

 **c) prison**

 **d) food hall**

 **e) I don’t know.**

2. What follow up question would you ask the researchers?

**SESSION 2: WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK**

The recent Hub day/TRG on corrective feedback looked mainly at *oral* error correction. This session looks only at direct and indirect feedback on *writing*. The studies show how feedback benefits different language features (e.g., vocabulary versus grammar), and how the effectiveness of correction is influenced by learners’ individual characteristics.

***Pre-reading group discussion (20 mins)***

1. Is there a policy on *written* error correction in your department / in your Hub schools’ departments? That is, a policy *for foreign languages, specifically*.

2. Following the recent Hub day/TRG on corrective feedback, what might such a policy look like, about the purposes and nature of written corrective feedback?

***Post-reading group discussion (20 mins)***

Make notes on each of the following points so you are ready to discuss them.

1. Are there any main ‘take-away’ points from the totality of all the summaries? Generally, to be sure of helping most learners, should *written* feedback tend to be:

‘direct’ or ‘prompting the learner to work it out’?

‘focus on a small set of errors’ or ‘correct everything that is wrong’?

2. Has reading the summary made you think differently about pedagogy (in your own or your Hub schools)? If so, how? Did any of the findings surprise you? If so, which and why? Are there any *potential* implications to consider for your classroom practice or SOW (in your school or your Hub schools)?

***Summary 5*** [The effectiveness of comprehensive corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy](https://oasis-database.org/concern/summaries/rb68xb86g?locale=en)

1. What is the difference between direct and indirect feedback according to the summary?

2. Results showed direct and indirect feedback was efficient for different language features. Why might that be?

***Summary 6*** [The effects of direct written corrective feedback, metalinguistic written comments, and learner differences on foreign language learners’ use of articles](https://oasis-database.org/concern/summaries/474299142?locale=en)

1. What was the task in the instruction session?

2. How would you change the design of the study if you could do a follow-up study?

***Summary 7*** [Does direct and indirect error correction help English foreign language learners write more accurate texts in the short-term and in the long-term?](https://oasis-database.org/concern/summaries/s4655g713?locale=en)

1. What does “long-term” mean in this study?

2. What was the main finding?

**SESSION 3** **TEACHING METHODS AND LEARNER CHARACTERISTICS**

The studies in this session focus on individual differences in learners’ characteristics and whether teaching methods can really mediate these differences.

***Pre-reading group discussion (20 mins)***

1. In what ways can students in a class differ from each other in terms of their ‘aptitude’? That is, a) what kinds of cognitive abilities are needed to learn a language and b) how can these vary between students?

2. One of the missions of NCELP was to help students access a foreign language who otherwise might not do so. Do you think the design and delivery of teaching activities in class can *really* help learners who might have less ‘aptitude’, or is it a given that those with more aptitude will *always* benefit more from *whatever* you do?

***Post-reading group discussion (20 mins)***

Make notes on each of the following points so you are ready to discuss them.

1. Are there any main ‘take-away’ points from the totality of all the summaries? For example, what ability seems to play a major role in aptitude for language learning?

2. Has reading the summaries made you think differently about pedagogy (in your own or your Hub schools)? If so, how? Are there any *potential* implications to consider for your classroom practice or SOW (in your school or your Hub schools)?

***Summary 8*** [Working memory moderates the effects of instruction as learners start a new language](https://oasis-database.org/concern/summaries/3x816m604?locale=en)

1. Did the feedback include the grammar rule or not?

2. What other study we have seen today discussed working memory? What were the findings?

***Summary 9*** [A simpler task can increase the benefits of error correction for learning a grammatical feature, regardless of aptitude](https://oasis-database.org/concern/summaries/jm214p25t?locale=en)

1. What was the difference between a “simple” and a “complex” task?

2. How was knowledge of the grammar feature assessed, and what do you think about that?

***Summary 10*** [Method of instruction has the potential to level differences in aptitude between learners](https://oasis-database.org/concern/summaries/4f16c2963?locale=en)

1. What were the three experimental groups and what were the differences between them?

2. Do you think any of the three approaches compared in this study is like the NCELP approach, or would we need another design to evaluate that approach in its totality?

***Summary 11*** [The importance of explicit learning in the primary foreign language classroom](https://oasis-database.org/concern/summaries/765371506?locale=en)

1. What language were the learners tested on?

2. What do the findings suggests about the nature of language aptitude?

**WRAP-UP / GENERAL DISCUSSION (25 MINS)**

1) Can you see any links between NCELP pedagogy and SOW and the issues being researched in the studies you looked at today? Has NCELP derived any *basic* ideas or principles from this research?

2) What makes a good study when trying to collect ‘*hard evidence*’ about ‘what is effective’?

 What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of the studies? You could think about: the nature of the comparison being examined; the number of participants; the kinds of participants; the measures of learning used; the kinds of timescales being investigated.

3) Describe your ideal study to get ‘hard’ evidence about the effectiveness of different practice schedules?

***Participants take away the ‘Summary of the Summaries’ document.***