



# 2016-17 Research Report



<b>Authors:</b>	Sue Drake
<b>Research Question:</b>	Is a form of coded marking in Year 7 French a more effective and efficient way of providing feedback than traditional marking in which the teacher marks and writes individual comments on students work?
<b>Context: When, Where, who?</b>	I was able to use two extremely comparable groups for this research project. Jo Wood, whose class was acting as the control group, had set 3 on the purple band and I had set 3 on the white band. Midway through term 3, both groups took a grammar test in class which was marked and returned. Both groups then took a similar grammar test at the start of term 4 and the results of the two groups were compared.
<b>Why do it?</b>	To attempt to ascertain the impact and effectiveness of coded marking
<b>What was tried?</b>	As above
<b>How was it tested?</b>	When Jo Wood's class took the first test, she provided individual written feedback on the students' work. I used a form of coding with my group. There were no written comments. These were replaced by quite a complicated series of colour codes. For example, if a word was highlighted in orange, the verb ending did not match the subject. When I returned the test, I explained what the codes meant with examples. I then insisted that the students discussed their answers with a partner and they had to work on correcting any incorrect answers, whilst I circulated to offer support and advice. I collected a set of marks for my class for the two tests and compared the raw scores to see whether there had been any improvement between the two tests. I did the same for Jo Wood's tests.
<b>What was the impact?</b>	In the control group, 15 students improved their scores between the two tests and 11 students got the same score for both tests. For my group, 21 students improved their scores, 2 students got the same mark and 5 students got between half and one mark fewer marks for the second assessment. Of significance is the fact that the marks for the control group only ever went up by one mark. For my group, 15 students improved their scores (which were out of 10) by at least 2 marks; six students improved their scores by 2 marks, two by 3 marks and four by 4 marks, one student improved his score by 5 and another by 6 marks,
<b>Implications for Practice: What next?</b>	The improvement in the tests scores for students suggests that the coded marking was effective. 71% of the students were able to improve their marks by more than one mark. From a teaching angle, I believe that students had to reflect more and really consider how to rectify their errors. The coded marking took me longer to complete than when I mark the work in a traditional way. It would have been less onerous if there had a more limited number of grammar errors that could have occurred. I had not anticipated that students would need a code for picking completely the wrong verb or for missing out or indeed adding in extra words. The marking became quite involved. I would undertake this form of feedback again as I believe that it really caused the students to focus and reflect and this seems to have produced a positive improvement in the results of the majority of the students.
<b>Links for further reading</b>	<a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/resources/teaching-learning-toolkit/feedback/">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/resources/teaching-learning-toolkit/feedback/</a> <a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/news/eef-marking-review-responding-to-feedback/">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/news/eef-marking-review-responding-to-feedback/</a> <a href="http://www.ncca.ie/uploadedfiles/primary/wiliam.pdf">http://www.ncca.ie/uploadedfiles/primary/wiliam.pdf</a>



# 2016-17 Research Report

