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Abstract

This research paper looks at teachers’ views, and use, of formative assessment in the subject of English 6. It also highlights students understanding and processing of feedback and their opinions of eight assessment tools. The study was carried out using mixed methods research with individual teacher interviews, a student focus group interview, and a questionnaire. My finding shows the difficulties with identifying formative assessment and working with this in a way that helps students in their development of English 6, and the need for tools to make feedback and guidance clearer for students. Furthermore, this study identifies the need for guidance from the Swedish national agency of education regarding how teachers should incorporate formative assessment in their classroom.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Background

When the new curriculum was introduced in 2011, the grading system was revised and shifted from the “IG–MVG” system to the “F–A” system. With a new curriculum, the forms of assessment also need to be revised to reflect the new content of the curriculum (Ogan-Bekiroglu, 2009). The requirements for grade E of English 6, states that students need to be able to “In oral and written communications of various genres ... work on and make simple improvements to their own communications” (Skolverket, 2011a). This goal clearly reflects the need of formative assessment in today’s school.

Dylan Wiliam (2011) writes about the difficulties of defining formative assessment and argues that many definitions differ from each other (Wiliam, 2011). The Glossary of Education Reform (2014) defines formative assessment as having the aim to gather information to help students improve while the learning process is happening, contrary to summative assessment that aims to measure students’ knowledge at the end of a project or a course. Formative assessment also is as a tool for learning. A formative assessment process is recognized by the fact that the assessment is developed through three stages: firstly, the goals for the assignment are clarified, secondly the student’s current position in regards to the goal is viewed, and thirdly the feedback that is given should help the student develop towards reaching the goal (Skolverket, 2014). Lundahl (2014) claims that the purpose of formative assessment is to establish learning processes that will help students’ develop their knowledge and teachers to develop their teaching.

1.2 Purpose and research questions

In Formativ bedömning på 2000-talet – en översikt av svensk och nationell forskning (Hirsh & Lindberg, 2015), several recommendations are provided for future research. One of these recommendations concerns the need for research aimed at an in-depth understanding of how formative assessment is carried out in Swedish classrooms, including a learner perspective. The purpose of my study is therefore to get an insight
into some teachers’ use of formative assessment as well investigate some students’ experiences and perceptions of formative assessment. To be able to learn a language, feedback on how to develop your knowledge is key. Therefore, as a future teacher of English, this research will probably also help me in my work with assessment and feedback.

My research questions are as follows:

- How do some upper secondary teachers view formative assessment and incorporate it in their teaching of English 6?
- How do some upper secondary students view and use the types of assessment they encounter in English 6?

This research do not aim to investigate teachers and students opinions and attitudes towards formative assessment, but to get a deeper understanding of how they understand and think about formative assessment.

The study consists of mixed methods research, a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. Zoltán Dörnyei (2007) divides the benefits of mixed method research into four categories, increasing the strengths while eliminating the weaknesses, multi-level analysis of complex issues, improved validity, and reaching multiple audiences. The quantitative part of the research consists of a questionnaire, which was completed by students studying English 6. This questionnaire was used as the basis for a discussion with a focus group of four students. The qualitative part of this research consists of four individual interviews with teachers of English 6 at an upper secondary school in Sweden, and one focus-group interview with four students of English 6. The interviews were semi-structured and recorded for partial transcription (Dörnyei, 2007). The interviews followed the interview guidelines suggested by Dörnyei (2007).
2. Theoretical context

2.1 The shift of the grading system

Assessment serve many purposes. Students can use assessment as an indication of what knowledge is, and how that knowledge is achieved. It is important for teachers to be aware of their assessment procedures to be able to assist students in developing their knowledge further (Hult & Olofsson, 2011). Alongside the new curriculum in 2011 the six-stage letter grading scale, as seen in Figure 1, was introduced in the Swedish education system.

![Figure 1. The previous grading scale in comparison with the new (adapted from Lundahl 2014:33)](image)

In all courses at the upper secondary school, knowledge requirements are developed to show what knowledge is needed to be able to reach a specific grade. A dash indicates so much absence that a student’s knowledge has not been possible to measure. The knowledge requirements for grades E, C and A are specified but for grades D and B there are no specifications. Grade B is given when the students have met the requirements for C and the majority of the requirements for A, and grade D should be given on the same principles but in relation to E and C (Skolverket, 2013d).
The purpose of the shift to the six-stage grading scale was to be able to give more precise and fair assessment. When the goals of the knowledge requirements are clear and precise, the likelihood of increased equivalence in the assessment of students’ knowledge increases (Lundahl, 2011).

2.2 Formative and summative assessment

Since the curriculum reform in 2011, there has been a lot of discussion focusing on formative assessment, but formative assessment is not a new phenomenon. Michael Scriven first introduced the term formative evaluation in 1967. Scriven used the term to explain the importance of evaluation when working on improving the curriculum. Different researchers and pedagogues have then used the term formative assessment for different purposes that may have led to the difficulties of defining formative assessment (Wiliam, 2011).

Some say that formative assessment is “the process used by teachers and students to recognize and respond to student learning in order to enhance that learning, during the learning” (Cowie & Bell, 1999, as cited in Wiliam 2011, p. 37), whilst others take a different approach and define formative assessment as a tool that teachers can use to identify what their teaching should focus on.

The difficulties in trying to give an exact definition of formative assessment is that it cannot be considered something that you either do or do not do. For example, some teachers can use an examination with a summative purpose formatively. Therefore formative and summative assessment should not be seen as a type of assessment, but more as a description of the purpose of the assessment. Instead of using the term formative assessment, many prefer to use assessment for learning as a description of the assessment purpose. This to clarify the importance of the process of assessment and not the assessment itself (Wiliam, 2011).

Lundahl (2011) stresses that formative assessment should not only help students to develop their knowledge but should also assist teachers in developing their teaching skills. Formative assessment should focus on the learning progression and give guidance and feedback during the learning process (Lundahl, 2011).
The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe, 2001) points to strengths as well as weaknesses connected to formative assessment. The strengths involve the clear focus on the process of supporting students’ knowledge development, and the weaknesses concern the pressure on the students to be able to process feedback and use it to develop independently. Students need to be able to interpret the feedback they are given as well as act upon it (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 186).

The focus on student responsibility in the feedback process can be seen in the Swedish national curriculum which says that the school’s goal is that all students individually should “take responsibility for their learning and study results, and [be able to] assess their study results and need for development in relation to the requirements of the education” (Skolverket, 2011a, p.13).

Summative assessment or assessment of learning can be more precisely explained than formative assessment. CEFR defines summative assessment as follows:”Summative assessment sums up attainment at the end of the course with a grade. It is not necessarily proficiency assessment. Indeed a lot of summative assessment is norm-referenced, fixed-point, achievement assessment (CEFR, 2001, p. 186).

Summative assessment measures what knowledge the student has acquired, whilst formative assessment seeks to strengthen students’ learning (Skolverket, 2016h). Lundahl (2011) defines summative assessment as a tool that measures the students’ knowledge in regards to the assessment criteria, with the help of a grade or some kind of statistical norm. Summative assessment can also be used a posteriori to evaluate and distribute resources (Lundahl, 2014).

Summative and formative assessment can be seen as contraries, but the Swedish National Agency of Education stresses that both are necessary and should be used so that they balance each other. Summative and formative assessment should be used in different stages of the learning process. They can also be combined, for instance when the results of a test is used to inform the teacher’s teaching and to provide feedback that points forward (Skolverket, 2011b).
### 2.3 Assessment and the teacher

Assessment and grading in Swedish upper secondary school play a significant role in the future education of its students. From a student perspective the final grade often decide what education or profession is within reach. One of the main educational debates in Sweden concerns fair and equivalent assessment (Lundahl, 2014).

A teacher should have excellent management skills. It is the teacher’s responsibility to make sure that students gain the expected knowledge at the end of a course. The Swedish National Agency of Education states that the national test is used as support for teachers in their grading. It should also function as a way of increasing the fairness of assessment. It has been reported that there are differences in the results on the national test and the final grade of the course, but the national test should not be seen as or used as a final course exam, but serve as part of the other assessment toward the final grade (Skolverket, 2015).

Teachers should make sure that the students gain knowledge in its different forms, for instance language abilities. If a student cannot process some certain knowledge, it is the teacher’s responsibility to assist and help the student gain the knowledge in another way (Lagheim, 2015). Consequently, a teacher has to be able to use a rich repertoire of teaching methods and assessment tools.

Lundahl (2014) discusses different methods to increase the assessment literacy of teachers. Teachers have the complex mission of assessing students understanding and this is only possible if the teachers themselves are aware of what it is that they are assessing: “The teacher cannot, for example, say that he or she has assessed students reading comprehension without having a clear understanding and a definition of what reading comprehension is” (Lundahl, 2014, p. 73, my translation).

To increase their assessment literacy teachers also need to have the skill to recognize and avoid subjectivity, have an understanding of key assessment concepts and of how different students are affected by different types of assessment. According to Lundahl, they should also know about assessment history. To have the opportunity to develop these skills teachers need support, not only by their employers but also from each other. By being provided with time for this in their working hours, teachers can get together in peer learning groups to develop common strategies for working with the national goals.
for upper secondary education as well as develop their teaching abilities (Lundahl, 2014).

2.4 Feedback

Hattie and Timperley (2007) claim that feedback should be seen as information about performance and understanding provided by someone else like a teacher, a parent, a peer or by self-assessing. Feedback provided by people in different positions can be effective because of the different approaches used and intentions involved. A peer might give feedback containing examples and suggestions based on their own experiences and by doing a self-assessment you can become aware of what needs to be added or developed further (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

To be able to receive feedback students first need to know what they are going to learn. Without clear learning intentions students might end up doing something different from what the teacher wanted them to, but by explaining the learning intentions and sharing clear assessment criteria this can be avoided. It is the teacher’s responsibility to define learning outcomes suited to the assignment and understandable by the learners (Wiliam, 2011).

The Swedish National Agency of Education suggests in their general advising, a four-step process for developing concretized learning outcomes based on the Swedish curriculum for upper secondary school. The first step is for the teacher to choose what parts of the curriculum the students will cover. Secondly, the aims of the curriculum need to be concretized. This is to help students understand what they are expected to learn. Thirdly, the knowledge requirements need to be analyzed to make sure that every student can develop the furthest that they are capable of. Finally, the overarching goals of the curriculum for upper secondary schools also need to be present when choosing the way of working (Skolverket, 2012c).

Lundahl (2014) proposes that “[w]orking with feedback is an ongoing process with the purpose of changing the relation between the actual result and the expected result.” (p. 55, my translation). He also highlights the fact that some researchers suggest that giving a grade encourages students to develop their knowledge. He further suggests that this might not be correct considering Butler’s study of the effects of different types of
feedback. The study indicated that when receiving only a grade there was no progression for further knowledge development compared to receiving comments without a grade. One of the most surprising findings was the outcome of receiving both comments and a grade. When these two types of feedback were combined students only focused on the grade. Students did not remember the comments and consequently, they did not learn anything from the feedback (ibid).
3. Methodology

When determining what type of research methodology a research study should consist of, it is important to proceed from the aim of the research. The research questions should be answered. Hence, it is crucial to develop the methodology with these in mind (Kuada, 2012). Since my research questions concern teachers’ and learners’ views of formative assessment, it was natural to use interviewing as a research method. Kvale points to the possibility of learning about people’s thoughts through interviewing: “If you want to know how people understand their world and their lives, why not talk with them?” (2007, p. 2).

This research consists of four individual interviews with teachers of English 6 at an upper secondary school in Sweden, and one focus-group interview with four students of English 6. The interviews were semi-structured with open-ended questions and recorded for partial transcription (Dörnyei, 2007). The quantitative part of the research consists of a questionnaire, which was completed by 54 students of English 6.

3.1 Mixed methods research

Mixed methods research involves the possibility of looking at a multifaceted subject from different angles. When combining a questionnaire with interviews you gain a deeper understanding of the subject. The combination also opens up for the possibility to see if the findings from the different methods support each other (Sandelowski & Barroso, 2002).

Dörnyei (2007) mentions four benefits of mixed method research. Firstly, increasing the strengths while eliminating the weaknesses, where the different methods complement each other and fill in the possible missing gaps of each individual method. Secondly, multi-level analysis of complex issues, which Dörnyei explains as the possibility of clarifying quantitative results in relation to qualitative outcomes and vice versa. Thirdly, when presenting results from mixed methods research you improve the validity of the research. Finally, when combining mixed methods, the research can
reach multiple audiences. There are parts that attract different audiences with different purposes for taking an interest in the research (Dörnyei, 2007).

Mixed methods research has raised questions such as how the quantitative data and the qualitative data are best integrated and how to make sure that the data from both methods are equally valid (Johnson et.al, 2007).

My research is what Johnson et.al. calls a *qualitative dominant* mixed methods research, meaning that the qualitative part of the research is dominant but at the same time dependent on the quantitative data (ibid). When combining mixed methods research you use triangulation to cross check data from different methods. Flick et.al. motivates their use of triangulation and their mixed methods research as the only option to be able to fulfill the need of different perspective of the research issue (Flick et.al. as cited in Mertens &Hesse-Biber, 2012). Their motivation also supports the use of mixed methods in this study. The questionnaire needed to be the basis of the focus group interview to be able to support the focus groups reasoning and give validity to the results of this study.

3.2 Interviews

Interviews can be divided into different types such as structured interviews, unstructured interviews and semi-structured interviews. Structured interview questions are set up like a questionnaire. The answers are expected to be quite short and for every interview conducted the order of the questions always stay the same. Unstructured interviews are based on different overarching themes where the interviewee is expected to talk more freely around the issues. When conducting each interview, the order of the themes may vary from time to time to be part of the ongoing conversation. Finally, semi-structured interviews are interviews that has a structure but also flexibility. There might be more overarching questions with possible sub questions to be able to clarify and develop answers (Rowley, 2012). The interviews in this study has the structure of a semi-structured interview.

There are both strengths and weaknesses to using interviews as a method of collecting data. The participants of an interview might give an idealized view of what
they do and what they think that the researcher wants to hear. Conducting interviews are also highly time consuming (Kuada, 2012).

Interviews can be used when aiming to gain a wider perspective of an issue. Many opponents of qualitative interviews argue that one cannot generalize such a small sample. However, one should not assume that the purpose of qualitative interviews is to achieve a generalized correct answer but to get an insight into many possible correct answers (Dörnyei, 2007).

When a research strives towards gaining an insight into one’s own understanding and perception of an issue, qualitative interviews are recommended (Kuada, 2012). By conducting interviews focused on a person’s personal interpretation of an issue you might not always get the answer that you were looking for. However, the flexibility of interviews allows the researcher to ask clarifying questions straight away. One does not have to be worried about not receiving the needed data (Dörnyei, 2007).

To develop my interview questions I used the book *Formativ bedömning – konkreta exempel och metodiska tips* (Heyer & Hull, 2014) as a guide. This book gives the reader an insight into the systematic work with assessment to increase students’ learning as well as insight into the research on formative assessment.

The four individual teacher interviews took place at the teachers’ workplace on four different occasions. The teachers work at a school with highly-motivated students. The school offers studies of social science, natural science and introductory classes in Swedish. It is located in the south of Sweden right in the center of a big city. Even with the central location the school is quite small and can therefore focus on attending every individual student’s needs. The school emphasizes the importance of collegial learning and all teachers have hours in their schedule set aside to this. The teachers were asked because of their current teaching schedule where they teach English 6. The teachers were asked via email regarding their willingness to participate in this study. At first one teacher declined because of other time consuming obligations. However, a new teacher was recommended by one of the others and was willing to participate.

The first interview took place on March 3rd and lasted about 45 minutes, the second and third interview took place on March 10th (on separate occasions) and also lasted for about 45 minutes each, and the last interview took place on March 24th and lasted for about 35 minutes. Information was provided via email about the purpose of the study and the anonymity of all participants. The interviewees received interview guidelines beforehand to have the opportunity to prepare themselves for the interview. It was
mentioned that any detailed preparation was not necessary since the purpose of the interview was to get an insight into the teachers’ ways of viewing and using formative assessment. Since I recorded the interviews with a dictaphone, the focus could be fully directed towards the interviewee’s answers, and the audio was saved for future partial transcription. The interviews were conducted in Swedish and later translated by me. I chose to conduct all my interviews in Swedish to acquire the qualities of a good interview according to the guide from Dörnyei (2007). He suggests that a good interview is both filled with details and has a natural flow directed by the interviewee (Dörnyei, 2007). To be able to achieve a situation where the interviewee does not feel stressed, rushed or misses details because of language barriers, conducting the interviews in Swedish was the preferred option.

The interviews followed the structure of the interview guideline (see appendix 1) which consisted of a set of questions divided into three parts. The first part concerned the teachers’ background. This served the purpose of providing information about their education and working experience and to get the conversation going. The second part consisted of questions regarding assessment. The focus shifted from more general questions, towards more in depth questions with room for clarifying unscripted questions from both the interviewees and the interviewer. The third and final part regarded the role of being a teacher in relation to the new curriculum, the workload, and collegial-learning.

The student interview consisted of one 50-minute interview session on April 13th with four students as a focus group. Two of the participants identified as females, one of which has immigrated parents, the other two identified as male where one also has parents that have immigrated to Sweden. By selecting students with different backgrounds and gender, I achieve what Patton (1990) calls a maximum variation sample. This to avoid homogenous samples and gain answers that highlights opinions that are shared amongst the varied participants (Patton as cited in Amos, 2002).

When conducting an interview with a focus group the researcher needs to be aware of the limitations of the procedure. Gibbs (2012) argues that a focus group can develop a hostile environment if the researcher does not have the control of the group. When arguments occur, participants might not say what they are thinking and valid opinions to the researcher is lost. There is also the issue of one or two participants dominating the discussion and the practical issue of finding a suitable time for everyone (Gibbs, 2012, as cited in Arthur et.al).
However, there are also strengths in conducting focus group interviews. When a participant feels strongly of an issue and gets to reflect and discuss this with others the participants gets to develop their thoughts further than if they were in an interview session alone (Gibbs, 2012). A group setting also allows the participants to change their opinions, some might see this as a disadvantage but as Gibbs expressed it, “changes…may occur through focus group research because new ideas have emerged through focus groups dialogues between participants” (Gibbs, 2012, p.26 as cited in Arthur et.al).

The participants are all students of natural science and are in their second year of upper secondary school. The students were contacted via email to confirm their willingness to participate, and set a time and date for the interview. It was important that the students did not miss any lessons so they decided a time that was best for them and I accommodated to their suggestion.

The students were not provided with an interview guideline beforehand but they had participated in filling out a questionnaire regarding assessment that formed the basis for the interview. The students were thus aware of the purpose of the interview. The interview was recorded with a dictaphone. The students were provided with a compendium of introductory questions regarding assessment and pictures with explanations of eight different tools for giving assessment (see appendix 2). These explanations were there to give them a clear idea of the different assessment tools. The interview was conducted in Swedish, to make sure that no misunderstandings and language limitations would occur. The students’ answers were later translated by me.

3.3 Questionnaires

When wanting answers from a large group of people, using questionnaires as a method of inquiry is recommended by Rowley. Questionnaires are often handed out to a large amount of people when wanting to show the general view of a matter. The results of questionnaires can be used to outline the results based on age, gender, or different categories and also to measure the frequency of the answers (Rowley, 2014).

The limitations of questionnaires regards the possibilities of losing individual participants opinions because of the issue of generalizing and sometimes calculating an
average. Questionnaires do not usually focus on detecting the why behind an answer and can therefore be seen as one-dimensional (Dörnyei, 2007).

In this research a questionnaire was handed out (see appendix 3) on two different occasions, the first on March 2\textsuperscript{nd} and the second on March 17\textsuperscript{th}, in two different classes of English 6. The classes were chosen because their teacher of English were already a participant of the study. Therefore, the teacher were willing to set aside time for me to come to one of the English lessons and conduct my survey.

The students were informed about the purpose of the study and had about 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Information about the purpose and how to contact me if they had questions were also provided on the questionnaire. In total, a number of 54 questionnaires were distributed and collected, and four of them needed to be eliminated because of not being completed properly. The participation was voluntary and therefore I had taken into account the possibility of someone not wanting to complete the questionnaire.

3.4 Research ethics

When conducting research Vetenskapsrådet, the Swedish Council for Research Ethics, has developed four principles for research ethics. The first concerns the information obligation where the researcher is obliged to provide the participants with information about their involvement in the research, their right to anonymity, as well as their right to resign from the participation whenever they like (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002). To make sure that this principle was attended to I informed the participants of this via email and face-to-face communication before they agreed to participate in the project.

The second principle concerns the consent to participate in the research. If the participants are under the age of 15, consent from a legal guardian should be collected (ibid). In this research all the participants were of an age that allowed them to decide on their involvement themselves.

The third principle concerns confidentiality, and thus the need to anonymise the setting and the identities of the participating teachers and students. In this study, the teachers and students interviewed have therefore been given pseudonyms.
The fourth and final principle concerns the use of the collected data. The data collected in this research is only to be used in this particular study and not in any other future research without the consent of the participants (ibid).

3.5 Participants

The participants of this study have been given gender-neutral pseudonyms to assure their anonymity. The pseudonyms are as follows: The teachers are called Robyn, Charlie, Taylor and Riley, while the students are named Casey, River, Jamie and Elliot.
4. Result and analysis

The findings of the research are presented and analyzed in the following section.

When analyzing the data, three overarching themes occurred which helped me divide the result and analysis section into three categories. They are as follows: (1) Teachers’ and students’ understanding of formative and summative assessment; (2) The teachers’ work with the curriculum and the students’ views on it, and (3) The teachers’ use of feedback and the students’ view on different tools for giving feedback.

4.1 Formative and summative assessment

In the following section, I present and detail teachers’ views on both summative and formative assessment, and describe how the students’ understand the assessment that they are given.

4.1.1 The teachers

As mentioned in the theoretical context it can be hard to give an exact definition of formative assessment. When the interviewees were asked to define what formative assessment is, three of the teachers all had a similar idea. Charlie gave me this definition:

Well, I prefer the term assessment for learning because I think that assessment should almost always proceed from the fact that you are learning something. You’ll learn what you are good at and what you need to develop further. And that process is
why its assessment for learning, because you should be able to move forward (interview with Charlie, March 3, 2016, my translation).

A similar definition was given by Riley who said as follows:

Well, I believe that formative assessment is what you do in the process. That always leads to some form of summative assessment in the end. If we have practised writing, for example reading logs, the first time they do it I will give comments on everything, they do peer response, I will try to give suggestions on how they can reformulate, or simplify, and then they work with these comments and this process leads to some kind of essay writing that will be the summative assessment. Everything we do up to that point is a formative process. In some cases, when the summative assessment is done they still receive formative feedback that can guide them and support them in developing further. The summative assessments always become formative as well (interview with Riley, March 24, 2016, my translation).

Like Riley and Charlie, Robyn focused on the process of learning when defining formative assessment. Robyn said that at first it was more a question of not giving a grade, but now it is the process of giving students the opportunity to work with their texts in different ways when they have received feedback.

Taylor, on the other hand, defined formative assessment as a type of feedback. Whenever a teacher gives comments on something, the assessment is formative. You give the students an opportunity to see what they need to correct and it is up to them if they want to work with it. Taylor also mentioned that peer-response is recommended to the students as a way of helping one other develop.

By looking at the different definitions given by the participants in this study, the first three all somewhat correlate with the definitions by Wiliam (2011) and Lundahl (2011). They focus on the process of student learning and formative feedback is something that is given constantly. As for Wiliam (2011) these teachers do not consider formative assessment as a “thing” that you do but as a process. The teachers’ responses also show that the difficulties of defining formative assessment are real. In accordance with Wiliam’s suggestion, one of the teachers, Riley, also talked about how summative assessment can be used formatively.
When looking at Taylor’s definition, one can conclude that in this case formative assessment is seen more as a tool than a continuous process. It is then used to scaffold the students in their attempts to achieve the intended outcomes. The teacher provides the tool but the students should take the responsibility for processing the information. Because of the difficulties of defining formative assessment, Taylor’s view on formative assessment should not be seen as wrong. This definition can in fact be supported by the Swedish National Agency of Education since the assessment guide states that assessment should contain information that the student can use to move forward (Skolverket, 2012c). Hattie’s and Timperley’s research also raises strong points on this issue. According to them, assessment can be divided into different levels. One level concerns the feedback that is given specifically about an assignment. It cannot be generalized to suit all assignments but is needed in a specific task to help students understand what needs to be worked on (Skolverket, 2011b).

In the assessment guide (2011b), peer-response and self-assessment are described as parts of formative assessment. The Swedish National Agency of Education states that self-assessment concerns students’ ability to independently reflect over the quality of their work (Skolverket, 2011b). All the interviewed teachers mentioned peer-response as a way of contributing to formative assessment and the Swedish National Agency of Education supports this when saying that a combination of feedback from the teacher and a peer will contribute to the students’ ability of doing self-assessment.

A contributing factor to the different views on formative assessment could be the lack of research on the combination of theoretical and practical methods related to formative assessment (Smith & Gorard, 2005). This could lead to teachers adapting different approaches to how they execute formative assessment in their classrooms. As seen in my study one of the teachers have adapted an approach where the responsibility of the formative assessment is placed on the student and the others focus on the process of how the students work with the feedback that they are given.

None of the interviewees defined formative assessment as a tool to help evaluate and adapt their own teaching. The Swedish National Agency of Education suggests that student’s self-assessment could be used as a foundation for how to plan and execute the lessons. A teacher should take the opportunity to reevaluate their lesson plans and instructions to be able to assist the students in their learning (Skolverket, 2011b). It should be noted that the teachers did not mention their own teaching in this interview,
but that does not mean that the teachers are unaware of the possibilities of using formative assessment to develop their own teaching.

When describing summative assessment all teachers stated that it is something they view as a check-point. Charlie said:

Summative assessment is reconciliation, a checkpoint we have when we must give a grade. That is summative, you look at what the student has produced, and that could be called assessment of learning sure, but for me it is more of a reconciliation.

(Interview with Charlie, March 3, 2016, my translation).

The other interviewees talked about summative assessment in the same way as Charlie. They mentioned that they need to use summative assessment whenever a theme or a project comes to an end. The teachers then combine a summative grade with comments that should be seen as formative. They all thus claimed that they use the summative checkpoint in combination with formative assessment.

The issue of giving summative assessment on single assignments is that it might not be viewed in line with the teachers’ intentions. Smith and Gorard’s (2005) study into the effectiveness of different types of feedback showed that only giving comments resulted in more learner progression in comparison to the combination of grading and comments. However, students that did not receive any grade but only comments often expressed concerns as to what level they were at. They therefore asked for both grades and comments (Smith & Gorard, 2005). Other studies about feedback have arrived at the same conclusions (Lundahl, 2014).

4.1.2 Students

The participating students answered a questionnaire about how they receive feedback, how they process it and how they understand it. To get a clear picture of what type of feedback the students are familiar with the students answered the following question: When you have written a text and get feedback from the teacher, in what form is that feedback delivered? The students, 50 in total, had three alternatives to choose from and they were to mark every option that they found correct. Graph 1 below shows the result:
Graph 1. When you have written a text and get feedback from the teacher, in what form is that feedback delivered?

The graph shows that 45/50 students receive comments in the text, and this alternative is clearly the most common. Receiving a comment at the end of a text and/or a letter grade appears to occur amongst somewhat half of the students.

When asking the focus group consisting of four students; Riley, Casey, Jamie and Elliot their response did align with what the questionnaire showed. Casey said that “Well, in our English folder on google drive, we have a folder that’s called assessment. So on some bigger assignments the teachers puts the feedback there” (Interview with focus group, April 13, 2016, my translation). River continued with saying that sometimes they write essays on Digiexam and receive comments in the texts there. River also stated that they do have ‘one-on-one’ sessions with the teacher “but only on bigger assignments, the ones where you get a grade and they are also a part of the final assessment” (Interview with focus group, April 13, 2016, my translation). The others all agreed and said that they do get comments and a grade on the bigger assignments that are part of the final assessment. The questionnaire also indicated that most of the feedback is given digitally as seen in graph 2 below.
When asked if they expect to receive a letter grade and if they prefer to get one, they all provided similar reasons for wanting them. They wanted to have a letter grade to be able to have a point of reference concerning their level of English. Riley said that “We need to know because the grade is what determines what qualification point you get and what your average becomes, so we need it.” (Interview with focus group, April 13, 2016, my translation). However, Elliot pointed to the likely consequence of not receiving a grade:

I think I would read the comments more. Because when you receive a grade, you only look at that. However, maybe if you did not get the letter grade you would actually read the comments and process them when you look at the criteria. But if you look at the criteria and you reach some on a C level and some on A and some on E it's hard to understand what level you are on...but maybe that's not important to know (Interview with focus group, April 13, 2016, my translation).

The other students agreed with the statement that they would read the comments more if they did not receive a letter grade. Casey said that:

When I look at a grade, for example a B I never look at the rest because I know where I’m at and I’m satisfied ... and if you get a grade that you are not satisfied with you don't want to read the rest either, you know? However, if you get criteria instead I think you are more willing to go in-depth and look at why you reached that level.
Jamie believed that getting only comments or criteria felt very “wishy-washy” and that would not help at all. The students agreed that the only time the comments are actually helpful is when they get time during the lessons to process and rewrite their texts. Jamie also brought up an example of when they had written logs where the teacher commented throughout the writing process, and these comments were appreciated. Casey expressed that they were given a second chance to make sure that their work was up to standard. They also stated that usually they just look at the comments and that is it.

Looking at the result of the questionnaire, the focus group’s opinions were in line with the answers of the other students. On the questionnaire the students were asked to describe as detailed as possible what they do with the feedback they receive. Most of the students wrote that they read the comments and then they forget them. One student wrote that “I look at my mistakes and sometimes correct them, and then I kind of forget” (Questionnaire, March 2, 2016, my translation) and another that “I look at them, I sometimes don’t understand them, but I try to remember what they were when I’m writing the next paper” (Questionnaire, March 2, 2016, my translation).

The students in my research share the views with the students in the research by Smith and Gorard (2005). In their research, the students expressed concerns about not receiving a letter grade but they could also see the benefits of only receiving comments. When asked about combining grades with comments one student in the previous research said “I think people would prefer that then because they would read the comments and look at their marks. And then they could understand the comment” (Smith and Gorard, 2005, p. 34).

The research also highlights that even though the students prefer a combination, it does not help students to improve their work, they will look at the grade first and not focus that much on the comment (Smith and Gorard, 2005). The participants of the focus group were aware of their way of looking at the combination of grades and comments, and stated that they would always look at the grade first.

The students in Smith and Gorard’s study also emphasized the importance of the content of the actual comment. Many comments were too general and the students felt that they did not understand how the comment would help them develop. Comments like, “good job”, “well done”, and “try harder next time”, were confusing for the students (ibid). Lundahl (2014) highlights that for a comment to be helpful for the
development process it needs to contain in-depth descriptions of what the students should do to improve their work. Regarding giving a grade in combination with comments, he expresses that “students’ are more likely to compare results with each other and the information of the feedback is consequently overlooked” (p. 128).

Giving effective feedback can be challenging and Lundahl (2014) suggests that teachers should give feedback frequently and avoid feedback that is too individualized. If there is a continuous discussion about the feedback between students and teachers, it is more likely to support the students’ development (Lundahl, 2014). Casey expressed the same sentiment when explaining the benefits of receiving feedback throughout the writing process: “It gives us a second chance to revise before we hand it in” (Interview with focus group, April 12, 2016, my translation).

4.2 Assessment and the Swedish national curriculum

The assessment section of the Swedish national curriculum for upper secondary education (2011a) includes the following goals; “The goals of the school are that all students individually; take responsibility for their learning and study results, and can assess their study results and need for development in relation to the requirements of the education.” (Skolverket, 2011a, p.13).

When asked about this part of the curriculum, the teachers stated that it is a very complex goal and that it can be hard for students to process statements of this kind. They had some split opinions where Robyn expressed that

If I am being honest, I do not think many students can do that. I think it is very difficult … but the formative feedback, if you give that with the purpose of telling the students what they need to do to get better, then the student can see what they are supposed to do. Moreover, the goal of taking responsibility for their own learning and results, they have to do that if they get adequate education. They need to understand that they are the ones that have to do the work. I show them what to do but they need to do it. The second part about assessing in relation to the requirements I think is too hard and they do not know how to do that (Interview with Robyn, March 10, 2016, my translation).
Taylor voiced similar thoughts about this part of the curriculum and said that the goals of the curriculum are too ambiguous and that even if you go through them with the students they are too hard to understand.

Charlie and Riley agreed that the formulation of the goal is too complex but said that if you constantly try to visualize the goal, the students will have a better understanding of it. Riley expressed it as follows:

I do not think they can take full responsibility, but I can see that when you put in a lot of work to explain it, they will become aware of what they need to do. I feel that the assessment rubrics we have are constantly there so they learn fast what it is that they need to do. I feel like they are good at doing some kind of self-reflection of their work (interview with Riley, March 24, 2016, my translation).

As for Riley, Charlie also emphasized the importance of having a dialogue with the students: “It’s kind of complex but that's what we work with and towards all the time by making the learning process visible for the students” (Interview with Charlie, March 3, 2016, my translation). According to the Swedish National Agency of Education (2011), the teacher is the leader of the classroom and should therefore create possibilities for the students to process the goals of the curriculum (Skolverket, 2011b).

To be able to reach the goals of the curriculum it is important that students know what they need to do to reach the knowledge requirements. Of the 50 students that took part in answering the questionnaire, 34 said that they understand what is needed of them to be able to reach the knowledge requirements for grade E/C/A. 16 said that they did not understand what they are suppose to do to reach a certain grade. The Swedish National Agency of Education states that teachers should introduce the specific knowledge requirements of the every project or theme (Skolverket, 2011b). The students were asked if they ever, as part of an assignment, received instructions about what to do to achieve the knowledge requirements. As seen in Graph 3, more than half of the students felt that they did receive instructions about what to do to reach the knowledge requirements.
When having asked the students if they receive instructions about what to do to achieve the knowledge requirements, this question was a natural segway into asking how well they understand the instructions they get. As seen in Graph 4, the students had a split view. Most of them said that they understood the instruction, but 12 of them did not.

The students were also asked what the teacher does to present the knowledge requirements of the course. The questionnaire provided four different options where the
students were to mark every option that they find appropriate. As seen in Graph 5, most of the students marked the option that the teacher introduces the knowledge requirements at the beginning of the course, half of the students also marked that the teachers introduces the knowledge requirements before every new assignment. Approximately a fifth of the students also marked the options that the teacher describes afterwards what was needed to reach the knowledge requirements or that the teacher does not often explain what is needed to reach a certain grade.

Graph 5. What does the teacher do to present the knowledge requirements? (Check all alternatives that fits).

The Swedish National Agency of Education has published a booklet (2012c) with guidelines focusing on assessment and grading in school. Here the different parts of the curriculum are referred to and comments and advice for teachers are provided (Skolverket, 2012c).

Regarding the goal that the students take responsibility for their learning and can assess themselves in relation to the requirements of the education, the guidelines highlight that students first need to understand how teachers assess. They also mention that this can be accomplished if the students do self-assessment and peer assessment. By working like this, the students will acquire a deeper understanding of assessment and thereby become able to take responsibility and assess themselves (ibid).
Considering this suggestion, the participating students were asked how often they get the opportunity to do self-assessment and peer assessment. They were also asked to describe what purpose these two assessment forms have. Graph 6 shows that 32/50 students answered that they had done a self-assessment 1-2 times per semester and 11 students answered that they never had been given the opportunity to do one.

Graph 6. How often during a semester, do you get the opportunity to do a self-assessment?

When asked to describe the purpose of self-assessment some of them stated that it made them see what they had done badly. One student wrote: “To see your mistakes so that you know what you did wrong” (Questionnaire, March 2, 2016, my translation). Most of the other claimed that they had no idea.

Previous research claims that by doing self-assessment in the classroom the students develop the ability of reflecting and analyzing their own performance, and thereby becoming aware of their acquired knowledge in regards to the assessment criteria (Logan, 2015). This suggests that self-assessment should not focus on students’ mistakes but on enabling them to compare and analyze their work in relation to the knowledge requirements.

Peer assessment is when students assess each other. Researchers such as Van Den Berg (2006) suggest that peer-assessment can contribute to increased learner independence. It can be a way of stepping away from the view of the teacher as the only source of feedback (Van Den Berg, 2006, as cited in Vickerman, 2009). In this research
students were asked about how many times a semester they got the opportunity to do peer assessment. They were also asked to describe the purpose of peer assessment. Graph 7 shows the students’ answers to the question concerning frequency:

![Graph 7. How often during a semester do you get the opportunity to do a peer-assessment?](image)

Out of 50 students 32 answered that they do peer assessment 1 to 2 times during a semester; 16 answered that it was 3 to 4 times and only two students said that they never got the opportunity to engage in a peer assessment.

When analyzing the answers the students gave when asked what the purpose of peer assessment is, the students were overall more positive compared to their answers about self-assessment. Answers like the following were typical:

It’s an opportunity to help your friends and at the same time get inspiration and suggestions about how you can develop your own work. (Questionnaire, March 17, 2016, my translation)

To help each other achieve a better result, also to see an assignment from different perspectives since you have written kind of the same text. (Questionnaire, March 17, 2016, my translation)
Give each other feedback, it is easier to read suggestions from your peers than your teacher. (Questionnaire, March 2, 2016, my translation)

A study by Linblom-Yllänne et al. (2006) compared students’ views of self-, peer and teacher assessment. It showed that students thought of self-assessment as something that could be difficult because it is hard to see yourself from another perspective. They considered peer assessment somewhat easier but had some difficulties criticizing their friends.

4.3 Types of feedback

The following section aims to explain teachers’ use of feedback and students’ views on different tools for giving feedback.

4.3.1 The teacher and feedback

Feedback can come in many forms from different sources like teachers, peers or oneself. The purpose is not to give a massive amount of feedback but to give feedback that strives to get students to move forward. It should help students become aware of their position in regards to the learning outcomes (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

The teachers in this research aims to give feedback that will help students to improve their work. All teachers wanted to give written feedback in different forms, either on the assignment or in online documents and folders where students can access their comments. Everyone highlighted the importance of letting students have access to their feedback at all times. Robyn said: “I want to give written feedback in forms of rubrics or comments because I want them to be able to look back on it at all times. You can always add oral feedback to the written to make sure that they understand the comments” (Interview with Robyn, March 10, 2016, my translation).

All teachers emphasized that working with some kind of rubric will help the students in understanding their feedback. It will make it clearer for the students to see what they need to work on and what they did well.
After receiving feedback, by comments or in a rubric, all teachers wanted to give the students the opportunity of working with and processing the feedback. The teachers did this in different ways where two had a session for students to rewrite the paper, and one had lessons with peer-reviews, which led to a lesson where the students were expected to revise the essay. One teacher used a method that differs from the others where the students get their papers back with no comments. They then do self-assessment and after that, they receive the document with the teacher’s feedback. The teacher suggested that by doing this the students acquire a better understanding of their own work and process what they have written in a new way.

The teachers in this research use rubrics that they have constructed together. Unless it is a national test, they do not co-assess students’ papers. The teachers mentioned that they can always ask their colleagues for a second opinion. The School Inspectorate has expressed concerns about the reliability of teachers’ assessment (Skolinspektionen, 2013)

Assessment in today’s Swedish schools needs to make use of three different interpretations. Firstly, teachers need to look at the curriculum and make an interpretation of what the knowledge requirements actually mean. Words and phrases like “somewhat fluent”, “essential details” and “nuanced” occur frequently, and they are open to interpretation. Secondly, teachers need to interpret a student’s different abilities towards the end of a year or a course. Finally, the teacher needs to qualitatively weigh the student’s part abilities together into a final grade (Skolverket, 2012c).

The National Agency of Education advocated that co-assessment is used to achieve equivalent assessment for all students. The idea is based on teachers working in teams or pairs, and when this occurs the reliability of assessment increases (Thornberg & Jönsson, 2015). Skolverket also suggests that co-assessment can help teachers “increase; understanding of the knowledge requirements and qualities in students performances, unanimity regarding assessment, assessment competence.” (Skolverket, 2013, p. 25)

4.3.2 Students views of feedback tools

The students participating in the focus group interview were all given a compendium (see appendix 2) with pictures and descriptions of eight different tools to use when
giving formative feedback. They were asked if they had seen any of the tools before and if they thought using any of them would help them in their development.

The students were somewhat familiar with the first tool, a checklist, but said that they had mostly seen it as a part of a lesson where the teacher had written it on the board and they had the option of writing it down themselves. They said that they often did it but then they forgot. They also said they may have found it right before a test and had had a quick look. When asked if they thought it would be helpful to have one when writing an exam they all thought so. River compared it to a formula sheet on a math test and said:

> But it's weird that you can't have one with you because on a math’s test you get these sheets with formulas, so you have the structure of the equations you should do. But maybe in English the structure is seen as something you should obviously know (Interview with focus group, April 13, 2016, my translation).

Heyer and Hull (2014) suggest that checklists should not be used to portray a student’s development but should instead be seen as a tool to help students know what their assignment should contain.

The students had all seen the second tool, the rubric. They were well aware of the purpose of having a rubric but expressed that the content of the rubric was often hard to understand. Jamie said: “We get them but I always think they are so hard to read and understand because it is exactly the same as what's on the Swedish National Agency of Education website” (interview with focus group, April 13, 2016, my translation). Elliot also expressed his concern about not understanding rubrics.

The issue of presenting a rubric that is similar or identical to the syllabus for English concerns whether the knowledge requirements should be concretized (Heyer & Hull, 2014). According to Heyer and Hull, the creation of a rubric together with the students will help them understand what they need to do to reach a certain level (ibid).

The third method of working with formative assessment is to have the students look at and analyze different examples produced by students. Using such examples, students can assess the essay themselves and motivate their assessment with the help of a rubric. This example engaged the students and River said: “This is so good! You can really see what you need to do” (interview with focus group, April 13, 2016 my translation). The others agreed and said that it would give them a bit of hope when looking at an
example, because sometimes they might have thought the example was a C but it turned out to be an A.

Peer assessment was the fourth method presented to the students and they said that they had done it but never in the presence of another student. Elliot said:

Yeah we have done it but not together, we just give each other our texts and then we give comments to each other. It is really hard because when it is someone you do not really know or [if it is not] one of your close friends, you just feel uncomfortable when giving comments, and you are never sure if your comment is good. If it would have been a friend, you can explain more after the lesson. (Interview with focus group, April 13, 2016, my translation)

The students’ reactions to giving feedback to each other are in line with research findings. Peer assessment has many advantages but also its limitations. Vickerman (2009) emphasizes that when working with peer assessment you need to take into consideration if the students has the knowledge and skills to assess each other. To avoid the awkwardness that concerned the students in my study, Vickerman suggest that peer assessment should be carried out anonymously (Vickerman, 2009).

The fifth example concerned self-assessment. None of the students said that they had done it before and they felt that it would be difficult. Charlie expressed that “[t]his is the worst, because you have obviously put in all your energy to do something so when you send it in you just want to forget about it” (interview with focus group, my translation).

Heyer and Hull (2014) write about the importance of doing self-assessment, since it may help students to develop their metacognition, but for this to work the teacher needs to be the leader of the process.

As for self-assessment, the students had never used the sixth method, two stars and a wish, to give or receive feedback. They all agreed and said that it is always good to see what you do well and having the needed revision expressed as a wish would feel nice.

Heyer and Hull (2014) suggest using two stars and wish for all purposes, teachers’ feedback, peer feedback or as a self-reflection (ibid).

When asked about the method called exit ticket, the group said that they had never done that either. Charlie expressed that
[i]t would be good to do it sometimes, the last 10 minutes of a lesson just so you can collect your thoughts. I usually don’t think about what we have done during the lesson. I just focus on having the next lesson. (Interview with focus group, April 13, 2016, my translation)

An exit ticket serves the purpose of letting the teacher know if the lesson was successful. When analyzing student answers you can see if the purpose of your lesson was fulfilled (Heyer and Hull, 2014).

The final method discussed in this research is called “the staircase of goals”. It serves the purpose of helping the students visualize what their main goal is and how to get there. Jamie expressed his views as follows:

In all these individual subjects, you never have time to reflect on how you get to a grade or your progression to get there. You just do it and move on to the next course, it feels like you just do stuff with no real purpose. (Interview with focus group, April 13, 2016, my translation)

River said that usually it is not the grade that is most important: it is how you get there. Charlie agreed and said that “[t]hese individual staircases would be good because we all have different things we need to work on” (interview with focus group, my translation).

The students’ responses to the different tools show that they all have a positive attitude towards incorporating them in their learning. Incorporating these tools would help attend to different student needs (Heyer & Hull, 2014).
5. Conclusion

In the beginning of my research, I posed the following questions;

- How do some upper secondary teachers view formative assessment and incorporate it in their teaching of English 6?
- How do some upper secondary students view and use the types of assessment they encounter in English 6?

The results of this research shows the difficulties of assessing in the name of fairness and equivalence. The knowledge requirements found in the syllabuses for English are open to interpretation. The teachers in this study all have different ways of working with their formative assessment. They have developed assessment rubrics together but with the exception of the national test, they do not use any co-assessment. During the interviews with the teachers, it became clear that all teachers perceive that they work with formative assessment, consisting of comments and rubrics. However, when defining formative assessment it became clear that formative assessment is a matter of one’s own interpretation.

I have also studied how some upper secondary students view, and how they claim that they act upon, the types of assessment they encounter in English 6. The students participating in this research expressed their concern about not understanding the comments they receive and mostly focusing on the grade. Previous research by Smith and Godard (2005) indicates that when giving a grade as well as comments the valuable information of the comments is forgotten (Smith & Godard, 2005). The results of the questionnaire and the interview with the focus group indicate that most students read the comments they receive but do not process them in a way where they remember them, unless time is given during a lesson to do so. By getting clearer guidelines from the Swedish national agency of education, effective feedback is more likely to occur.

During the interview with the focus group, eight different methods of working with formative assessment were presented. The results show that the students responded positively to using more concrete methods when working with feedback and assessment.

Even though the results of this research are limited to some teachers and learners at one upper secondary school, they may still offers insights into the difficulties and
benefits of working with formative assessment. By having gained insights into students’ views, I hope to give inspiration about different methods that can help teachers with feedback and formative assessment. My study also shows the need of clearer guidelines from the Swedish national agency of education. This to be able to reach a unanimous strategy of working formatively and avoid individual interpretations of what working formatively means. By doing this all students will receive the feedback they need in a way where they can develop their knowledge further.

As for future research, a larger study about the different interpretations of formative assessment is needed. In addition, to gain deeper understanding of students’ hectic situation of studying multiple subjects at once, a long-term study of students’ work on processing comments and feedback would be helpful.
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Appendix 1.

**Bakgrund**

- Berätta om din utbildning.
- Berätta om din lärerfarenhet.

**Bedömning**

- Hur uppfattar du formativ bedömning, också kallad bedömning för lärande?
- Hur uppfattar du summativ bedömning, också kallad bedömning av lärande?
- I läroplanen för gymnasiet står det att varje elev "tar ansvar för sitt lärande och sina studieresultat, och kan bedöma sina studieresultat och utvecklingsbehov i förhållande till kraven för utbildningen.". Till vilken grad tror du att dina elever kan axla detta ansvar och göra det?
  - Vad gör du med de elever som klarar detta i mindre grad?
- När och hur bedömer du eleverna idag och vilka av de här formerna har ett formativt syfte?
  - Ger du din feedback på olika sätt och med olika hjälpmedel?
  - Hur vet du att eleverna förstår din feedback och kan använda den för sitt lärande?
- Vilken typ av summativ bedömning använder du idag?
  - I vilken utsträckning kombinerar du summativ och formativ bedömning?
  - Hur anpassar du din bedömning till elevernas behov?

**Lärarrollen**

- På din arbetsplats idag pågår kollegialt lärande. Till vilken utsträckning handlar detta om bedömning?
- Hur ser du på förhållandet mellan formativ och summativ bedömning? Vad innebär formativ bedömning för ditt arbete som engelsklärare?
Appendix 2.

- Hur får ni vanligen återkoppling (feedback) på något ni skrivit?

- Hur får ni återkoppling på det muntliga?

- Finns det andra former av återkoppling under terminen?

- Förväntar du dig att få ett bokstavsbetyg på dina bedömningsuppgifter?
  - Varför? Varför inte?
  - Finns det några fördelar med att få betyg på enskilda uppgifter?
    Finns det några nackdelar?

- Jag kommer nu visa er åtta olika metoder för att ge återkoppling. Jag undrar om ni har sett dem här förut och i vilken utsträckning tror du/ni att detta exempel skulle kunna vara lärorikt? På vilket sätt?


![Checklista](image1.png)

![Matris](image2.png)
3. Elevexempel.
   "Läraren delar ut två elevexempel och ni får i grupper diskutera, jämföra och analysera de olika texterna. Ni får också komma med förslag hur texterna kan förbättras.”

   “Ni får sitta i par och med hjälp av matris, checklista eller instruktioner tillsammans bearbeta varandras arbeten för att visa på vad som är bra och vad som kan förbättras.”

5. Självbedömning.
   "Här får du tillfälle att bedöma din egen text. En själv bedömning behöver inte se ut exakt såhär.”

6. “Two stars and a wish”.
"När du gjort en uppgift kan du av din lärare eller dina klasskamrater få 2 saker du gjort bra och en önskning om en sak du kan förbättra."

7. “Exit ticket”.

Reflektera! Vad har du lärt dig som var nytt i dag?
Vad var svårt i dag?
Är det något du vill lära dig mera om?
Behöver du repetera något?
Vad skulle du ändra på i dagens lektion för att den skulle bli bättre/tydligare?

“I innan du går ut från en lektion fyller du i en exit ticket där du svarar på korta frågor om vad du lärt dig under dagens lektion och om det finns något du undrar över.”

8. Måltrappan

“i början av en kurs eller ett projekt får du skapa din egen måltrappa. Där har du ett huvudmål och får själv bestämma vad dina delmål ska vara.”
Appendix 3.

Hej och tack för att du fyller i följande formulär!
Detta formulär är helt anonymt och kommer att hjälpa mig i skrivandet av mitt examensarbete som handlar om bedömning. Jag uppskattar att du funderar på dina svar och svarar ärligt, detta kommer hjälpa mig mycket. Frågorna i detta formulär rör bara ämnet Engelska, ha därför inga andra ämne i åtanke när du svarar.
Om du har några frågor om detta formulär kan du nå mig på;
maria.eriksson4@skola.malmo.se
Tack igen för ditt deltagande!

1. När du har skrivit en text och får återkoppling från läraren, hur ser den ut?
   (Kryssa i alternativen som passar)

   □ Jag får kommentarer fortlöpande i texten.
   □ Jag får kommentarer i slutet av texten.
   □ Jag får ett bokstavsbetyg (A, B, C osv.)


   □ Jag får återkopplingen muntligt.
   □ Jag får återkopplingen handskriven.
   □ Jag får återkopplingen digitalt.


   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
För frågorna nedan, kryssa för det alternativ som passar dig bäst.

4. Känner du dig säker på vad som krävs för att uppnå de olika kunskapskraven för att nå A/C/E i Engelska 6?

☐ Ja    ☐ Nej

5. När du får uppgifter i skolan, får du då oftast samtidigt instruktioner om vad som krävs för att nå kunskapskraven?

☐ Ja    ☐ Nej

6. När du får instruktioner, hur väl förstår du efter genomgången vad du ska göra för att nå kunskapskraven?
7. Hur gör lärarna när de går igenom kunskapskrav för dig? Kryssa i det/de svarsalternativ som stämmer bäst:

☐ Introducerar kunskapskraven i början av termen/kursen

☐ Introducerar kunskapskraven inför varje ny uppgift

☐ Beskriver i förväg vad kunskapskraven betyder för en viss uppgift

☐ Beskriver i efterhand vad som krävdes för att få ett visst betyg

☐ Lärarna berättar ofta inte vad som krävs för att nå upp till ett visst betyg

☐ Annat:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

8. Hur ofta får du tillfälle att göra en självbedömning under en termin? (Kryssa för det alternativ som passar bäst)

☐ Aldrig   ☐ 1-2 gånger   ☐ 3-4 gånger   ☐ 5 eller fler gånger

Vad är syftet med självbedömning?

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

☐ Aldrig   ☐ 1-2 gånger   ☐ 3-4 gånger   ☐ 5 eller fler gånger

Vad är syftet med kamratbedömning?

Tack för din medverkan 😊