ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES AND FEEDBACK

Alimova Shakhnoza Yakhshibaevna

English teacher at Termez branch
Tashkent State Technical University.

ANNOTATION

The purpose of this article is to clarify some key terms that we use, discuss some earlier reviews that define the baseline on which our research is based, discuss some aspects of the methods used in our work, and finally, introduce the structure and the rationale for the subsequent sections.

KEY WORDS: *evaluation of results, feedback, written answer, English.*

ОЦЕНКА РЕЗУЛЬТАТОВ ОБУЧЕНИЯ И ОБРАТНАЯ СВЯЗЬ

Алимова Шахноза Яхшибаевна-

Преподаватель английского языка Термезского филиала Ташкентского государственного технического университета.

Аннотация

Цель данной статьи состоит в том, чтобы уточнить некоторые ключевые термины, которые мы используем, обсудить некоторые более ранние обзоры, которые определяют базовую линию, на которой основано наше исследование,обсудить некоторые аспекты методов, используемых в нашей работе, и, наконец, представить структура и обоснование последующих разделов.

Ключевые слова:оценка результатов,обратная связь,письменный ответ,английский язык.

DISCUSSION

Recent years one of the most famous features of studies of assessment has been the modification in the focus of attention, towards greater interest in the interactions between assessment and classroom learning and away from concentration on the properties of restricted forms of test which are only weakly linked to the learning experiences of' students. This move has been coupled with many expressions of hope that improvement in classroom assessment will make a strong contribution to the improvement of learning. So one main purpose of this review is to survey the evidence which might show whether or not such hope is justified. A second

purpose is to see whether the theoretical and practical issues associated with assessment for learning can be illuminated by a synthesis of the insights arising amongst the diverse studies that have been reported.

The purpose of this Introduction is to clarify some of the key terminology that we use, to discuss some earlier reviews which define the baseline from which our study set out, to discuss some aspects of the methods used in our work, and finally to introduce the structure and rationale for the subsequent sections.

Evaluation of educational results is an important means of stimulating students' learning activities. As practice shows, attempts to exclude

controlling the activities of a student in whole or in part from the educational process lead to a decrease in the quality of education. Today, the functions of pedagogical assessment are not limited only to identifying the shortcomings of the organization of the educational process, but are considered as its critical analysis, conducted to improve learning outcomes and improve the quality of education. Here it should be pointed out, assessment and feedback associate together and they are tandem.

Feedback is widely seen as crucial for encouraging and consolidating learning, and this significance has also been recognised by those working in the field of second language (L2) writing. Its importance is acknowledged in process-based classrooms, where it forms a key element of the students' growing control over composing skills, and by genre-oriented teachers employing scaffolder learning techniques. In fact, over the past twenty years, changes in writing pedagogy and research have transformed feedback practices, with teacher written comments often supplemented with peer feedback, writing workshops, conferences, and computer-delivered feedback. But while feedback is a central aspect of ESL/EFL writing programs across the world, the research literature has not been unequivocally positive about its role in writing development, and teachers often have a sense that they are not making use of its full potential. In this paper we examine recent research related to feedback on L2students' writing, focusing on the role of feedback in writing instruction and discussing current issues relating to teacher written and oral feedback, collaborative peerfeedback and computer-mediated feedback.

Feedback has long been regarded as essential for the development of second language (L2) writingskills, both for its potential for learning and for student motivation. In process-based, learner-centredclassrooms, for instance, it is seen as an importantdevelopmentaltoolmovinglearnersthroughm ultipledrafts towards the capability for effective self-expression. From an interactionist perspective it isregarded as an important means of establishing thesignificance of reader responses in shaping meanings(Probst 1989). In genre classrooms feedback is akey element of the support provided by theteacher to build learner confidence and the literacyresources to participate in target communities. In fact, over the past twenty years, changes in writingpedagogy and insights gained from research studieshave transformed feedback practices, with teacher written comments now often combined with peer feedback, writing workshops, oral-conferences, or computer-delivered feedback. Summative feedback,focusing on writing as a product, has generally beenreplaced or supplemented byformative feedbackwhich points forward to the student's future writingand the development of his or her writing processes.

But while feedback is a central aspect of L2 writingprograms across the world, the research literaturehas not been plainly positive about its role inwriting development, and teachers often have a sensethattheyarenotmakinguseofitsfullpotential.Many questions relating to feedback remain unanswered or only partially addressed: Does it make a difference tostudents'writing?Ifso,inwhatareas?Whatisthebestwa y of delivering feedback? Can error correction andform focused feedback have long term benefits onstudents' writing? Can technology play a greater partin delivering feedback? What role can peer feedbackplay in writing development? How far does cultureplay a part in student responses to feedback? Howcan teacher feedback enhance students' ability toindependently reflect on their writing? What are theimplications of feedback for teacher control and textappropriation? This paper reviews recent researchwhich addresses these questions by focusing onteacher written and oral feedback, peer conferencingand computer-mediated feedback. The volume of this research means that we are forced to focus on L2learners of English, although the issues are commonto studies of learners of other languages.

Teacher written feedback

Despite increasing emphasis on oral response and theuse of peers as sources of feedback, teacher writtenresponse continues to play a central role in mostL2 and foreign language (FL) writing classes. Manyteachers feel they must write substantial commentson papers to provide a reader reaction to students'efforts, to help them improve as writers and to justifythe grade they have been given (K. Hyland 2003).Research in the 1980s and early 1990s, however,began to question the effectiveness of teacher feed-backasawayofimprovingstudents'writing.Early research on native English speakers (L1) suggested thatmuch written feedback was of poor quality and wasfrequently misunderstood by students, being vague,inconsistent and authoritarian, overly concernedwith error and often functioning to appropriate, or take over, student texts by being too directive.

A substantial amount of the research on teacher written feedback in L2 writing contexts has beenconcernedwitherrorcorrectionandwhetherthisben efitsstudents'writingdevelopment.Researchinthisarea has sought to explore whether error correctioniseffectiveandwhatstrategiesandtreatmentste achersuse for error correction, and to discover the effectscorrection has on students' immediate revisions andtheir longer term development as writers.Another key area of investigation has been thestance teachers take towards students' texts and therelationship they build with their learners whengiving feedback. It has long been recognised thatteachers approach texts with a number of

differentpurposes in mind and that these may change withdifferent assignments, different students and differentdrafts (Bates, Lane & Lange 1993). Thus commentaryon a draft is likely to serve more immediatepedagogical goals than that given on a final product,for instance, and process approaches mandate thatteachersshouldcommentonideasinearlierdraftsand on grammar in later drafts (e.g. Zamel 1985). Severalresearchers have observed, however, that becausemeaning is only realised through language, thecontent-form distinction creates a false separation.

One key variable here is thetype of error feedback that is given, and a number of researchers have compared directfeedback,where theteacher makes an explicit correction, with indirectforms where he or she simply indicates that an error has been made by means of an underline, circle, code,etc. The role of explicitness in student uptake, or response to feedback, is important as whileindirecterror feedback may encourage learner reflectionand self-editing (Lalande 1982), lower proficiencystudents may be unable to identify and correct errorseven when they have been marked for them (Ferris&Hedgcock 2005).Findings on feedback type have been conflicting,largelyduetothewidelyvaryingstudentpopulations,types of writing and feedback practices examinedand the diverse research designs employed. For example, in assessing and giving feedback for future lawyers students, the important notion that should be pointed out, we always pay great attention to their critical thinking abilities and surely, the type of their writing research. Particularly, case study and giving legal advice to the issues are the right tool to enhance the abilities and skills. Undoubtedly, assessment and giving feedback play the vital role in adapting knowledge and boost future proficiency of learners. The concept of appropriation has been redefined with the suggestion that assumption can go in two directions. Appropriation of teacher feedback can be an active strategy used by novice academic writers as they develop their own voices and their familiarity with different genres.Commentaryon a writing is expected to serve more instantpedagogical objectives and these feedback should serve for positive results.

REFERENCES
1. *Gass&Selinker 2001; Mitchell& Myles 2004*
2. *http://www.top-technologies.ru/ru/article/view?id=35210*
3. *www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/transcript_assessing_writing.pdf*
4. *English Grammar and Technical Writing 2004; Washington, DC*