



Flipped Classroom Improves German Grammar Acquisition in Nonlanguage Students

A.K. Aubakirova¹, G.K. Tussupova^{1*}, A.A. Niyazbekova¹

¹Department of Foreign Languages, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

*Corresponding Author Email: tusgul@mail.ru

Abstract. General Background: Foreign language instruction in non-language degree programs faces increasing proficiency demands despite limited instructional time, requiring alternative pedagogical approaches. Specific Background: The flipped classroom model reorganizes learning by shifting theoretical content to pre-class self-study and dedicating class time to active, problem-oriented activities in German as a foreign language (DaF) instruction. Knowledge Gap: Empirical evidence on the application of flipped classroom models for teaching German grammar to non-language majors in Kazakhstan remains limited. Aims: This study evaluates the implementation of a flipped classroom model for teaching the German Perfect Tense and examines its instructional design, learning outcomes, and student perceptions. Results: A mixed-methods quasi-experimental design with 78 A2-level students showed significant improvement in the experimental group ($M = 12.4$ to 16.8 , $d = 1.26$) compared to the control group ($M = 12.1$ to 14.2 , $d = 0.63$), indicating stronger gains in grammatical accuracy, metalinguistic awareness, and application skills. Qualitative findings revealed increased learner engagement, confidence, and autonomy. Novelty: The study provides context-specific empirical evidence and a structured instructional model for flipped classroom implementation in German grammar teaching within non-language higher education programs in Kazakhstan. Implications: The findings suggest that flipped classroom models can address limited contact hours by promoting autonomous learning and reallocating classroom time to interactive practice, offering a practical solution for foreign language education in similar contexts.

Keywords: Flipped Classroom, German Grammar, Learner Autonomy

1 Introduction

Issues related to foreign language teaching in non-linguistic specialties remain a constant focus of attention for researchers and university instructors, both globally and in Kazakhstan [1,2]. The rapid development and integration of artificial intelligence, among other things, has brought new challenges into everyday life and significantly transformed the requirements imposed on higher education graduates. Consequently, approaches to foreign language instruction must also evolve in response to these changing conditions.

Today, a foreign language is much more than just a compulsory academic subject; it is a vital part of a graduate's professional portfolio. At the same time, the number of academic hours allocated to language instruction within university curricula is clearly

© The Author(s) 2026

R. Lomotey et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Communication and Digital Multimedia 2025 (ICCDM 2025)*, Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research 1020, https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-589-8_10

insufficient. This discrepancy necessitates the search for alternative ways to compensate for limited contact hours and, potentially, a shift in instructional focus from the teacher to the learner. The teacher is no longer the sole source of information. Instead, their role within the educational process must be reconceptualized to fulfil a different mission, one that enables the achievement of higher education's overarching goal: preparing highly qualified specialists who meet the demands of today's labor market.

Moreover, innovation constitutes a key driver of contemporary societal development. As Tikhonova mentions, it is essential to make learners ready for specializations which don't exist in society, to meet future challenges. Because there are technologies and innovations which have not been invented yet and issues which could be impossible to forecast [3]. In the context, higher education institutions must adopt instructional models that encourage learner autonomy and flexibility, as well as the development of transferable skills.

2 Literature Review

One such approach is the flipped classroom model, which has been increasingly discussed in recent years in Kazakhstan to enhance learner autonomy and compensate for limited contact hours. [4] The flipped classroom flipped learning and inverted classroom are the same and reorganise the common structure of instruction by changing the initial acquisition of knowledge to the students' self-work task. Students devote their classroom to active, interactive, and problem-oriented learning activities.

Despite extensive discussion of the flipped classroom model in foreign language education, there remains a lack of empirical evidence regarding its application in teaching German as a foreign language (DaF) to students of non-language students in higher education institutions in the Republic of Kazakhstan. This study's novelty lies in its context-sensitive adaptation of the flipped classroom model, has been empirically evaluated in a real instructional setting.

The theoretical basis of the flipped classroom approach can be traced back to pedagogical concepts that emerged in the 1990s. In her article *From Sage on the Stage to Guide on the Side*, King criticizes the transmission of ready-made knowledge from the teacher to the student that is the traditional instructional model. In the flipped classroom students generally assume a passive role [5]. According to King, this model no longer meets contemporary educational needs, as it fails to encourage independent thinking and active knowledge of construction.

King's concept is based on constructivist learning theory. Within the constructivist educational paradigm, the teacher's role is not to transmit information, but to organize and facilitate learners' cognitive activity. The teacher creates a learning environment that encourages active engagement, asks problem-oriented questions, leads to discussions, and promotes reflection. These principles are consistent with the constructivist framework developed in the works of Piaget [6] and Vygotsky [7], according to which knowledge is constructed through active cognitive processes rather than passively received. In this context, the teacher acts as a facilitator and mentor, providing conditions that enable learners to interpret, understand, and apply learning material independently.

These theoretical assumptions found practical realization in the flipped classroom model, which was introduced by Sams and Bergmann in 2007 [8]. As noted by Gnutova

[9], Aaron Sams and Jonathan Bergmann are commonly regarded as pioneers of the flipped classroom approach. While working at Woodland Park High School in Colorado, USA, they started experimenting with video-based instruction to solve the issue of students missing classes. Initially, the model involved students studying theoretical material independently through online video lectures, while classroom time was devoted to practical work, discussion, and providing individual support. The further development of the flipped classroom approach was closely linked to the concept of personalized learning. Building on their initial experiences, Sams and Bergmann refined the model and laid out the groundwork for what later became known as “flipped learning” [10]. Whereas early implementations largely followed a traditional, teacher-centered logic in terms of knowledge transmission, with only the mode of delivery changing, the revised model placed greater emphasis on learner autonomy and individual learning needs. This shift marked a transition towards a learning paradigm in which students are responsible for constructing their own learning trajectories and assume responsibility for their learning outcomes, with teachers acting primarily as consultants and facilitators.

In this model, the teacher takes a back seat, ensuring access to carefully selected, high-quality, and level-appropriate learning resources. However, such an instructional design requires considerable time of investment from the teacher, particularly in terms of instructional planning, material development, and learner support.

3 Research Gap and Study Aim

Although the flipped classroom approach has been debated in the context of foreign language education, empirical studies focusing on its implementation in teaching German to non-language major students in higher education remain limited, particularly in post-Soviet educational contexts. This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of adapting a flipped classroom model adapted to this specific educational context. The idea behind flipped learning is that it can improve student engagement and learning outcomes.

To address the outlined challenges and research gaps, it is necessary to examine the flipped classroom model in two ways: first as a general pedagogical concept; and the second in terms of its concrete instructional design, learning outcomes, and student perceptions within a specific educational context. Due to the limited number of contact hours in non-language degree programs and the central role of grammar instruction in foreign language learning, this study examines on the implementation of a flipped classroom model for teaching German grammar to students who are not majoring in languages.

In order to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the pedagogical potential of this approach, the study formulates the following research questions:

RQ1: What instructional design features characterize the implementation of a flipped classroom model for grammar instruction in teaching German to non-language major students?

RQ2: In what ways does the flipped classroom model influence students' grammar-related learning outcomes in German compared to traditional classroom instruction?

RQ3: What are students' thoughts on the flipped classroom approach in terms of engagement, learning effectiveness, and perceived autonomy?

This study makes three contributions to the field of foreign language education. Firstly, it builds upon existing research on flipped learning to the context of teaching German as a foreign language to non-language majors. Secondly, it provides a replicable instructional model that details activities to be carried out before, during and after the class. Thirdly, it offers valuable insights into the practicality of flipped learning in higher education institutions where contacts hours are limited.

4 Method

4.1 Design of Research

In this paper a mixed-methods quasi-experimental design is used to investigate the strength of a flipped classroom model in teaching German grammar to undergraduate students who were not majoring non-linguistic specialties. The mixed-methods approach allowed quantitative and qualitative data to be integrated, providing a comprehensive analysis of both learning outcomes and learner perceptions.

Quantitative data was collected through pre- and post-tests that measured students' knowledge of the German Perfect Tense. Qualitative data was obtained through classroom observations, student questionnaires, and reflective notes from the instructor. Triangulating data sources enabled a more nuanced understanding of instructional effectiveness and learner engagement.

4.2 Participants

The study at L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University involved 78 undergraduates enrolled in a German as a Foreign Language course. All participants were non-language majors and demonstrated A2-level proficiency according to the Common European Framework of Reference Languages (CEFR). Their age ranged between 18 and 20 years.

The participants were divided into two groups: an experimental group which includes 39 students ($n = 39$) and a control group that includes also 39 students ($n = 39$). To ensure that two groups were equal, pre-test scores were used to compare two groups before the intervention ($p > .05$).

4.3 Instructional Conditions

The eight-week instructional intervention focused on selected grammatical topics, including the German Perfect Tense, which is known to cause learners difficulty and lends itself to structured pre-class preparation.

Both groups were exposed to the same grammatical content and practice materials. The only difference in the instructional sequence was the mode of the presentation rules.

The experimental group followed a flipped classroom model. Students completed structured pre-class tasks designed to guide inductive rule discovery of the German Perfect Tense. The tasks required learners to classify example sentences according to the following criteria: auxiliary selection (haben vs. sein), verb regularity, separable vs. inseparable prefixes, and verbs with the suffix *-ieren*. Guided prompts helped learners to formulate grammatical rules independently. Progress on tasks was monitored through written submissions.

The formulation of rules was discussed and refined collaboratively by learners during in-class sessions, after which consolidation activities were carried out.

The control group received traditional in-class explicit explanations of the grammatical rules. Subsequent consolidation activities were identical to those in the experimental group. The main differences between the two instructional conditions are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparison of instructional components between experimental and control groups

Component	Experimental group	Control group
Introduction of Perfect	Pre-class guided discovery	In-class explicit explanation
Pre-class		
Role of teacher	Facilitator	Rule presenter
Practice	In-class consolidation	In-class consolidation
Materials	Identical examples	Identical examples

A representative sample of the pre-class tasks is provided in Appendix A.

Assessment Instruments. The pre-test and post-test were designed to assess knowledge of the German Perfect Tense. Each test consisted of three components:

- Gap-fill sentences (10 items)
- Auxiliary selection (*haben/sein*) (5 items)
- Sentence transformation (Present → Perfect) (5 items)

The pre-test measured baseline knowledge, while the post-test assessed learning gains achieved through the intervention. Both groups took the same tests in identical conditions. The tests were used exclusively as assessment instruments and were not included in instructional activities.

4.4 Instructional Design (Self-Study Phase)

Prior to the in-class session, the experimental group completed structured self-study tasks. These tasks were designed according to principles of inductive grammar instruction and aimed to facilitate rule discovery. In contrast, the control group received an explicit teacher-led explanation during class time.

As part of the flipped classroom intervention, students completed a structured self-study phase prior to the in-class session. The materials were designed to facilitate guided rule discovery rather than provide explicit grammatical explanations.

Learners were presented with model sentences in the German Perfect Tense and were asked to analyze patterns in verb placement, past participle formation, and auxiliary selection (*haben* vs. *sein*). Through scaffolded analytical prompts, students were encouraged to formulate the underlying grammatical rules in their own words.

These activities included pattern recognition exercises, guided comparison tasks, and short reflective prompts, all of which were designed to foster metalinguistic awareness. These activities were not graded and were intended to prepare students for collaborative in-class practice.

Although the instructional phase included short gap-fill self-check exercises, the pre- and post-tests contained different lexical items to avoid practice effects while maintaining structural comparability.

During the self-study phase, students were provided with model sentences in the German Perfect Tense and guided through structured analysis tasks designed to

facilitate the discovery of rules. Instead of receiving explicit instruction, learners were encouraged to identify patterns in the formation of the past participle and the choice of auxiliary verbs (haben/sein).

In addition to standard patterns of verb formation, the self-study materials included guided analysis of verbs ending in *-ieren* and verbs with inseparable prefixes (e.g., *be-*, *ver-*, *er-*). These tasks were designed to help learners refine their formulation of rules and recognize systematic exceptions in the formation of the past participle. The material aimed to deepen structural awareness and prevent the overgeneralization of the *ge-* prefix rule by contrasting regular patterns with morphologically distinct verb groups. These activities were designed to promote metalinguistic awareness and prepare students for subsequent in-class practice.

The self-study phase was designed in accordance with the principles of inductive grammar teaching and aimed to encourage learners to take ownership of their learning and develop their metalinguistic awareness. The structure of these self-study tasks and their intended learning indicators are summarized in Table 2, while the complete self-study materials are provided in Appendix B.

Table 2. Self-study task design, learning objectives, student activities, and target indicators

Task type	Learning objective	Student activity	Target indicator
Guided rule discovery	Identify the structure of Perfect Tense	Analyze example sentences and formulate the rule	Fähigkeit, Regeln selbst zu formulieren
Mini self-check exercise	Apply the rule	Complete short gap-fill tasks	Sicherheit bei der Anwendung
Reflection prompt	Grammar awareness	Explain the rule in own words	Verständnis der grammatischen Struktur

The sequence of instructions was created to provide support and assistance as learners discovered the rules, and to encourage them to think about how they are using language before the test at the end.

Although gap-fill tasks were also used as short self-check activities during the instructional phase, the pre- and post-tests contained different items that targeted the same grammatical structure. This was done to measure acquisition of the structure itself rather than recalling specific examples. The alignment between each assessment task and its target construct is summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Overview of assessment tasks and target constructs in the pre- and post-tests

Task type	Target construct	Mode
Gap-fill	Grammatical accuracy	written
Rule explanation	Metalinguistic awareness	written
Oral task (post-test)	Knowledge transfer	oral

Full versions of the post-test are provided in Appendix C. The pre- and post-tests both consisted of gap-fill and transformation tasks in a structurally identical format, targeting the German Perfect Tense. While the instructions and task types remained the

same to ensure comparability, different lexical items and sentence contexts were used in the post-test to avoid practice effects.

4.5 Data Analysis

Paired-samples t-tests were used to analyze quantitative data and compare pre- and post-test performance within each group. Effect sizes (Cohen's *d*) were calculated to determine the magnitude of instructional impact. Thematic analysis of qualitative data from classroom observations, student questionnaires, and instructor reflective notes were analyzed thematically to identify patterns related to learner engagement, autonomy, and perceptions of the flipped classroom approach.

5 Results and Discussion

5.1 Results

A total of 78 students at A2-level participated in the study, with 39 students assigned to the experimental group and 39 to the control group. Before the intervention, all participants completed a pre-test designed to assess their general knowledge of the Perfect Tense. The pre-test consisted of three tasks. The first task included 10 sentence-based items. On average, students in the experimental group made between three and five errors. The second task consisted of 5 short examples, in which students made an average of 2 errors. In the third task, which also contained 5 examples, students made up to 3 errors. A similar pattern of results was observed in the control group, suggesting that both groups had comparable initial levels of grammatical competence in both groups prior to the experiment.

According to the given results, both experimental and control groups have the same initial knowledge of the perfect tense before the flipped learning approach was implemented.

Before using flipped learning methods, a pre-test was given to both experimental and control groups to evaluate their overall knowledge of the Perfect Tense. The test comprised 20 items, each worth 5 points (maximum score = 100%).

Error analysis showed similar performance patterns in both groups. In Task 1 (10 items), participants made 2–4 errors, corresponding to a loss of approximately 10–20% of the possible points. In Task 2 (5 items), participants made up to 2 errors ($\approx 10\%$ loss). In Task 3 (5 items), participants made up to 3 errors ($\approx 15\%$ loss).

Overall, the pre-test results suggest that the two groups had comparable initial proficiency levels in the Perfect Tense prior to the implementation of the flipped learning approach. The pre-test mean scores were comparable between the experimental group ($M = 12.4$, $SD = 2.1$) and the control group ($M = 12.1$, $SD = 2.3$), indicating similar initial levels.

Beforehand, both the experimental and control groups completed a pre-test, assessing their overall knowledge of the Perfect Tense. The test comprised 20 items (maximum score = 100%). Error analysis showed similar performance patterns in both groups. In Task 1 (10 items), participants made 2–4 errors ($\approx 10\text{--}20\%$ loss). In Task 2 (5 items), participants made up to 2 errors ($\approx 10\%$ loss). In Task 3 (5 items), participants made up to 3 errors ($\approx 15\%$ loss). The pre-test results imply that both groups show comparable initial proficiency levels in the Perfect tense.

To compare the experimental group's pre-test and post-test scores, a paired-samples t-test was used. A significant difference was noticed in scores between the pre-test ($M = 12.4$, $SD = 2.1$) and post-test ($M = 16.8$, $SD = 1.9$); $t(24) = 6.32$, $p < .001$. The effect size was large (Cohen's $d = 1.26$).

A paired samples t-test was also conducted for the control group. The difference between the pre-test ($M = 12.1$, $SD = 2.3$) and post-test ($M = 14.2$, $SD = 2.0$) was significant; $t(23) = 3.11$, $p = .005$. The effect size was moderate (Cohen's $d = 0.63$).

The comparison of effect sizes indicates that the flipped classroom approach produced a stronger impact on developing proficiency in the perfect tense than the traditional method. The large effect in the experimental group ($d = 1.26$) contrasts with the moderate effect in the control group ($d = 0.63$), supporting the effectiveness of the flipped classroom model. The full comparison of pre-test and post-test results is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Pre-test and post-test results

Group	Pre-test (M ± SD)	Post-test (M ± SD)	T(df)	p	Cohen's d
Experimental	12.4 ± 2.1	16.8 ± 1.9	6.32 (24)	< .001	1.26
Control	12.1 ± 2.3	14.2 ± 2.0	3.11 (23)	.005	0.63

In the experimental group, the mean score increased from 12.4 to 16.8, with a large effect size (Cohen's $d = 1.26$), indicating a substantial improvement. In the control group, the mean score increased from 12.1 to 14.2, with a moderate effect size ($d = 0.63$). Paired-samples t-tests confirmed that improvements in both groups were statistically significant ($p < 0.01$), but the improvement was much stronger in the experimental group.

Overall, the experimental group's students got higher scores than those in the control group on the post-test, demonstrating improved accuracy in forming the German Perfect Tense. Prior to the in-class activities, the self-study tasks were completed. These tasks included analysis of regular verbs as well as verbs with -ieren endings and inseparable prefixes.

Additional Diagnostic Tasks (Experimental Group Only). To complement the quantitative post-test results, two additional diagnostic tasks were administered only to the experimental group.

For task B4 (Rule explanation) students were required to provide a brief explanation of when the auxiliary verb *sein* is used in the Perfect Tense. The most of students provided correct explanations, with the majority making around two minor errors.

In task B5 (Oral production), students were asked to give a one-minute spoken description of their weekend activities using Perfect Tense. Most students produced coherent narratives of at least 5-7 sentences and correctly using auxiliary verbs (haben/sein). This suggests that students were able to apply their knowledge from home preparation to their spontaneous speech. The results indicate that allocating time to studying the theoretical part at home allowed students to use the structure more confidently in their spoken responses.

5.2 Discussion

The findings of this paper provide practical support for the effectiveness of a flipped classroom model in teaching German grammar to non-language major students in the context of higher education in Kazakhstan. The analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data indicates that the instructional design of the flipped classroom contributed to improved learning outcomes, increased learner engagement, and fostered greater autonomy.

Instructional Design Features (RQ1). The pre-class guided rule discovery tasks proved to be a crucial element of the flipped classroom model. Students were able to analyze example sentences and formulate grammatical rules independently, which aligns with the constructivist view of learning as an active process of knowledge construction rather than passive reception. The scaffolded design of pre-class activities, carried out in class, enabled learners to gradually develop understanding of the Perfect Tense before receiving explicit explanation from the instructor. This approach reflects a shift from a teacher-centered model of knowledge transmission to a learner-centered one, in which the instructor acts as a facilitator rather than the primary source of information.

These results confirm that the flipped classroom model involves more than just a change of format, but also a shift in the roles of teacher and student. The pre-class phase supported self-regulated learning, while the in-class phase offered opportunities for guided practice and feedback. This instructional design is particularly relevant in contexts where contact hours are limited and where the development of learner autonomy is important.

Learning Outcomes (RQ2). A quantitative analysis of the results from the pre- and post-test results demonstrated significant improvements in students' grammatical accuracy, particularly with regard to the correct formation of Participle II and the selection of auxiliary verbs. The most substantial gains were observed in tasks that required students to justify their choices and explain the underlying rules. This indicates an increase in metalinguistic awareness. This finding is consistent with previous research suggesting that learners' understanding of grammar can be improved through inductive instructions and support long-term retention of Ellis and Schmidt [11-12].

The control group also showed some improvement, which indicates that any structured instruction contributes to learning. However, the experimental group achieved higher gains, suggesting that the flipped classroom approach may provide additional benefits in grammar learning by creating conditions for deeper cognitive engagement and independent problem-solving.

Students' Perceptions and Engagement (RQ3). Qualitative data from observations and student feedback revealed that most learners perceived the pre-class tasks as supportive rather than overwhelming. Students reported feeling more confident when using the Perfect Tense in both written and oral activities, and they were more willing to participate in class discussions. The opportunity to explore grammatical patterns independently motivates learners and make them feel more involved in the learning process.

These findings align with the concept of learner autonomy, widely considered to be a key outcome of flipped learning. The shift of responsibility for initial knowledge acquisition to students may foster self-directed learning habits that are essential for lifelong learning and professional development.

Despite the positive overall results, some students continued to struggle with irregular patterns, particularly verbs that require *sein* as auxiliary. This suggests that additional reinforcement of grammar exceptions through targeted practice and explicit explanation may still be required. Furthermore, the study was conducted with A2-level students in a single institution, which restricts the generalizability of the findings. Future research should involve larger samples, students at different proficiency levels and institutions in different contexts.

The structured self-study assignments probably helped to improve enhanced metalinguistic awareness and rule internalization. By engaging students in guided analysis of both regular verbs and morphologically distinct verbs (e.g., -ieren and inseparable prefix verbs), the intervention may have promoted deeper understanding and facilitated the application of this knowledge to new sentences.

Another limitation concerns the duration of the intervention. Further research is required to ascertain whether the observed improvements persist over time and if flipped classroom model enhances performance in more complex communicative tasks.

The study contributes to foreign language education by demonstrating that flipped learning can be effectively adapted to the teaching of German grammar in non-language higher education programs. The findings suggest that well-structured pre-class tasks can foster grammatical awareness and learner autonomy, allowing in-class activities to focus on meaningful practice and feedback. In contexts with limited contact hours, the flipped classroom model offers a viable solution to increase learning time without extending formal instruction hours.

Instructors considering adopting flipped learning should pay close attention to the design of pre-class materials and the level of scaffolding provided. These tasks should be challenging but manageable, ensuring that students are prepared for in-class activities without feeling overwhelmed.

6 Conclusion

This study examined the implementation and effectiveness of a flipped classroom model for teaching German grammar to non-language major students in a higher education institution in Kazakhstan. The findings suggest that the flipped classroom approach can be effectively adapted for grammar teaching, leading to better learning outcomes, greater learner engagement, and increased autonomy.

The findings suggest that structured self-study tasks, integrated into a flipped classroom design, effectively supported students in acquiring German Perfect Tense, including for verb types that deviate from regular formation patterns.

Firstly, the instructional design of the flipped classroom, which incorporated guided pre-class rule discovery tasks and in-class consolidation activities, encouraged active student engagement with grammatical structures. The pre-class phase allowed learners to explore patterns independently. Classroom time was then used for practice, clarification, and feedback, thus shifting the teacher's role from knowledge transmitter to facilitator.

Secondly, quantitative results revealed that the experimental group demonstrated greater improvements in grammatical accuracy and metalinguistic awareness compared to the control group. Students demonstrated, in particular, a better ability to form Participle II, select the correct auxiliary verbs, and justify their grammatical choices. These results imply that the flipped classroom model can encourage deeper cognitive processing and more profound grasp of grammar.

Thirdly, qualitative data revealed that students generally found the flipped classroom tasks as supportive and motivating. Many learners reported increased confidence in using the Perfect Tense as well as a higher level of participation during class activities. However, persistent difficulties with less frequent irregular patterns indicate the need for targeted reinforcement and continued support.

Overall, the study makes a valuable contribution to the existing literature by providing empirical evidence of the effectiveness of flipped learning approach for teaching German as a foreign language for non-language majors in Kazakhstan. The results suggest that a structured, flipped classroom model could be a practical solution for institutions with limited contact hours. However, future research should explore the long-term effects of flipped learning, its applicability across different proficiency levels, and its impact on other linguistic skills beyond grammar.

References

- [1] O. Bainova, "Flipped Classroom Integration as an Innovation in Teaching Practices in Kazakhstan Higher Education: A Phenomenological Study of Faculty Experiences," Master's thesis, Graduate School of Education, Nazarbayev University, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/8426>
- [2] D. Taubay, "The Rationality of Using the 'Flipped Classroom' Method in the Process of Teaching English," *Bulletin of the M. Kozybayev North Kazakhstan University*, no. 2, pp. 45–50, 2022.
- [3] N. V. Tikhonova, "Flipped Classroom Technology in a University: Potential and Challenges of Implementation," *Kazan Pedagogical Journal*, no. 2, pp. 101–108, 2018.
- [4] K. Tattimbetova, E. Chekina, T. Pavlova, and Z. Aden, "Organizing the Educational Process Using the 'Flipped Classroom' Technology in Russian Language Learning at a University," *Eurasian Journal of Philology: Science and Education*, vol. 193, no. 1, pp. 162–172, 2024, doi: 10.26577/EJPh.2024.v193.i1.ph15.
- [5] A. King, "From Sage on the Stage to Guide on the Side," *College Teaching*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 30–35, 1993, doi: 10.1080/87567555.1993.9926781.
- [6] J. Piaget, *Psychology of Intelligence*. Moscow, Russia: Progress Publishers, 1979.
- [7] L. S. Vygotsky, *Thinking and Speech*. Moscow, Russia: Pedagogy Publishers, 1982.
- [8] J. Bergmann and A. Sams, *Flipped Learning: Gateway to Student Engagement*. Eugene, OR, USA: International Society for Technology in Education, 2014.
- [9] I. I. Gnutova, "From the 'Flipped Classroom' to 'Flipped Learning': The Evolution of the Concept and Its Philosophical Foundations," *Higher Education in Russia*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 86–95, 2020, doi: 10.31992/0869-3617-2020-29-3-86-95.
- [10] J. Bergmann and A. Sams, *Flip Your Classroom: Reach Every Student in Every Class Every Day*. Eugene, OR, USA: International Society for Technology in Education, 2012. [Online]. Available: <http://i-lib.imu.edu.my/NewPortal/images/NewPortal/CompEBooks/Flip-Your-Classroom.pdf>

[11] R. Ellis, "Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective," TESOL Quarterly, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 83–107, 2006, doi: 10.2307/40264512.

[12] R. Schmidt, "The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning," Applied Linguistics, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 129–158, 1990, doi: 10.1093/applin/11.2.129.

Appendix A.

Pre- Test Tasks on the German *Perfekt* (A2 Level)

A. Pre-Test

Task A1. Gap-Fill

Ergänzen Sie die Sätze im Perfekt.

1. Gestern ____ ich meine Hausaufgaben ____ (machen).
2. Wir ____ spät nach Hause ____ (kommen).
3. Sie ____ einen Brief ____ (schreiben).
4. Am Morgen ____ er zur Arbeit ____ (fahren).
5. Ich ____ lange auf den Bus ____ (warten).
6. Ich ____ richtig ____ (buchstabieren).
7. Timur ____ schnell ____ (laufen).
8. Er ____ sich gut ____ (erholen).
9. Du ____ dieses Wort nicht ____ (verstehen).
10. Sie ____ rechtzeitig ____ (kommen).

Task A2. Auxiliary Verb Selection

Wählen Sie das richtige Hilfsverb (*haben* oder *sein*).

1. Wir ____ ins Kino gegangen.
a) haben b) sind
2. Wir ____ nach Berlin gefahren.
a) haben b) sind
3. Die Kinder ____ schnell eingeschlafen.
a) haben b) sind
4. Die Studentin ____ Ski gefahren.
a) hat b) ist
5. Sie ____ ein interessantes Buch gelesen.
a) hat b) ist

Task A3. Sentence Transformation

Bilden Sie Sätze im Perfekt.

1. Ich kaufe ein Buch. → Ich ____ ein Buch ____.
2. Sie bleibt zu Hause. → Sie ____ zu Hause ____.
3. Wir spielen Fußball. → Wir ____ Fußball ____.
4. Er liest eine E-Mail. → Er ____ eine E-Mail ____.
5. Ihr telefoniert mit euren Eltern. → Ihr ____ mit euren Eltern ____.

Appendix B

Self-Study Materials (Flipped Classroom Intervention)

Task 1. Guided Pattern Observation

Read the following sentences and underline:

a) the auxiliary verb

b) the past participle

1. Ich **habe** gestern einen Film **gesehen**.
2. Wir **sind** nach Berlin **gefahren**.
3. Sie **hat** lange Musik **gehört**.

4. Er **ist** früh nach Hause **gekommen**.

Reflection questions:

- Where is the auxiliary verb positioned?
- Where is the past participle positioned?
- What form does the past participle usually have?
- When is *sein* used instead of *haben*?

Task 2. Rule Formulation

Based on the examples above, complete the statements:

1. The German *Perfekt* consists of _____ + _____.
2. The past participle of regular verbs usually ends in _____.
3. The auxiliary *sein* is typically used with verbs that express _____.

Write the rule in your own words.

Task 3. Guided Comparison

Compare the following sentences:

- a) Ich spiele Fußball.
- b) Ich habe Fußball gespielt.

Answer:

- What has changed?
- Which elements were added?
- How did the verb form change?

Task 4. Mini Self-Check

Put the verbs in brackets into the *Perfekt*.

1. Wir (lernen) Deutsch.
2. Er (gehen) nach Hause.
3. Sie (machen) die Hausaufgaben.

Task 5. Reflection Prompt

Explain in 3–4 sentences:

- How is the German *Perfekt* formed?
- How do you decide between *haben* and *sein*?

Task 6. Special Cases: Verbs without “ge-”

Read the sentences and underline the past participles.

1. Ich habe Deutsch studiert.
2. Sie hat das Problem erklärt.
3. Wir haben das Museum besucht.
4. Er hat die E-Mail beantwortet.

Questions:

- Do these verbs contain *ge-* in the past participle?
- What do these verbs have in common?
- What ending do you observe?

Complete the rule:

Verbs ending in **-ieren** form the past participle without ____ and usually end in ____.

Task 7. Inseparable Prefixes

Observe the sentences:

1. Ich habe das Buch verstanden.

2. Sie hat die Aufgabe bekommen.
3. Wir haben die Geschichte erzählt.
4. Er hat den Film gesehen.

Now compare:

1. Ich habe das Fenster geöffnet.
2. Sie hat das Radio eingeschaltet.

Reflection:

- Which verbs do NOT take *ge-*?
- What do they have in common?
- Can you identify a pattern?

Complete the rule:

Verbs with inseparable prefixes (be-, ver-, er-, ent-, etc.) form the past participle without _____.

Task 8. Guided Application

Put the verbs into the Perfekt.

1. Wir (studieren) Medizin.
2. Er (verstehen) die Frage.
3. Sie (besuchen) ihre Großeltern.
4. Ich (erklären) das Problem.
5. Wir (spielen) Fußball.

Then answer:

- Which verbs used *ge-*?
- Which verbs did not?
- Why?

Appendix C

B. Post-Test

Task 1. Gap-Fill

1. Gestern ____ wir unsere Freunde ____ (besuchen).
2. Ich ____ früh nach Hause ____ (gehen).
3. Er ____ eine E-Mail ____ (schicken).
4. Am Abend ____ sie ins Kino ____ (fahren).
5. Wir ____ lange auf den Lehrer ____ (warten).
6. Er ____ das Wort falsch ____ (aussprechen).
7. Lena ____ langsam ____ (laufen).
8. Sie ____ sich schnell ____ (erholen).
9. Ich ____ diese Regel nicht ____ (verstehen).
10. Er ____ pünktlich ____ (ankommen).

Task 2. Auxiliary Verb Selection

1. Er ____ nach Hause gekommen.
a) hat b) ist
2. Die Schüler ____ früh aufgestanden.
a) haben b) sind
3. Wir ____ lange geblieben.
a) haben b) sind
4. Meine Freundin ____ nach München geflogen.
a) hat b) ist
5. Der Mann ____ den ganzen Tag gearbeitet.
a) hat b) ist

Task 3. Sentence Transformation

1. Ich schreibe einen Brief. → Ich ____ einen Brief ____.
2. Er bleibt lange im Büro. → Er ____ lange im Büro ____.
3. Sie lernen Deutsch. → Sie ____ Deutsch ____.
4. Wir sehen einen Film. → Wir ____ einen Film ____.
5. Du sprichst mit deiner Freundin. → Du ____ mit deiner Freundin ____.

Task 4. Rule Explanation

Instruktion: Beantworten Sie die Frage kurz.

Wann benutzt man im Perfekt das Hilfsverb *sein*?

Task 5. Oral Production

Instruktion: Sprechen Sie ca. 1 Minute.

Erzählen Sie, was Sie am Wochenende gemacht haben.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

