



Malmö högskola
Fakulteten för lärande och
samhälle

Kultur, språk, medier

Examensarbete i Engelska och Lärande

15 högskolepoäng, avancerad nivå

Oral Feedback in the EFL classroom

Muntlig feedback till elever med engelska som främmande språk

Diana Mahdi

Noha El Saadany

Lärarexamen 270 hp
Engelska och Lärande
2013-11-27

Examinator: Björn Sundmark
Handledare: Bo Lundahl

Foreword

Writing this degree project has been a very interesting journey for the two of us and since most of the degree project was written in two different parts of the world it symbolizes hard work and good cooperation. Writing a big degree project like this taught us how to manage to find solutions that suits both and how to equally divide the workload. The different chapters in this degree chapter were discussed by Diana Mahdi and Noha El Saadany before the writing them. In addition, secondary sources such as articles and books used in this degree project were considered and decided on together. Likewise, the alternative methods and the approach of the investigation were planned by us both. Furthermore, the introduction, research questions, theory, methodology (chapter on questionnaires) and discussion were written by Noha El Saadany. The purpose, research questions, methodology and the results section were written by Diana Mahdi. When it comes to language correction and recent changes of the final drafts both Diana Mahdi and Noha El Saadany collaborated. But primarily, we would like to express our gratitude to Professor Bo Lundahl who has been our supportive supervisor. Thank you for your valuable insight, time and patience with us through the entire writing process. We would also thank the participating teachers and students who wanted to be a part of our investigation. We are happy to have had the possibility to gather data from engaged and sincere teachers' perspectives for this degree project. Finally, we would like to thank Skype for making it possible for us to communicate when being in two different continents while writing this degree project.

Abstract

Teachers use different methods to help students acquire the tools needed to learn English, or any other subject for that matter. One method is oral feedback, which is used to immediately encourage students or correct them when making an error. Our aim is therefore to investigate what kind of oral feedback can be found in a EFL-classroom and what attitudes both teachers and students have towards oral feedback. Three types of research tools were used: observation, interviews and questionnaire. The results show that the students were positive to oral feedback in the classroom, especially explicit corrective feedback. On the other hand, this type of feedback was the least used one in the classroom due to the teachers' believing that other kinds of oral feedback are more beneficial.

Key words: Oral feedback, corrective feedback, oral feedback types, interactional feedback, learner preferences, learner types.

Table of contents

1. Introduction	7
2. Purpose and research questions	8
3. Theoretical framework	8
4. Methodology	17
4.1 Qualitative Research	17
4.2 Context	17
4.3 Observation	18-19
4.4 Interviews	19
4.5 Questionnaire	20-22
4.6 Piloting	22-23
4.7 Presenting the questionnaires	23
5. Results	24
5.1 Results of the teachers' interviews	24
5.1.1 Teachers' backgrounds	24
5.1.2 EFL Learners with different abilities	24-25
5.1.3 The role of feedback	25-28
5.1.4 Corrective feedback types	28-30
5.1.5 Students' responses and assessments	30-34
5.2 Results of the observations	35
5.2.1 Participants	35
5.2.3 Observing the lesson	35-36
5.2.4 Praising	36-37
5.2.5 Elicitation	38-39
5.2.6 Conversational recasts	39-40
5.2.7 Explicit correction	40
5.2.8 Metalinguistic clues	40-41

5.2.9 Clarification requests	41
5.3 Results of the questionnaires	41
5.3.1 Factual information	41-42
5.3.2 Language errors	42
5.3.3 Oral feedback	42-43
5.3.4 The effect of oral feedback	43
5.3.5 The need of oral feedback	44
5.3.6 Understanding oral feedback	44
5.3.7 Types of oral feedback	44-45
5.3.8 Explicit correction	45
6. Discussion	46
6.1 Oral Feedback types	46-47
6.2 Oral feedback from teachers' perspectives	47-48
6.3 Learner preferences	48-49
7. Conclusion	50
References	51-52
Attachments	53
1. Observation schedule	53-54
2. Questionnaire form	55-57
3. Information sheet for teacher interview	58-59
4. Teacher interview Malin (transcription)	60-65
5. Teacher interview Anna (transcription)	66-72
6. Feedback types sheet	73

1. Introduction

In any classroom, there are numerous forms of interaction, especially between students and teachers. Oral feedback is one of many communication forms where students receive feedback from their teacher who either corrects them implicitly or explicitly or asks them to clarify what they say. According to various researchers, oral feedback has proven to be an effective tool in SLA classrooms (Lyster et al., 2013). Furthermore, Long's interaction hypothesis proposes that interactional process facilitates second language learning (Mackey, 2006). Interaction connects "input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways" (Long 1996, pp. 451-452). With regard to corrective feedback, helpful interactional processes and provision of recast, which is a subcategory to Corrective Feedback, are claimed to be helpful in language learning (Mackey, 2006).

Teachers in the EFL classroom provide different types of oral feedback where the aim is to facilitate language development. Indeed, meaningful input from the teacher and learner uptake are considered to be key processes in language acquisition since "authentic communication [is seen] as the primary locus of the learning process" (Anthony 2008, pp.11-12). However, there are studies, such as Loschky's (1989), that show that the effect of negotiated interaction is less beneficial when it comes to "syntactic development or vocabulary retention". Hence, there are not merely positive consequences of interaction to consider but also non-beneficial ones. Therefore, the research on corrective feedback preferences and effectiveness are important and may lead to more effective teaching practice (Lyster & Saito & Sato, 2013).

2. Purpose and research questions

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the role of oral corrective feedback in an ESL classroom. The focus of this paper is to look into both teacher and student perspectives about oral corrective feedback in order to gain an understanding of how interactional feedback may affect language acquisition.

Our research questions are as follows:

- What kinds of oral feedback do EFL students in compulsory school receive from their teacher during a teacher-led lesson?
- What are compulsory school teachers' experiences of and thoughts on oral feedback as a teaching method?
- To what extent do students notice teacher feedback and act upon it?

3. Theoretical framework

3.1 Oral Feedback

The word *feedback* is found in many contexts but not only limited to the educational definition. The general definition of *feedback* is “a process in which the factors that produce a result are themselves modified, corrected, strengthened, etc. by that result” or “a response, as one that sets such a process in motion” (Collins, 2013, p. 520). Askew (2000) defines feedback in other words, as “a judgment about the performance of another with the intentions to close a gap in knowledge and skills” (p. 6). These general definitions of feedback can also be applied within an educational context but the most common name for feedback within classroom context is called *corrective feedback*.

CF (corrective feedback) is defined as “responses to learner utterances containing an error” (Lyster & Saito & Sato, 2013, p. 2). Furthermore, Russell and Spada (2006) explain that “the term corrective feedback [refers] to any feedback provided to a learner, from any source, that contains evidence of learner error of language form” (p. 134). There are numerous ways of using CF in EFL-classrooms, but oral feedback is not only limited to CF which will be presented further in this text.

3.2 Types of oral corrective feedback

CF plays a significant role in the kind of scaffolding that teachers need to provide and to promote continuing second language growth (Lyster et al., 2013). Lyster & Ranta (1997) identify six different CF types which were classified into two CF categories: reformulations and prompts. Reformulations include recasts and explicit correction, because both these sorts of CF supply students with the correct way of saying a certain word or a sentence. Although recast and explicit correction are placed under reformulation, recast is considered an implicit way of giving CF to

students which is explained in table 1.

Table 1 Corrective feedback

	Implicit	Explicit
Reformulations	<p>Conversational recasts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● a reformulation of a student utterance in an attempt to resolve a communication breakdown ● often take the form of confirmation checks 	<p>Didactic recasts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● a reformulation of a student utterance in the absence of a communication problem <p>Explicit correction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● a reformulation of a student utterance plus a clear indication of an error <p>Explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● in addition to signalling an error and providing the correct form, there is also a metalinguistic comment
Prompts	<p>Repetition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● a verbatim repetition of a student utterance, often with adjusted intonation to highlight the error <p>Clarification request</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● a phrase such as ‘Pardon?’ and ‘I don’t understand’ following a student utterance to indirectly signal an error 	<p>Metalinguistic clue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● a brief metalinguistic statement aimed at eliciting a self-correction from the student <p>Elicitation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● directly elicits a self-correction from the student, often in the form of a wh-question <p>Paralinguistic signal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● an attempt to non-verbally elicit the correct form from the learner

[Lyster et al., 2013, p. 5]

On the other hand, prompts include a variety of signals other than reformulations such as elicitation, meta-linguistic clues, clarification requests and repetition. Further, according to Tedick (1998), elicitation means that “the teacher directly elicits the correct form from the student by asking questions and pausing to allow the student to complete the teacher’s utterance or by asking students to reformulate the utterance” (p. 3). In accordance with table 1, this type of CF is clearly explicit since it directs the student into the right form by asking questions (Lyster et al., 2013).

Furthermore, meta-linguistic clue is also a type of explicit corrective feedback and is similar to elicitation except that the teacher does not provide the correct form (See table 1). The teacher instead asks about or provides comments on what the student said (Tedick, 1998). While these two types of CF within prompts are explicit, clarification requests and repetition are considered implicit (table 1). Clarification requests contain questions just like meta-linguistic clues and elicitations but are not as noticeable and explicit as them. The teacher instead uses phrases like “excuse me?” or “I don’t understand”. These phrases indicate that the message has not been

understood or that what the student said contained a mistake and needs to be repeated or reformulated (Tedick, 1998).

Finally, repetitions are implicit forms of CF that differ from the three CF forms defined earlier. Repetition means that the teacher repeats what the student said with a certain intonation in order to indicate an error (Lyster et al., 2013.). By drawing the student's attention to it, s/he will be made aware of the error and correct it (Tedick, 1998), as shown in our example:

Student: "Yesterday, I goes to him."

Teacher: "Goes?"

Moreover, reformulations contain recasts and explicit correction. The latter is direct and explicit as the teacher directly corrects the student's error while recasts are often considered implicit. However, research has shown that, depending on their context and characteristics – such as linguistic targets, length, and number of changes made to the original utterance – they can also be quite explicit" (Lyster, Saito, Sato, 2013, p. 3).

Recast is a type of the feedback that has received a lot of attention from researchers and is the most preferred corrective feedback by teachers (Fujii & Mackey, 2009; Loewen & Philips, 2006). Tedick (1998) explains that with recasts "the teacher implicitly reformulates the student's error or provides the correction" without indicating that the student's utterance was incorrect (p. 2). Fujii & Mackey (2009) confirm this by also defining recast as "utterances that repeat a learner's incorrect utterance, making only the changes necessary to produce a correct utterance without changing the meaning" (p. 269). In this case, the main focus is on form.

Long (1991) defines focus on form as "overtly draw[ing] student's attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning and communication" (pp. 45-46). Therefore, implicit feedback is a method where the teacher implies instead of states the existence of an error and might draw the learners' attention to their utterance that is non-target-like without threatening the students' confidence (Loewen & Philips, 2006; Mackey, 2006).

However, it is important to bear in mind that recast may be of benefit only if they are noticed by the learner. Therefore, Long (1991) noted "that the selective attention of the learner is of fundamental importance in the connection between conversational interaction and acquisition" (p. 538). In other words, what the learner notices holds potential for learning. On the other hand,

there are risks that recasts may pass unnoticed, and the younger the learners are, the higher the risk that they will not notice the recast (Loewen & Philips, 2006). As a result Lyster (1998) suggests that feedback should take on a more explicit form. Additionally, Lyster (1998) also discovers that teachers leave many errors uncorrected and also repeat correct utterances as often as they recast incorrect utterances. Given these similar response patterns for both correct and incorrect utterances, Lyster and Ranta (1997) concluded that “recasts, because they are implicit, are unlikely to benefit learners, who may experience difficulty in differentiating positive and negative feedback” (p. 538).

Moreover, this brings the discussion further on how researchers differ on whether recast is beneficial or not. Lyster (1998) suggests “that recasts may not be as beneficial as is often thought, due to the fact that they do not require immediate modification and tend to lead to less “uptake” or immediate responses than other types of feedback for example, clarification requests, confirmation checks, and elicitations that explicitly prompt learners to modify their incorrect utterances” (Qtd in Fujii & Mackey, 2009, p. 5).

Furthermore, learners’ uptake is a way to measure whether one kind of feedback was effective or not. Mackey (2006) claims that learner uptake is measured based on the learners’ immediate reaction to the recast. The scholar also explains that recasts were the most frequently used in the EFL-classroom but led to the least uptakes with regards to learner’s immediate responses.

In summary, although recasts can be ambiguous as corrective feedback, the likelihood of their effectiveness depends on various factors: the classroom context, the context of the recast within the discourse, and variable elements of the recast itself (Loewen & Philips, 2006). Furthermore, these types of CF push learners to self-repair and are also either explicit or implicit (see Table 1). Although prompts include a range of CF types, there is one important feature that prompts have that sets them apart from reformulations: the teacher withholds correct forms and instead provides clues to assist students to retrieve the correct forms from their existing knowledge. However, explicitness is a difficult variable to hold constant across classroom studies because learner perceptions of salience and linguistic marking are affected. Not only by learner variables such as age and meta-linguistic knowledge but also by contextual variables such as the instructional context and its communicative orientation (Lyster & Saito, 2010). Therefore, comparisons of CF effectiveness are not limited to implicit or explicit distinctions.

But it is vital to mention that there is still a need for more research about how effective oral

feedback is in order to define which feedback type is the most effective (Mackey, 2006). However, Lyster & Saito (2010) mention that “in terms of linguistic evidence [...] explicit correction provides both negative and positive evidence, recasts provide positive evidence and possibly also negative evidence, and prompts provide only negative evidence” (p. 268).

3.3 Interactional Feedback

According to Long’s interaction hypothesis, second language learning is facilitated through interaction by connecting input, learner capacities, selective attention and output (Mackey, 2006). Interactional feedback lies within the frames of Long’s interaction hypothesis. Researchers have empirically shown that interactional feedback impacts second language acquisition (Long, 1996). Mackey (2006) mentions that recent research on interactional feedback shows that it has generally positive results and is more effective than promoting modified output by learners:

The importance of interactional feedback lies at least in the fact that it can provide learners with information about the accuracy and communicative success of their production. Sometimes, learners’ initial utterances will lack important linguistic information, and feedback can give them opportunities to notice mismatches between their utterances and target language norms.

[Fuji and Mackey 2009, p. 268]

Moreover, interactional feedback is divided into two types of feedback – Recast and negotiation (Mackey & Oliver, 2002). Recast has been defined earlier in section 3.1, but could be used differently if the teacher has an aim to use recast to correct the students or to clarify a student’s utterance. Within interactional feedback, recast is used as a tool to clarify what the student said (Mackey & Oliver, 2002). In addition, Lyster et. al. (2013) defines this type of recast as an implicit, conversational recast. An example could be:

Student: Do you have a boat has like si...?

Teacher: A boat with a sail?

Student: Do you have a boat with a sail?

[Mackey & Oliver, 2002, p. 464]

Additionally, negotiation is similar to clarification requests where the teacher asks for clarification such as:

Student: Do you have a man...big spaceship?

Teacher: Pardon? Do I have-?

Student: Do you have a man near a big spaceship?

[Mackey and Oliver, 2002, p.464]

Finally, interactional feedback can help direct the learner's attention towards a mismatch between the target input and the learner's own inter-language form (Mackey, 2006).

3.4 Praising

Oral feedback in EFL-classrooms is not limited to correcting errors but can also appear in form of praising. Waring & Wong (2009) mention that there is a large variety of literature on corrective feedback while research about positive feedback is rare to find. Positive feedback is defined as "fine" or "good" as part of the quality judgments' integral to the guidance we give as teacher in the language classroom" (p. 195).

Furthermore, praising is often use in the absence of feedback where the students can respond or correct their saying (Waring & Wong, 2009). Utterances like "very good" for instance are defined as praising which Waring and Wong (2009) claim it to be a signal that it is time to move on to the next person, also mentioned as "transition ritual" stage (p. 196). It might inhibit the students from learning - by sending a signal that the student has completed an exercise, even though it is not completed, and consequently blocks a possible dialogue.

However, using praise such as "very good" can also be a way of reinforcing a student's correct response which is equal to reinforcing correct comprehension of production of a language structure (Waring & Wong, 2009). Praising is described as something vague and unclear. What specific part of the exercise does the teacher evaluate as "good" or is she or he referring to the entire success of the exercise? Or is the teacher maybe only pleased about the student producing

something at all? (Waring & Wong, 2009). On the other side, Waring and Wong (2009) stress that correctness is not necessarily a key consideration in whether a teacher offers praise. Consequently, teachers could sometimes offer inappropriate praise acclaiming students for both incorrect and correct answers. Therefore, Waring and Wong (2009) stress the importance of being consistent while praising students in order for this type of oral feedback to function as reinforcement. Additionally, praising must be specific about the behaviour being reinforced and addressed to a particular context in question (Waring & Wong, 2009). As a result, saying something like “very good” is not specific about what utterance was correct or incorrect. As a consequence, it is likely that students will not understand what was correct or positive about their utterance.

Furthermore, Waring and Wong (2009) claim that in order to save time, one should not offer in particular advanced learner praising after each and every response; the scholars argue, with support of research, that using the phrase “very good” is not as beneficial feedback reinforcement. But by “examining, altering, or varying the ways in which teachers provide positive feedback to learners is another dimension in scaffolding instruction [...] and providing guidance or knowledge of results” (pp. 202-203).

3.5 Learner Preferences

Lyster et al. (2013) investigated learner and teacher preferences for CF. Learner preferences are important for two reasons: firstly they can influence learning behaviours and secondly, there could be a mismatch between teachers’ intentions and the ways learner interpret CF which could result in negative effects on learning. On the other hand, learners prefer to receive CF to having their errors ignored (Lyster, Saito, Sato, 2013). Although the general tendency for students to prefer receiving CF is consistent across most contexts, some studies have reported that the strength of the preference varies according to learners’ cultural backgrounds, previous and current language learning experiences, or proficiency levels (Lyster, Saito, Sato, 2013).

3.6 Learner types

The kind of learners you give corrective feedback to is also an important factor for how effective CF actually is. According to Lyster & Saito (2010), children benefit from interactional CF and learned more immediately than adult ESL learners. The main reason why CF suits children better than adult ESL learners is because they are “provided at a time in their cognitive and psycholinguistic development when it is most conducive for their learning” (Lyster & Saito, 2010, p. 271). Similarly, children’s sensitivity to recasts seems to function similar to L1 feedback given by parents. However, Spada (2011) mentions that besides the age being a factor, memory components of aptitude and analytic abilities were other important factors in how students perceived CF. Furthermore, this also applies to interactional feedback. Mackey & Oliver (2002) argue that age seems to affect the rate of acquisition and the end state of second language acquisition. Older learners learn language, especially grammar more quickly while younger learners seem to acquire a more native-like command of second languages (Mackey & Oliver, 2002). Being aware of both learner types and learner preferences is relevant to our investigation when observing classrooms and interpreting data. Could these factors affect our results or deviate from what former researches?

4. Methodology

4.1 Qualitative research

This degree project is based on qualitative research. Our qualitative research is mainly about collecting and examining verbal data; it is known to be essential in helping practicing teachers to gain “a deeper knowledge [...] of learning and teaching language” (Heigham & Crocker 2009, p. xi). Indeed, by observing and analysing a current language classroom it is possible to reflect upon our own teaching for improvement as well as attaining an insight into a specific language context.

Furthermore, the approach to data collection used was based on triangulation where both students and teachers were observed, the teachers were interviewed and through a questionnaire (open-ended items) we collected data from the students’ perspectives. Using multiple sources is useful to better understand different perspectives: students’ perspectives and teachers’ perspectives. In the following section the approaches on how data were collected are discussed.

4.2 Context

The investigation was conducted at a school in a small municipality in South Sweden with a high socioeconomic status. According to the teachers interviewed (see attachment 4 & 5), most of the students at the school are highly motivated and strive for high grades. With regards to ethnicity, the majority of the students are ethnic Swedes with Swedish as mother-tongue language. The teachers that were observed are certified teachers who have several years of teaching experience.

4.3 Observation

Observation is the first research method for collecting data for this research. Heigham & Crocker

(2009) point out that observation goes hand in hand with interviews and that it provides “important preliminary information about participants’ external behaviour which can then be followed up with questions about their inner values and beliefs” (p. 166). Hence, observation in combination with interviews may give us an important insight into an authentic environment of interaction between students and teachers.

Bell (2010) mentions four kinds of observations that could be relevant for qualitative research: Unstructured and structured, non-participant or participant observations. Unstructured observation is an extended observation type that requires significant field work where the researcher will find a certain pattern in their data instead of looking for a specific kind of information (Bell, 2010). Structured observation, on the other hand, has a clear focus and is subjective. The researcher will observe behaviour and different kinds of situations. Bell (2010) defines non-participant observation as an observation where the researcher observes behaviour without participating. Finally, participant observation is the opposite to non-participant observation where the researcher participates in the investigation.

The kind of observation that was conducted for this research is non-participant observation.. In addition, the chosen kind of observation used is structured observation which includes different feedback types given by the teacher and how they are perceived by the students. Bell (2010) stresses the importance of the compatibility of the chosen method (i.e. structured observation) and therefore encourages researchers to pilot the observation schedule before using it. However, we did not pilot the observation since we presented different feedback types on the scheme but also prepared room for "other" feedback types to be filled in. Therefore piloting would not be necessary – any new feedback types would be filled in if found.

We divided the observation schedule into two categories:

- Teachers’ responses/oral feedback
- Students’ responses to feedback (Does the student change wordings/language? Is there any response?)

The first category concerns what kind of oral feedback the teacher gives the students where the observer circles one of the ten options listed (see attachment 1). The second category covers the students’ responses to the teacher’s feedback. What is of interest to observe is whether the

students change their utterance or ignore the oral feedback received from the teacher. On the other hand, the students might want to correct their utterance but do not get a chance by the teacher to do so.

Heigham & Crocker (2009) stress that entering another teacher's class and observing him or her can be seen as threatening and an invasion of privacy. The observed teachers had had continuous contact with us throughout our student teaching time. Therefore, we presumed that the observation could be pursued as naturally as possible.

Another important factor to consider is the reliability of making observations. Darlington & Scott as quoted in Bell (2010) emphasize that results of an observations could be biased due to the fact that the observers might "[impose her/his own] interpretations on what is observed and so fail to understand ' what an activity means for those who are involved in it'" (p.192). But since we were two interpreting the data we managed to discuss critically from two perspectives in order to be as neutral as possible.

4.4 Interviews

The interviews followed ethic guidelines where the teachers were informed about "the purpose of the interview and what will be done with it as well as emphasize that their participation will be anonymous" (Bell, 2010, p. 49). The interviews were conducted in Swedish based on the teachers' preferences. In a previous research, the same teacher found that answering interview questions in English was limiting and preferred to respond in Swedish in order to give more "valuable" answers (Mahdi, 2012).

Furthermore, the interviews were tape-recorded in order for us to get access to the interviews later for content analysis. The interviewees were also informed about this before the interview session, as suggested by Bell (2005). This will let the interviewees have a chance to consider "the meaning" of what is going to happen and have the time to reflect on whether they want to participate or not – simply an arrangement to protect the interviewees' rights (p. 157).

Moreover, one significant advantage of conducting interviews is that "an interviewer can follow up ideas, probe responses and investigate motives and feelings, which the questionnaire can never do" (Bell, 2005, p. 157). Bell compares verbal form to written form, and stresses that

the role of interaction, between the interviewer and the interviewee, is of value since written form can sometimes conceal “face value” (ibid). This means that we can ask questions to make sure that we have understood what the participants mean, but also follow up on an idea that is relevant to our research. In addition, facial expressions can provide some information about what the interviewees feel, which is another strategy that we can use to understand what the participants mean.

On the other hand, there is a disadvantage of conducting interviews which is the issue of time and the wording. Bell argues (2005) that interviews are time-consuming and to interview only a couple of people can lead to bias. However, the interviewees can provide us with rich insight and in combination with other research techniques – the interviews can make greater sense (ibid). This is why our methods of research have been carefully chosen in dialogue with our supervisor at Malmo University – to arrange a relevant plan of what to observe. When it comes to the wording of the interview questions, Bell argues that it must be a simple and understandable language used. In addition, all our research topics must be covered. This is something we had in mind when designing the interviews. Our supervisor at Malmo University (Lundahl, mail conversation, 2013-10-10) also came with comments on our suggested prepared interview questions which helped us improve them and create a clear structure.

4.5 Questionnaire

For this research, questionnaires were distributed to students in order to receive written responses from them. Dörnyei (2007) defines questionnaires as “any written instruments that present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they are to react either by writing out their answers or selecting from among existing answers” (p. 102). Questionnaires are usually associated with quantitative research and statistics. But they can also be used in qualitative research, designed differently. The most common ways of using questionnaires in quantitative research is by using close-ended questions (Dörnyei, 2007). According to Dörnyei (2007) one should use interviews for more personal answers. On the other hand, using open-response questionnaires is more suitable for qualitative research, especially case studies and often function as a complement to observation, interviews and diary studies (Brown, 2009). Open-response

items on questions require the participants to answer in their own words by writing in a space that is provided (Brown, 2009).

Furthermore, questionnaires in general contain three types of questions that Dörnyei (2007) mentions: Factual, behavioral and attitudinal questions. Factual questions concern the respondents' background information, for example, age and gender. Behavioral questions focus on life-styles habits and personal history. Finally, attitudinal questions are used to find out what people think and cover beliefs, values and interests etc. These are very general categories regarding how to organize a questionnaire. Brown (2009), on the other hand, comments on how open-ended questions should be designed since "open-ended questions work particularly well if they are not completely open but contain certain guidance" (p. 203). He mentions four question types: specific open questions that ask about concrete pieces of information, similar to Dörnyei's (2007) factual questions. The second question type is clarification questions which could come after a multiple choice item. Furthermore, sentence completion and short answer questions are the two final types that Brown (2009) mentions. Sentence completion consists of claims where the respondents have to fill in the blanks. While the short answer questions are questions that allows the respondents to answer in short sentences. This should not be confused with essay questions that require far longer answers.

The questionnaire used for this research is based on open-ended items since it is more suitable for qualitative research. Given that the observations were made in the classrooms and interviews were conducted with the teachers, questionnaires would allow us to vary the data intake. The questionnaire consists of eleven short questions. Brown (2009) advises that the questions should be concise and easy to understand. This is highly important when dealing with young students who barely are familiar with the subject; this is also why the questionnaire is conducted in Swedish. The questionnaire consists of two types of questions: factual questions and attitudinal questions. There are only two factual questions in this questionnaire, one regarding gender and another regarding school year. The rest of the questions concern whether the students receive any oral feedback or not and how they perceive it. Additionally, the open-ended items in the questionnaire are designed as specific open questions, clarification questions and short answer questions. There were no behavioural questions since they were not relevant to our research. The majorities of the questions are yes- or no questions and ask for an explanation hence the categorization as clarification question. Question number ten is also a factual question with

different choices with a sub question that asks the students to explain why. Further, question number four is a pure short answer question asking the students about what kind of oral feedback they usually receive where they are expected to give a short answer.

Additionally, it is critical to understand the pros and cons of conducting an open-answer questionnaire. Questionnaires consisting of open-ended questions give researchers knowledge needed but controlled by the questions. In addition, conducting a questionnaire is an administrative convenience (McDonough & McDonough, 1997). According to Brown (2009) open-format questionnaires permit a “greater freedom of expression” and “provide a far greater richness than fully quantitative data” (p. 205). Furthermore, open-format items give us as researchers long and detailed personal accounts, similar to interviews (Dörnyei, 2007).

On the other hand, it is important to highlight the disadvantages of using open-response items. Brown (2009) brings up the difficulty in analysing and interpreting the results which also is time consuming. It is important for researchers to find the useful and interesting patterns and requires a lot of data. In some cases, finding a pattern can be difficult since some responses may be irrelevant which we as researcher must be aware of. Also, it is important to realize that not all questions will be answered. The “Squeaky wheel syndrome” is what Brown (2009) names it. This means that the researchers will not be able to know if the answers received represent the whole group’s answers or just a particular kind of people (Brown, 2009).

Brown (2009) mentions that one major problem with open-response items which is the difficulty to demonstrate reliability, validity, replicability and generalizability. These concepts are usually applied to quantitative studies, not qualitative. Furthermore, analogous qualitative concepts are credibility, dependability, conformability and transferability which are very important factors in demonstrating how reliable the data is (Brown, 2009).

Credibility is the idea that the researchers should be as accurate as possible when characterizing the people they are investigating. This can be enhanced by “using prolonged engagements, persistent observation, triangulation ...” (Brown, 2009, p. 215). Moreover, dependability is the notion that researchers should be ready for any drastic changes in their research; it can be improved by “using overlapping methods, stepwise replications and inquiry audits” (Brown, 2009, p. 215). Conformability asks researchers to make the data they are basing their research on available; this can be improved by saving all records for any inquiries. Finally, transferability is the notion that the researchers should describe their research design, the context

and the conditions of the study so that other readers can conclude whether the results could relate to their own context or not; this could easily be done by writing a very detailed description. (Brown, 2009).

In short, designing a questionnaire with open-ended items must be carefully done and one must be aware that there are always some factors that could affect the results and change the direction of the investigation.

4.6 Piloting

It is important to mention that we had a test group – with a 7th grade class where the questionnaires were filled out. Here the students did not understand what oral feedback was even though we had a short presentation of what feedback was. The questionnaire questions were also filled out in a less fulfilling way. The answers were very short, vague and not answered according to the questions given. Often the students asked what one meant with certain questions, and in fact they stressed that some of the questions were too difficult to understand. In addition, many students believed that there were too many questions. Therefore we reduced the number of questions – from twelve questions to nine. We also simplified the language in order for the new group to comprehend the questions better and without as much confusion. The presentation was also simplified in order for the new group to understand the purpose of the questionnaires.

4.7 Presenting the questionnaires

The students in the current class were provided with questions that were based on thoughts and ideas about oral feedback. There were different types of questions that concerned what type of feedback a teacher could provide learners with.

When we handed out the questionnaires, we explained that there is a small introduction in the questionnaire form where the purpose of our questionnaire is stated and instructions given on how to fill in the answers. We also gave an example of how one could answer an attitudinal question; in order for the students to have an idea of what oral feedback could look like.

5. Results

5.1 Interview

The aim of conducting interviews was to demonstrate the role of oral feedback in an EFL classroom through two teachers' perspectives. The interview was divided into four categories where three of them cover the different perspectives of oral feedback while one concerns background information. In addition, since the interviews were conducted in Swedish, we have translated the quotes into English meaning that all quotes in English in this section is our translation.

5.1.1 Teachers' backgrounds

The first category contains factual questions concerning the teachers' backgrounds. The answers revealed that both interviewees are experienced female teachers who have worked as teachers between ten and twenty-seven years. They have numerous experiences of teaching languages as well as working in this current compulsory school. The teachers describe the students at the current school as motivated and ambitious, but emphasize that problems exist as in any other school (Anna & Malin interview, 2013-09-20)

5.1.2 EFL learners with different abilities

The second category refers to providing feedback to EFL learners with different abilities. Anna (Anna interview, 2013-09-20) highlighted the importance of adjusting the lessons suiting the different learners' levels:

Perhaps having a more simplified exercise with the students who have some language difficulties or perhaps create different groups where those who have similar difficulties

work together. [Anna interview 2013-09-20]

Kanske ha en enkel variant som de som har lite svårare för sig kan göra, eller att man gör grupper så att dem som har lite svårare kan hänga på. Eller att man kan göra grupper av olika slag. Att de som har lite svårare är för sig. [Anna interview 2013-09-20]

Malin drew a similar conclusion and stressed the importance of having pleasant relationships with the students and trying to pay equal attention to all of them but she also tries to offer student individual attention based on their English level (Malin interview, 2013-09-20).

5.1.3 The role of feedback

The third category covers the role of feedback in the EFL classroom. Anna believed that written feedback is more effective than oral – and that the latter is a complement to the former:

The written feedback is what I look at the most. Written feedback consists of words and students can go back to the feedback later and see ‘What did I actually write?’ I believe it is easier to give corrective feedback in written form because it is not ambiguous and does not mix with gestures that would confuse the students. If I would be verbal and say: ‘You could have done a bit better’ and [at the same time if I have a positive body language the students may misinterpret the feedback]. The written feedback is more valuable than oral one.

[Anna interview 2013-09-20]

det skriftliga det är det jag bygger det mesta på. Det är ju ord – och då kan de gå tillbaks och titta ”vad skrev jag egentligen?”. Det är inte färgat. Om det då är en lite jobbig respons – att det inte var så bra gjort, då har jag tänkt igenom när jag skrivit ner det och det är inte färgat av några gester. Att jag ska säga: ”Du kunde gjort lite bättre” och kanske är man för positiv i kroppsspråket och så tar de inte det till sig. Det jag har läst om skriftlig respons är att den ska vara snabb. Och att det skriftliga är mer värt än det muntliga.

[Anna interview 2013-09-20]

Furthermore, Anna explained that as a complement to written feedback one could give “quick” oral feedback (Anna interview, 2013-09-20). She provided examples of feedback types such as praising and questions that show that she is interested in what the students have done - to make the students empowered and proud of their production. The feedback will be quick in order for

the students to be able to continue with the work by themselves. Anna explained that explicit corrective feedback could discourage students from talking. Instead Anna suggested that students should learn to use words and use the right grammar by themselves:

[I try] to make the students ask themselves the same questions I provide them with - if it is about grammar, word choice and similar concerns. Sometimes when they are unconcentrated and cannot respond to my questions, I say: 'This is not feasible. You can answer nineteen out of twenty questions. Try to find [the answer] or ask a friend who you know can tell you [the right answer].' It is not a question about winning a Nobel Prize. It is not questions that I have to answer – you do a better job if you think by yourself [...] Ask the questions to yourself – then you will be motivated.

[Anna interview 2013-09-20]

Att de själv ställer frågor: ”Men vad brukar hända? Vad skulle det vara om man byter ut någonting”. Att de själv ställer dem här frågorna som jag matar dem med. Om det handlar om grammatik, ordval och sådana här saker. Ibland när de är stirriga så säger jag: 'Det här är ohållbart. Nitton av tjugo frågor kan ni själv svara på, hitta, fråga en kompis som ni vet också kan det. 'Det är liksom inte nobelpris frågor. Det är inte frågor som jag måste svara på utan ni gör ett bättre jobb om ni själv tänker efter, ni frågar en kompis eller själv börjar bläddra i era papper boken. Ställ frågorna själv till er – då blir ni mer självgående.

[Anna interview 2013-09-20]

Hence, the teacher believed that the students need to build up analytic abilities in order to assess their work. This will let the students improve their work and learn to reflect upon their work. However, Malin expressed a desire to provide students with a variety of feedback types (Malin interview, 2013-09-20). For example, a set of positive and reinforcing feedback. According to Malin, varying the feedback like this is more beneficial, due to the fact that one involves the students in the lesson by encouraging them:

It is important that I, as a teacher, acknowledge when the students have done something right. One must be positive and provide them with praise - that 'it is going well' in order to make them dare to say something next time. [Malin interview 2013-09-20]

I varje konversation så är det viktigt att de får ett kvitto på att jag har förstått och att de har gjort rätt. Att man är positiv och ger dem beröm att det går bra så att de ska våga säga

någotting igen nästa gång. [Malin interview, 2013-09-20]

Furthermore, Malin explained that when it comes to corrective feedback the exposure to recasts helps the students develop since it provides them with the right answer: “I goes to school today – Oh, you went to school today” (Malin interview, 2013-09-20). However, she mentioned that explicit correction of a student’s grammar is not preferred since the student will be withdrawn and may not dare to speak again. In other words, the teacher’s feedback should not put pressure on the students to be accurate. Instead the aim is to encourage the students to trust in their language skills.

When it comes to the main purpose of oral feedback both teachers agree that it should be used to increase the students’ self-esteem. In the following example, Anna describes a classroom scenario where praise is of great benefit:

It is when they are insecure. [The students] want to know that they are on the right track. They want to know that they have done a good job. [Students] do not know that by themselves, of course. From my experience, in the process of my writing, I can share the same thoughts as the students: ‘Is this good? Is this how I supposed to be doing?’ When providing the students with feedback it becomes a quick check [for the students] that they are doing well: ‘Yes, you are on the right track!’ or ‘This is good, do not erase this!’. There are a lot of students erasing what they have written. [It is important to say:] ‘This is good, continue like this’ even though [the students] say ‘But my friend has done it differently.’ Trust yourself now. [Anna interview, 2013-09-20]

Det är väl när de är osäkra. Dem vill ju veta att de är på rätt väg. De vill veta att de har gjort ett bra jobb. De vet ju inte själva förstås. När man är i process och ska skriva någotting så vet jag ju själv: ”Är det här bra? Är det såhär jag ska göra?”. För det är det en snabb check att ”Ja, du är på rätt väg!” eller ”Det här är bra, sudda inte ut det!” Det är många som bara raderar. ”Det här är bra, fortsätt så!” fastän de säger ”Men kompiserna har gjort på det viset. Vilket ska jag göra?” Lita på dig själv här nu. [Anna interview, 2013-09-20]

Anna provided her students with some guidance in order for them to trust their own ability and see the quality of their work. Furthermore, she founds praise as a way to provide a good-natured atmosphere in the classroom:

Everyone has the right to receive the same amount of help. It is important, otherwise I will not be able to give any oral feedback if it is not equally given to students. In that case I have to do it in written form [...] [I want the students, through the job I am doing, to find their own strategies] and be able to proceed further with their work by themselves. That is truly the main focus, and also to feel proud over what they are doing. I want to help them see the qualities. [Anna interview, 2013-09-20]

Alla har lika mycket rätt att få hjälp. Det är viktigt för annars kan jag ju inte ha någon muntlig feedback. Då får jag göra det skriftlig [...] Att genom det jobbet jag gör, att de själva hitta sina egna strategier och kunna själv klara sig vidare. Det är verkligen huvudfokus. Och känna sig stolta över det de gör. Hjälpa dem se kvalitéerna.

[Anna interview, 2013-09-20]

5.1.4 Corrective feedback types

Moreover, the fourth category brings up the variety of corrective feedback types and their relevance in the EFL classroom. Both teachers preferred reformulation including recasts but did not prefer to use explicit correction. Anna explained that she can use corrective feedback only in grammar focused lessons as when preparing the students in beforehand that she will be “picking” on their grammar (Anna interview, 2013-09-20). However, she argued that “[Recasts] are most relevant since students will understand and learn when I am repeating the right form” (Anna interview, 2013-09-20). In connection to this, Malin mentioned this about explicit corrective feedback: “I believe that [corrective feedback] is too harsh. It is better if I would say ‘Oh, you went’. If I use corrective feedback, it feels as if I hit them on the knuckles.” (Malin interview, 2013-09-20). The teacher explained further that she will most likely supply the students with the correct way of saying utterances in an implicit way.

Furthermore, both teachers try to avoid to repeat the incorrect utterance used by the student in the same incorrect way. They find this type of oral feedback similar to explicit correction. In addition, Anna expressed her thoughts regarding this by stating:

If a student says something wrong I would then repeat [what he or she is saying] without revealing to the class that the student did something wrong. There is no reason to point out: ‘Now you did something wrong. It should be like this instead.’ In front of the whole class

[...]. [Anna interview, 2013-09-20]

Om en elev säger fel. Så upprepar jag gärna för dem andra fast på rätt utan att liksom peka ut ”Nu gjorde du fel!”. Finns ingen anledning att påpeka: ”Nu gjorde du fel. Det ska vara såhär istället.” inför alla, om det är en helklassituation. [Anna interview, 2013-09-20]

Thereupon, Anna explained that she does not want to correct the spoken errors. If she does so, the student will be embarrassed if somebody else hears it in the class. She further stressed that at compulsory level one concentrates more on content, and explicit correction is included in written form (Anna interview, 2013-09-20).

Clarification requests are often used in Malin’s classroom, but Anna did not find them important. Malin argued that she used clarification requests frequently when “[the students] have answered upon something and I am not quite sure of what they mean. [They would when provided with clarification requests] understand that I want them to further explain what they said.” (Malin interview, 2013-09-20). Anna stated that she might use clarification request if she did not understand what a student was talking about (Anna interview, 2013-09-20).

The teacher, Anna, does not use metalinguistic feedback often because she did not find it useful to help students to develop their English fluency. For instance, Anna has not reflected on this feedback type and suggests that she might use it only when teaching at high school level. Likewise, Malin’s approach to metalinguistic feedback is that she does not use it often: “‘Use past tense in your sentence’ I can use this if it is a student at a higher level. I would not use it in this group. There are many students who do not know what ‘past tense’ is at all” (Malin interview, 2013-09-20).

5.1.5 Students’ responses and assessment

The final category brings up students’ responses and assessment. Anna and Malin (Anna & Malin interview, 2013-09-20) have different views concerning how feedback can be beneficial for the students. Anna highlights that she tries to provide the students with questions in order for the students to reflect on what they are doing, and as a consequence stimulating their learning:

There are lessons where I have succeeded in providing effective questions to the students. When the students have a concern about something we are working on which they do not understand - I provide them with questions to make them come up with the answer by

themselves. Some students understand the questions and discover new ideas and will appreciate the feedback. However, the students who are lazy and could therefore be discouraged by receiving questions, they cannot understand the purpose of me providing them with questions. They do not understand that they have to reflect by themselves on what they are doing. They do not understand the purpose of what they are doing.

[Anna interview, 2013-09-20]

I dem sammanhang när jag har lyckats med det här att ställa frågor till dem. Dem frågar och får bara motfrågor av mig. Efter ett tag – så kanske de som vill någonting och har en drivkraft dem ser ju ”Aha, det är såhär man kan tänka”. De kan uppskatta det. Men de som inte orkar - de kanske slutar fråga för de bara får motfrågor. För de ser inte vitsen. De ser inte kopplingen. [Anna interview, 2013-09-20]

In short, the teacher supplied the students with follow-up questions based on what they are asking for, so that they can figure out by themselves where they are in the learning process.

Furthermore, Malin explained that useful feedback such as praising will strengthen the students’ self-esteem. She described that there are many students who find it difficult to attend English lessons and have a negative attitude. She gave an example of a student who came to class and had done her homework but still thought English was a difficult subject. The student has a low self-esteem concerning the English subject but appreciated when the teacher praised her: “I believe she became quite happy when she received praise and could explain by her herself that it went well with the work she has done in oral form” (Malin interview, 2013-09-20). In brief, Malin stresses that she praise her students in order to effectively change their behaviour.

Malin also mentioned that there are some students who do not understand the feedback she gives but merely look at their grades. These students do not often do their homework, or want to make an effort in their work to be able to learn more. She stressed that it is typical teenage behaviour that one has to work with constantly. During the interview Malin expressed an interest in seeing how students develop from her feedback and their time in compulsory school when starting high school:

When the students come away from this school and meet other students, they will notice that ‘We actually know a whole lot’ or ‘We do not know a lot’ [...] There are students who understand what study skills are at intermediate level, but not all of them know what they

are. [I believe the students need to have some distance to understand what they have learned in compulsory school.][Malin interview, 2013-09-20]

När de kommer ifrån denna skola och träffar andra elever så märker dem – ’Vi kan ju faktiskt en hel del’ eller ’Vi kunde inte så mycket’. [...] Sen finns det de som förstår studieteknik redan i högstadiet men det är ju inte alla. Jag tror man behöver ha distans.

[Malin interview, 2013-09-20]

When it comes to students’ development in English, as a result of receiving oral feedback, Anna referred to what was previously said about the urge to learn. However, Malin described that a variety of feedback, such as praise and correction, given to students will create a positive atmosphere. For instance, when the students’ spoken language is corrected the students become aware of the errors they have made. An important starting-point here is to consider the students’ personalities and provide corrective feedback depending on what type of learners I have (Malin interview, 2013-09-20). Malin explained this as follows: “Some [students] can take criticism negatively and shut down. Afterwards they blame the problem on me as if it is I who is negative” (Malin interview, 2013-09-20). According to Malin, an explanation for this behaviour is that such students do not listen or participate in the lessons; this issue occurred specifically with one of Malin’s students. The student in question thought Malin was a “bad teacher” when the student did not listen to the feedback she was given:

When someone has difficulties understanding something or has too high demands on themselves, it is easier to blame the teacher for the problem. In this case the student will call me ‘dumb’ and will not listen to the feedback because the feedback I provide is another sign of me being ‘stupid’ [...] Instead of listening to the feedback they totally ignore it.

[Malin interview, 2013-09-20]

Det är oftast så om det är blir någonting som man inte kan och man ställer ribban högt – då är det lättare att lägga felet på någon annan och oftast är det läraren som blir fel. Att man blir dum i huvudet och då tar man inte till sig den feedbacken man får. Det är bara ännu ett tecken på att den är dum i huvudet för att hon fattar inte att jag inte fattar. Istället för att se vad det är jag kan göra åt och bara lyssna på själva feedbacken så blir det bara en blackout.

[Malin interview, 2013-09-20]

Malin explained that it is frustrating when students as in this example do not understand feedback

(Malin interview, 2013-09-20). A solution to this is for the teacher to take a step back and meet the student with empathy. According to Malin, one can support the student by offering help instead of making remarks about students not doing their homework. Finally, when the current student finally “opened up and could learn from her mistakes that I pointed out, she could perceive the feedback as support and not a threat (Malin interview, 2013-09-20).

Furthermore, the process of learning from feedback is described as something important. Anna explained that the students will develop a confidence where they can feel content with themselves and learn to give themselves feedback that I give them. The students will start thinking: “What I am writing is not that bad! This was how I wrote last time and it was quite good!” (Anna interview, 2013-09-20). Malin also mentioned that one does not know if her feedback is effective in the long run. Therefore, she suggested that the National Agency for Education should let the students evaluate their education (Malin interview, 2013-09-20). She explained further, that it is only the skilful students who return after high school and provide Malin with some feedback of what they have learned, but Malin wondered what the other students who were not fond of school believed of her teaching and the feedback she provided. Malin described it as if teachers also need feedback to be able to have confidence in the feedback they provide students. According to Malin, the classroom is as an enclosed place and more assessment from the National Agency for Education is needed to learn about new ways of giving feedback to students. Another idea is for teachers to be able to participate in in-job training to develop, as mentioned, new ways of teaching.

These thoughts bring us to the question of whether students learn from feedback at the current compulsory school. Both Anna and Malin highlighted that it depends on how open-minded the students are. For instance, Anna saw it in this light:

“[Some students have a perception of themselves being even efficient then they actually are.] When I try to give students on a low English level feedback that suits them it becomes difficult to reach out to them since the students consider themselves being on a higher level. They say ‘Yes’ just in order to get me to stop talking and pretend that they already know what I am saying. [It is very different from student to student – of how they perceive feedback]”. [Anna interview, 2013-09-20]

Det beror på hur låsta det är. Vissa kan vara låsta i någonting - att de har en uppfattning om sig själva om att de är bättre än dem är. När jag försöker med respons som är på en lägre

nivå för att jag ser att de är på en lägre nivå och de själv ser sig högt uppe, då är det svårt att nå ut, eller de som inte är intresserade; De säger ”Ja” för att jag ska sluta prata. Det är väldigt olika hur de uppfattar feedback. [Anna interview, 2013-09-20]

The follow-up question regarding this subject was “What do you as a teacher do when a student is resistant to your feedback? Anna stressed that she tries to reason with the student when she sees that her feedback has no effect. She illustrated how a conversation with that student could look like: “I notice that you do not understand this. Do you have any explanation for this? Don’t you understand what I am saying?” (Anna interview, 2013-09-20) Anna will find out the reason behind the student not understanding the feedback by talking to him or her. If the case is that the student is not looking for a high grade, Anna “will not waste energy” to provide the student feedback if he or she do not want it. If the case is that the student’s has a specific aim such as to be fluent when talking to people in English she will know what the student’s ambition is and provide feedback along with that.

Furthermore, there are interview-questions that refer to whether students listen, understand and respond to the teacher’s feedback. Both teachers expressed that students generally do listen to the feedback they receive; especially if they have a positive attitude to the lesson (Monika & Anna interview, 2013-09-20). Monika indicated that if a certain student does not understand the feedback, the teacher must try to give it in a different way.

The final interview-question brings up students’ assessment of their oral feedback. According to Malin, she generally gives the students a chance to evaluate their different skills in her lessons but does not remember if she has done this in her English subject (Malin interview, 2013-09-20). Similarly, Anna was not sure if students are actually aware of their spoken level in English:

I believe it is about self-confidence. Some students have been abroad travelling a lot and they know that they will manage forward. Other students know [how to speak English but have not tried to practice the language in real life]. I do not know. It is a question that would be fun to ask my students: ‘What level is your spoken English on?’ ‘What level are you on according to you?’ [Anna interview, 2013-09-20]

Jag tror nog det handlar om självförtroende. Vissa har ju varit ute och rest mycket och vet att de klarar sig framåt. Några andra kan men har inte testat. Det kan jag inte svara på. Det är en fråga som skulle varit kul att ställa dem: ”Vilken nivå är du i muntligt? Vad anser du

själv?” [Anna interview, 2013-09-20]

In relation to this, Anna mentioned another aspect, that students do not know when they should use colloquial or academic English. An example of this is when a student repeatedly wrote “like” in an essay, in the same way one does when speaking. Anna explained that: “The student in this case is fluent but is not aware that he is using colloquial language.” (Anna interview, 2013-09-20).

5.2 Observation

Observation is one of the three data-gathering methods chosen for this degree project. The purpose of the observation was to examine in detail the participants’ behaviour in a classroom where English language is used. The role of feedback was studied in a naturalistic setting. Furthermore, in this chapter the classroom setting and the result of the observation are presented.

5.2.1 Participants

The participants in the observation were the current two teachers that were interviewed in the first method chosen for research gathering. They are both teachers of English who have significant experience of teaching (see interview results).

The students chosen for observation belong to two different classes. The first one is a small group of 9th graders consisting of ten students. Their current English teacher, Malin, describes the students as having different kinds of English levels where most of them are at a relatively low level. For example, several of them have problems to finish their homework (Malin interview, 2013-09-20) In addition, some students have problems to structure their text, both in oral and written form. There is also another student who often lacks concentration during the English Lessons.

The second class observed is a bigger class of 8th graders consisting of twenty-eight students. The majority of the students are well-motivated and strive for high grades in English (Anna interview, 2013-09-20). However, a couple of students only want to pass with the lowest grade

due to the fact that they do not have the ambition to study at a university.

5.2.2 Observing the lessons

The lessons that were observed were carefully chosen in dialogue with our supervisor and the teachers at the partner school. Feedback is a form of communication that exists between two parts; in this degree project teacher and student interaction is investigated (see introduction). Therefore we had to observe lessons where such interactional feedback existed. The lessons chosen had a teacher-student focus where the teachers led discussions about certain written texts, a listening exercise, a grammar review and a mind-mapping lesson.

The number of feedback types used in the 9th grader, with Malin as a teacher, is illustrated as followed:

First lesson: 39

Second lesson: 40

Third lesson: 11

[Observation Schedule, see attachment 1]

In the 8th grade-class, with Anna as a teacher, the following amount of feedback types were used in each lesson:

First lesson: 7

Second lesson: 14

Third lesson: 15

[Observation Schedule, see attachment 1]

The students' responses varied depending on what feedback type the students received from their teacher, therefore a short summary is difficult to present. Instead, the students' responses can be read about in the different categories in this chapter.

5.2.3 Praising

The results indicate that the teachers used praise as the most common feedback type in all the

lessons, and mostly in the smaller group. In the first lesson with the 9th graders, praise was used twenty-three times by the teacher out of thirty-nine. In the second lesson with the same group praise was used twenty-one times out of forty. In the third and last lesson with the same group praise was used once out of eleven feedback moments. In all these lessons positive feedback occurred when the teacher asked questions about a grammar phrase or asked a student to retell facts from a listening exercise.

The positive reinforcement could be phrases such as “Good, you know how to say it Jenny!”, “That’s very good!”, “I think it went well, excellent!” or “Really well done, Eva!” (Observation schedule, 2013). The majority of the students’ responses contained no response, or a response characterized by an affirmative “yes” which sounded somewhat like a gasp. However, occasionally students have asked their teacher, when she provided them with praise, about what particular part the teacher working (Observation schedule, 2013).

In the 8th grade-group, with Anna as a teacher, praise also dominated in the observed lessons. In the first lesson praise was used five out of seven feedback moments. In the second lesson praise was used two out of fourteen feedback moments. In the third and last lesson reinforcement was used six out of fifteen moments. These kinds of feedback were given: “Good! Great!”, “Good good!”, “That’s good! When he was a little child.” and “Yes, it was when he was two years old. Good!” (Observation schedule, 2013). The feedback was provided when the students explained the story about the creation of Big Ben which was illustrated in the students’ mind-map papers. The teacher often praised along with conversational recasts. Moreover, when the teacher used this positive reinforcement to show students that they did well – the students responded with a gesture of nodding or hummed, and mostly continued to tell the story in the mind-map. On other occasions, the students ignored what the teacher said and other times they continued retelling the story without any response to the provided feedback from the teacher. Furthermore, some students stopped telling the story when provided with positive feedback. When the students stopped to tell the story the teacher went on with new questions about the next idea in the mind-map: “What are your exact thoughts about this picture?” (Observation schedule, 2013).

5.2.4 Elicitation

The teacher provided the students with elicitation in two different forms. The first form is when the teacher tried to talk about the next theme in the actual lesson with the students. The second

form is when the teacher tried to explain how to say a certain phrase or word in English (Observation schedule, 2013).

In the first lesson in Malin's classroom with the 9th graders, elicitation occurred fourteen times out of forty (Malin Observation, 2013). In the second lesson with the same class they were used seven times out of eleven. In the third and final lesson with Malin elicitation were asked eleven out of thirty-nine times; in this particular lesson praise was the largest group of feedback types but in comparison to other feedback, elicitation, was still a significant category.

Firstly, Malin used the first elicitation type and tried to asks questions to be able to motivate the student to figure out the right answer. The types of questions that the teacher provided was as follows: “‘posses’ what does this word mean? What is possessive form?, “What does the word university mean? You go there after ‘gymnasiet’”, “Instead of saying your pencil – how would you say that it is his?” (Malin Observation, 2013)

For example, one student response to the first question was “Posses means: I own you” (Malin Observation, 2013). The teacher confirmed that it was the right answer: “Yes, exactly. This is what possessive form means” (Malin Observation, 2013). Then the teacher wrote on the board “Danny, har en penna. Hur skulle du säga det på engelska?” – “Danny, has a pencil. How would you say that in English” (Malin Observation, 2013). The teacher continued by asking the student even more questions regarding possessive form. In general the students responded to the teacher's feedback and when the students did not give the right answer to the question, the teacher asked new questions to follow up on the students' ideas. Other times, the students' responses were no chance or ignore. The teacher tried then to provide the students with more questions or discuss the current theme in greater detail.

Anna used elicitation in the second lesson in two out of fourteen feedback moments. During the third and final lesson she used elicitation nine out of fifteen feedback moments. Such elicitation was presented as followed: “How would you know what direction to take?”, “Have you heard this expression before?”, “Explain it. What happened? Hur sager man böter?” ([...] How do you say a fine?) and “I do not think so. What are your exact thoughts?” The students' responses were in all the cases “responses” except from a few exceptions where the students were quiet. Thus, the students responded with a detailed answer most of the times. Such interaction between the teacher and students where elicitation was used is exemplified here:

Teacher: Have you been in the Middle of Nowhere?

Student: We were outside Kiruna. Vi drove and drove until we found the next place.

Teacher: So that was the Middle of Nowhere?

Student: Yes. We saw many reindeer and elks.

Teacher: Could anyone translate?

Student: Where has he been? Where is Kiruna?

[Anna observation, 2013]

Teacher: Have you been in the Middle of Nowhere?

Student: We were utanför Kiruna. Vi körde och körde tills vi hitta nästa ställe.

Teacher: So that was the middle of no-where?

Student: Yes. Vi såg många renar och älgar

Teacher: Could anyone translate?

Student: Where has he been? Where is Kiruna?

[Anna Observation, 2013]

5.2.5 Conversational recast

Another category of feedback that occurred rarely and was the third largest is conversational recast. Conversational recast was used when a teacher repeated students' comments in the same accurate way that the students responded. In Malin's grade 9 class conversational recasts were used only in one lesson. Here conversational recasts were provided on three out of forty feedback occasions. For instance, the teacher repeated the same sentence uttered by the students: "Aha. Many people live there" or simply added a "Yes" after repeating: "Texting – yes!" (Malin Observation, 2013). In Anna's grade 8 class recasts occurred in one lesson – and five times out of fourteen feedback moments. In another of Anna's lessons conversational recast occurred one time out of seven. In most cases the students had no chance to answer because the teacher asked new questions to the entire class. Here is an example that illustrated such feedback moments:

Student: In my family we travel a lot. I want to travel to Mount Everest. I would like to travel to forests and jungles too.

Teacher: Yes, you would like to look for these places: high mountains, forests, jungles and dangerous places. Anyone else? Would this happen to you? [Anna Observation, 2013]

5.2.6 Explicit correction

Explicit correction could only be found in Malin's lessons with the 9th grade class in all three lessons but was not used in Anna's lessons. Explicit correction occurred in one lesson two times out of forty, in another lesson two times out of thirty-nine, and in the last lesson one time out of eleven. For instance, the explicit correction that the teacher used was: "‘Barely’ betyder inte viktigt. Det betyder knappt." – "‘Barely’ does not mean important. ‘Barely’ means hardly" or "‘Nej, eller så kan man säga ‘agree with’" – "No, or perhaps you can say ‘agree with’" (Malin Observation, 2013). The students responded similarly in all the lessons by humming or saying "Yes" (Malin Observation, 2013).

5.2.7 Metalinguistic Clues

Metalinguistic clues did not appear frequently – they appear in one of Malin's lessons with the 9th graders and in one of Anna's lessons with the 8th graders. In Malin's lesson metalinguistic clues were used two out of thirty-nine feedback moments, and in Anna's lesson the same feedback type was used one out of seven feedback moments. The students did not respond in any of the lessons – and the teacher had to provide the students with further feedback. In addition, the teachers' use of metalinguistic clues were similar. Such Metalinguistic clues could be expressed as follows: "If you rephrase the sentence in English and say ‘it is mine’ instead" - "Om du omvandlar meningen och säger ‘det är min’" (Malin Observation, 2013).

5.2.8 Clarification requests

Clarification request is another category of feedback that was barely seen in either of the two observed teachers' classrooms. In Malin's classroom clarification request appeared twice out of eleven feedback moments in one lesson, and in another lesson clarification requests appeared once out of forty feedback moments (Malin observation, 2013). The students used inaccurate language in all the cases and the teacher replied by asking the students to explain what they meant, for example:

Teacher: Sorry? I do not understand that. Hur sa du det nu? Jag hörde inte riktigt.

Student: It is theirs.

[Malin Observation, 2013]

5.3 Questionnaires

The questionnaires were handed out, and filled in, in the same 8th grade class as the observed lessons and conducted interviews. In this chapter we present the students' responses to the factual and attitudinal questions (definitions are found in the methodology chapter).

5.3.2 Factual information

The first two questions concerned students' factual background. There were sixteen students that participated in filling out the questionnaires. The majority of the students are fourteen years old. The students in the 8th grade class were described as motivated and eager to learn (Anna interview, 2013). However, certain students were described as less motivated (Anna interview, 2013).

5.3.3 Language errors

After the questions about background, the third question asks the respondents to state whether the teacher corrects the students' inaccurate utterances in English (Attachment 2). Half of the students believed that their teacher corrects their inaccurate utterances. For example, these students stated that the teacher corrected them by saying the right word or sentence. Here one student explained that when one uses a wrong word choice the teacher could give an example of a new sentence where the word would work better. Another student mentioned that the teacher could say the right word when he was talking to his teacher alone.

The other half of the students believed that their teacher corrected their spoken English and one student here believed that her teacher did not correct her. Furthermore, the students believed that their teacher corrected their oral English by saying the right word or explaining what grammatical error they had made. A couple of them mentioned that their teacher gives them space to talk and corrects their language after they have finished speaking. In addition, one student believed that her teacher gives you hints on the right word until you come up with the right word by yourself.

5.3.4 Oral feedback

The fourth question refers to what type of oral feedback the students usually receive in their English lessons. Half of the participants described the oral feedback they received in varied ways. One student in this half highlighted that “if the teacher asks me a question and I answer with a wrong word choice, then my teacher will reply with a new sentence where she includes the word in an accurate way. Thereafter she will say “Good!” to me, as if I have not done anything wrong” (Questionnaire, 2013-10-01). Another student here described that he receives praise from his teacher and she also provides advice on how to improve learners’ pronunciation, for instance, by speaking slowly. Other students in the same half believed that their teacher asks questions where the students have to explain further because of their English phrases being vague. Furthermore, one student claimed that he did not receive any oral feedback: “I usually do not receive a lot of feedback. I would like to receive more feedback so that I know when I use incorrect language. I can only improve when I know and correct my language use.”

Moreover, the other half of the group mentioned that their teacher gives them positive feedback, such as when the teacher highlights that the pronunciation is good or that the language use works well. Many of the students here believed that their teacher corrects their spoken English by rephrasing what they say and then “saying it in an accurate way” (Questionnaire, 2013-10-01). The students explained that such feedback helps to improve their English and makes them develop accurate English in oral form.

5.3.5 The effect of oral feedback

The fifth question concerns whether the students find that the oral feedback that they receive from their teacher helps to improve their English. Nine of the students believed that their teacher’s oral feedback is beneficial. The majority of these students argued that when their teacher corrects their spoken English they can learn to pronounce words in the “right” and “accurate” way (Questionnaire, 2013-10-01). Likewise, some of these students explained that when the teacher corrects their spoken language – they improve their spoken language for next time and in that way speak more clearly.

The effect of the teacher’s oral feedback on the other half of the participants varied. Three

students stressed that the teacher's oral feedback did not help them improve their English. However, two students believed that it helped them improve their pronunciation. Other students considered that the teacher's oral feedback contained valuable advice on how to improve the language in general.

5.3.6 The need of oral feedback

The sixth question is about the students' need of oral feedback from their teacher. Eight students clarified that such oral feedback was needed due to the fact that they can know what to improve in their language. In addition, some of these students explained that when they receive oral feedback they can memorize what they did wrong and do it right the next time. Furthermore, one student believed that if one does not receive oral feedback then "you do not know if you are good at English" (Questionnaire, 2013-10-01).

Seven of the participants believed that they need oral feedback from their teacher to be able to know what is needed to improve their language. One student in this group argued that it is beneficial to know what is "good" and what is "bad" about one's English. In addition, another student explained that there is no need for oral feedback because the student likes to find out on their own how to improve his/her language.

5.3.7 Understanding oral feedback

The seventh question highlights the understanding of oral feedback that one's teacher provides in English. Nine students believed that they understand their teacher's oral feedback. Similarly, all seven students responded that they comprehend their teacher's oral feedback.

5.3.8 Types of oral feedback

The eighth question concerns types of feedback that students prefer to receive from their teacher in the English language classroom. Here they could choose more than one alternative. Seven students responded that the feedback they prefer to receive relates to pronunciation. Feedback on word choice was also chosen eight times by nearly all the same students. Moreover, feedback on grammar was chosen three times by the same group of students.

Nine students believed that they needed the mentioned feedback types to be able to speak and write accurately in English. However, one student in this group explained that he/she needed more feedback on pronunciation because the students generally barely speak English in the classroom.

Four of the nine students mentioned above expressed the need to receive oral feedback on pronunciation, grammar and word choice. They explained that they would like to know when they pronounce words wrongly or make other errors to be able to develop their English. Another student explained that he/she only needs feedback on pronunciation, and another student preferred to receive feedback on grammar since he/she believes they are “bad at grammar” (Questionnaire, 2013-10-01). One student did not need any type of teacher feedback since he/she liked to work alone.

5.3.9 Explicit correction

As for whether the students wanted to be corrected on their spoken English and in what way, nine students responded that they wanted to be corrected. They explained that they would like to know when they say something wrong in order to notice the inaccurate expression. These students described further that this helps them to remember the error and enabled them to learn the “right” expression (Questionnaire, 2013-10-01). Furthermore, one student in this group stressed the importance of the teacher correcting errors kindly so that other students in the classroom do not feel limited when using English (Questionnaire, 2013-10-01). Likewise, another student in this group would like an explanation, when being corrected, concerning why something is incorrect.

The majority of the other half of participants (seven participants) wanted to be corrected and they would like the teacher to say the right expression directly to them. Some of them explained that the teacher needed to explain what specifically was wrong with their oral language and provide examples of what one could say instead. Another student suggested that the teacher can correct him/her and then retell the language error in front of the whole class in order for other students to learn. If the students face problems with the same issue they can learn too. On the other hand, one student did not want to be corrected; he/she wanted to discover his/her language errors on his/her own.

6. Discussion

6.1 Oral Feedback types

Despite the fact that there are numerous kinds of oral feedback we did not find all kinds in our observations. One of the aims of this research was to investigate what kinds of oral feedback L2 students receive from their teacher in teacher-led lessons. As the results indicate, praise was the most common oral feedback used by both observed teachers. Since praise is often used with the absence of corrective feedback it either indicates that the students said something correct or functions as a “transition ritual” as Waring and Wong (2009, p. 196) define it. The observations conducted did not specifically cover what kind of praise there was, but according to one of the interviewed teachers, Malin, she preferred using praise as an encouraging tool instead of explicitly correcting the students which could discourage them. This could possibly depend on what kinds of students the teachers have. Lyster et al. mention that adult learners prefer explicit corrective feedback (2013) but that could be different for teenagers in compulsory school who struggle with the English language. On the other hand, Waring and Wong (2009) mention that praise could sometimes be vague and unclear since the student may not understand what it referred to. Therefore, correctness is not a key consideration when the teacher praises a student and could consequently be inappropriate praise for both correct and incorrect answers (Waring & Wong, 2009).

In our investigation, elicitation was the most common corrective feedback used in the classroom (Observation, 2013) where the teachers asked questions such as “How do you say . in English?” According to Lyster et al. (2013), elicitation is an explicit form of oral feedback and it was used differently by our two teachers. Malin who taught 9th graders used elicitation for grammatical purposes, such as “What is the possessive form of this word?” Anna, on the other hand, asked her 8th graders about the translation in English (Observation 2013). We assume that Malin’s students had no problems finding suitable words when speaking English but lacked some grammatical knowledge while the 8th graders needed to improve their vocabulary. Hence the

different approaches when it comes to oral feedback in the two teachers' classrooms.

Finally, the two least common oral feedback types were conversational recast and explicit correction which indicated that both teachers did not prefer to approach the students' incorrect utterances directly. The teachers' attitudes towards different oral feedback types are therefore interesting for this research.

6.2 Oral feedback from teachers' perspectives

Although both interviewed teachers have several years of teaching experiences and teach the same kind of students, they have different opinions on what kind of feedback is suitable for their teaching. Both teachers agreed that oral feedback is a tool to encourage students and raise their self-esteem (Interview, 2013). Anna mentioned that praising and asking questions were ways of creating a positive atmosphere where she can show the students that she is interested in what they say. Although praising and elicitation are the kinds of oral feedback she prefers to use, she believed that oral feedback works as a complement to written feedback, which she believes is more efficient. According to Anna, oral feedback could be ambiguous and unclear whilst written feedback is more tangible. In addition, Anna explained that explicit corrective feedback could discourage students from talking. This creates a dilemma that could draw students' attention to linguistic elements and lose focus on meaning and communication (Long, 1991). Similarly, Malin explained that explicit grammar on a student's grammar could embarrass him or her and discourage him or her from talking. But Malin's thinking was quite the opposite when it came to her opinions about oral feedback. Instead she expressed a desire to provide students with different oral feedback types since she believed that a variation of feedback, especially recast, will involve the students and encourage them to learn more.

Clearly, these were the teachers' opinions on what they believed suits them and their students. Lyster et al. (2013) mention that learners tend to prefer receiving CF in most contexts but one must include factors such as learners' cultural backgrounds, previous and current language experiences and proficiency levels, hence the different opinions that the interviewed teachers had. On the other hand, there could be a mismatch between teachers' intentions and the ways learners interpret CF which could influence learning behaviours (Lyster et al., 2013). A question that

could have been asked was how the teachers knew what kind of feedback their students needed. But Anna's claim that oral feedback functions as a complement to written feedback indicates that her students may not respond to or misinterpret her oral feedback and that she prefers to give written feedback which is easier for them to relate to. But to what extent will the learners learn from the written feedback?

6.3 Learner preferences

Learner preferences are important since they can influence learning behaviours (Lyster et Al., 2013). We understand from what the teachers preferred that they did not want to discourage their students from learning by explicitly correcting them. When we asked the students about what kind of oral feedback they preferred to receive, a majority preferred recasts but did not want recasts in combination with praise since this could be confusing for them. As mentioned earlier, Waring & Wong (2009) mention that praised has to be used consistently in order for the students to understand what the teacher is praising them for. In this case, students found praise together with recast confusing since they did not understand whether they were corrected or praised.

On the other hand, a majority of the girls wanted explicit correction on their pronunciation while a majority of the boys wanted explicit correction on grammar and words. Could it be that the students need to be explicitly corrected in order to understand what they say wrongly? Malin mentioned that she could use explicit correction sometimes, depending on the students and we found some explicit correction in one of her classes. We believe that explicit feedback could be directed in different ways without sounding undermining or offensive but that it all depends on what kind of learners you have. Spada (2011) mentions that age is an important factor, and it could be that the older a student gets, the better they perceive explicit correction. Besides age Spada (2011) mentions that memory components of aptitude and analytic abilities are other important factors in how students perceive CF. These are important components for a teacher to remember when giving oral feedback by asking "what kind of students am I correcting?"

Furthermore, elicitation was one feedback type what was used very often during our observations (Observation, 2013). The students who responded to this questionnaire found it confusing when the teacher asked them something. Was the teacher asking them in order to

clarify something (i.e. correct error) or to request more information?

7. Conclusion

In this study we investigated what kinds of oral feedback are found in an EFL classroom, teachers' opinions about oral feedback and students' perspectives on oral feedback. We found that there were differences between the students' preferred feedback type and the teachers'. As a consequence, we stress how important it is for teachers and students to communicate in order to find a type of oral feedback that will benefit both. Something to consider is that students may not be aware of the consequences that corrective feedback could have. Being corrected in front of the whole class could sound denouncing and could therefore discourage the students from speaking in class. In our questionnaires, we received some answers where the students preferred to be corrected privately which indicates how sensitive it could be to correct a student's language especially if the student barely speaks English due to insecurity. In addition, the relationship between teacher can be damaged since the student may perceive the teacher as harsh and not understand the purpose with explicit corrective feedback.

Furthermore, a lot of research has been conducted in laboratory settings where corrective feedback has been observed which clearly differed from our results in an authentic classroom where we observed all kinds of oral feedback. As mentioned earlier, Waring & Wong (2009) highlight the lack of research of other types of oral feedback such as praising which could make us unaware of other existing oral feedback besides corrective feedback. This can be related to how in our study, we found that significantly less corrective feedback was used while other types of feedback were always used. Therefore, there is a need for more research about oral feedback, beyond corrective feedback, in the EFL classroom. This concerns especially elicitation and praising that was according to the students in this research confusing. In addition, since the interviewed teacher preferred using elicitation and praising they need to be consequent while using these types of feedback in order for the students to understand why they received this kind of feedback.

Furthermore, since the teachers did not want to correct the students in order not to

discourage them there could be other options that belong within the category of interactional feedback. We are not unfamiliar with Long's interactional hypothesis where in order for the students to acquire a language they need to use the target language in interaction. More importantly, they need to negotiate for meaning which is of great value when students communicate with each other. Further, this includes that the students could give each other oral feedback while communicating in order, for instance, to clarify something. However, since our observations were on teacher-led lessons and what kind of feedback students receive from their teachers we could not include this option in our research.

Furthermore, uptake was repeatedly something mentioned in research on corrective feedback, while there has not been any research on uptake with praising or interactional feedback. In addition, measuring uptake by way of oral corrective feedback has been shown to be short-term. To what extent is this kind of uptake effective for EFL students and are there any other options? One could discuss whether learner preference is an important factor when it comes to learning from oral feedback. Since praising and elicitation were confusing the students, we drew the conclusion that there is a need for more explicit feedback in order for the students to understand what they said wrong. Still, one must bear in mind what context and how explicit oral feedback could be given in order to let the students understand and learn from their mistakes.

Finally, this study made us as future teacher fully aware of the variety of oral feedback that could be given to our future students and how important it is to fulfil the students' needs when it comes to oral feedback in the EFL classroom while still doing what you as a teacher believe will benefit your students. Therefore, we stress the importance of learner preferences where the teacher could adjust feedback types depending on what the students prefer. But we are fully aware of that this study is limited to one single school and that there could be different results depending on context, teachers, students and school meaning that the results are not presented as a definite answer to what kind of oral feedback is most efficient in the ESL classroom.

References

Primary sources

Anna interview, carried out: 2013-09-20, Sweden

Ahlner, B. (2012) *Feedback types sheet*. Pp. 5-6, carried out: 2013-10-01. Malmö University, Sweden

Lundahl, B. Mail conversation, 2013-10-10

Malin interview, carried out 2013-09-20, Sweden

Observation schedule, designed date 2013-09-14, Sweden

Observations, carried out: 2013-09-16, 2013-09-19, 2013-09-20, 2013-10-01, 2013-09-26, 2013-09-27, Sweden

Teacher interview questions, designed 2013-09-01 to 2013-09-17. Carried out 2013-09-20, Sweden

Questionnaire form, designed 2013-09-20 to 2013-09-25 , carried out with test group 2013-09-26. Carried out with focus group 2013-10-01, Sweden

Secondary sources

References

Anthony, N. (2008). *The construct of effective online language teaching: Instructors' perspective*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest. (3345770)

Askew, S. (2000). *Feedback for learning*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Bell, J. (2010). *Doing your research project – A guide for first-time researchers in education, health and social science* (5th ed). MacGraw-Hill Education, Berkshire.

- Brown, J.D. (2009). Open-response items in questionnaires. In J. Heigham & R. Croker (Eds.) *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A practical introduction* (pp. 200–217) Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- “Feedback” (N.d.) In *Collins English Dictionary*. Retrieved from: <http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/feedback?showCookiePolicy=true>
- Fuji, A & Mackey, A. (2009). *Interactional feedback in learner-learner interactions in a task-based EFL classroom*.
- Heigham, J & Croker, R. (2009). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan,
- Loewen, S. & Philips, J. (2006). Recasts in the adult English L2 classroom: characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness. *The modern language journal*, 90 (4), 536–556.
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: a design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramersch (Eds.), *Foreign language researching cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Long, M. H. (1996). *The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition*. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 451–452). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Loschky, L. (1989) *The effects of negotiated interaction and premodified input on second language comprehension and retention*. Hawaii: Department of English as a second language, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning* 48, 183–218
- Lyster, R. & Ranta, L.(1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19 (1), 37–66.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Learning* 46 (1), 1–40.
- Lyster, R & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 265–302.
- Mackey, A. (2006) *Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning*. Oxford University Press
- Mackey, A. & Oliver, R. (2002). Interactional feedback and children's L2 development. *System* 30, 459–477.
- Mahdi, D. (2012) Grade 9 students' ability to use specific communication strategies. Malmö University, Sweden
- McDonough, J. & McDonough, S. (1997). *Research methods for English language teachers*. London: Arnold.
- Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition: A meta-analysis of the research. In J. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 133–164). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Spada, N. (2011). Beyond form-focused instruction: reflections on past, present and future research. *Language Teaching* 44(2), 225–236.

Tedick, D.J. (1998). Research on error correction and implications for classroom teaching. *ACIE Newsletter* 1(3).

Waring, H.Z. & Wong, J. (2009). “Very good” as a teacher’s response. *ELT Journal Volume* 63 (3), 195–203.

Attachment 1 – Observation schedule

Respond, ignore, no chance (to respond), continue

	Teacher Feedback	Comments	Students’ Response	Comments
1	Recast Explicit Correction Elicitation Metalinguistic Clues Clarification Requests Repetition Other N/A		Respond Ignore No chance Other	
1	Recast Explicit Correction Elicitation Metalinguistic Clues Clarification Requests Repetition Other N/A		Respond Ignore No chance Other	
2	Recast Explicit Correction Elicitation Metalinguistic Clues		Respond Ignore No chance Other	

	Clarification Requests Repetition Other N/A			
3	Recast Explicit Correction Elicitation Metalinguistic Clues Clarification Requests Repetition Other N/A		Respond Ignore No chance Other	
4	Recast Explicit Correction Elicitation Metalinguistic Clues Clarification Requests Repetition Other N/A		Respond Ignore No chance Other	
5	Recast Explicit Correction Elicitation Metalinguistic Clues Clarification Requests Repetition Other N/A		Respond Ignore No chance Other	
6	Recast Explicit Correction Elicitation Metalinguistic Clues Clarification Requests Repetition Other N/A		Respond Ignore No chance Other	
7	Recast		Respond	

	Explicit Correction Elicitation Metalinguistic Clues Clarification Requests Repetition Other N/A		Ignore No chance Other	
--	---	--	------------------------------	--

Attachment 2– Questionnaire form

Hej!

Vi är två lärarstudenter som håller på att skriva vårt examensarbete om olika typer av muntlig feedback lärare kan ge elever, t.ex. genom att repetera det som sagts, omformulera det, be om ett förtydligande eller rätta det språkligt. Vi är intresserade av hur ni som elever ser på sådan muntlig feedback. Ringa in ett svar av de alternativ som finns per fråga och svara på de öppna frågorna så detaljerat som möjligt. Finns det något som du behöver förklara mer får du gärna skriva vid sidan om frågan eller på baksidan av pappret. Det ska bli jättespännande att få läsa ditt svar och TACK så mycket för ditt deltagande!

1. Jag är:

- Tjej b) Kille

2. Jag går i årskurs:

Svar:

3a. Brukar din lärare rätta dig när du sagt något språkligt felaktigt på engelska?

- Ja b) Nej

3b. Om ja, hur brukar din lärare rätta dig när du sagt något språkligt felaktigt?

Svar: _____

4. Vilken typ av muntliga kommentarer brukar du vanligtvis få på engelska? (Se förklaring till muntlig feedback i inledningen).

Svar: _____

5a. Tycker du att de muntliga kommentarer du får av din lärare hjälper dig att förbättra sin engelska?

- Ja b) Nej

5b. I vilken utsträckning hjälper den dig?

Svar: _____

6a. Tycker du att du behöver muntlig respons?

- a) Ja b) Nej

6b) Varför?

Svar: _____

7a. Förstår du mestadels de muntliga kommentarer som din lärare ger dig på engelska?

- Ja b) Nej
- Om nej, hur reagerar du när du inte förstår den?

Svar: _____

8a. Vilken typ av kommentarer hade du föredragit att få av din lärare i klassrummet? Du kan välja mer än ett alternativ.

- a) Respons på din grammatik
- b) Respons på uttal
- c) Respons på ordval
- d) Ingen respons alls
- e) Annat

8b. Varför tycker du det?

Svar: _____

9. Vill du att läraren ska rätta dina språkfel?

a) Ja b) Nej

b) Om ja, hur vill du att läraren ska göra det?

Svar: _____

c) Om nej, varför inte?

Svar: _____

Tack för ditt deltagande!

Attachment 3 – Teacher interview questions

Teacher Interview

Background

- How old are you?
- What is your education?
- For how long have you been teaching?
- For how long have you been working at this school?
- What grades do you teach? What kind of students do you teach?
- What subjects do you teach in?

Teaching EFL-learners with different abilities

- How do you manage a speaking task with a class with students with different abilities?
- More questions?

Feedback

- When do you use oral feedback in your teaching?
- How do you provide your students with oral feedback?
- How important is it to give oral feedback do you think?
- What do you take in consideration when providing oral feedback?
- How much feedback do you provide?
- What is your main focus when you give oral feedback?
- How often do you use the feedback-types on the terminology sheet? Do you find some more relevant than others? Why/Why not?
- **Students' response and assessment**
- How do students react on your oral feedback? Do you get any response?
- Do you experience that the students develop their English when they receive oral feedback?

- What do students learn when being provided with oral feedback?
- Do you suppose all students learn from feedback? How?
- Do you believe students listen and respond to your given feedback?
- Do the students understand your oral feedback?
- How do let students assess their spoken English?

Attachment 4 – Malin interview

A= Intervjuperson

B= Intervjuare

Läraryrkesintervju

Background

- *Hur gammal är du?*

49

- *Vad har du för utbildning?*

A: Jag går på lärarhögskolan i Malmö i svenska och Tyska. B: Det är för de senare åldrarna då?

A: 4 till 9 var det då jag läste – jag vet inte hur det är nu med det nya lärarprogrammet.

- *Hur länge har du undervisat?*

Sammanlagt 11 eller nått sånt, men sen har jag varit mammaledig. Det kanske blir 11-12 år. Språk har jag däremot alltid hållit på med indirekt.

- *Hur länge har du arbetat på denna specifika skolan?*

Jag har jobbat här i ca. 8 år. Jag har arbetat i X kommun i åtta år men i X kommun i ett år.

- *Vilka årskurser undervisar du i?*

Sexan till nian är det.

- *Vad är det för typ av studenter du undervisar?*

Det är studiemotiverad, trevliga elever man har här kan man ju säga. Det kan man utgå ifrån, sen finns det här också problem som på alla ställen men överlag är det ju det.

- *Vilka ämnen undervisar du i?*

Engelska och tyska.

Undervisa andraspråksinlärare av engelska med olika behov

- *Hur hanterar du en muntlig uppgift med elever som har olika förmågor?*

A: Denna gruppen jag har här säger rätt så mycket. Jag har tio olika elever med olika förkunskaper och språksvårigheter. A och O är att få en relation till dem allihopa sen får man

försöka dela in tiden så gott det går. Elev 1 som är duktig egentligen både verbalt kunskapsmässigt men behöver få hjälp med struktur och bara komma igång överhuvudtaget och få något gjort. Elev 2 som har andra språksvårigheter som är glömsk och har litet ordförråd då får man försöka ge lite till alla. Och framför allt ha roligt. Har inte jag kul har inte dem roligt – det kan man utgå ifrån. B: Hur är det när det är muntliga övningar specifikt – är det något särskilt man tänker på när det gäller olika elever? A: I denna gruppen blir det en hel del svenska också eftersom kunskapen är så bristfällig hos en del. Då får man försöka hjälpa och kanske locka fram nåt så får man säga det på svenska och sen på engelska kanske. Det hade man inte behövt om man hade haft andra elever för de hade kunnat mer å kunnat hålla bra konversationer på engelska. Men man får se till att man får med sig alla.

Feedback

- *När använder du muntlig feedback i din undervisning?*

A: Jag är mig själv. Jag tänker inte till å tänker nu ska jag göra på detta viset utan det kommer ju spontant och så ser man lite vem det är. Ibland avbryter jag inte alls. Som nu om de säger ett grammatiskt fel. Som nu när elev X höll på och pratade. Bryter man av för mycket med själva grammatiken då löser man ju henne och då vågar hon inte säga någonting, ibland säger jag efter rätt. Precis som när man gör med sina egna barn när dem säger ”Jag gick till skolan idag. – Jaha, du gick till skolan idag.” Ibland kanske jag säger det på ett annat sätt om det inte blir bättre och ibland berömmar jag om de gjort något väldigt bra. Det är jätteolika hur man gör.

- *Hur ger du elever muntlig feedback?*

Intervjuade hänvisar till ovanstående fråga.

- *Hur viktigt är det att ge muntlig feedback tror du?*

Det är jätteviktigt. I varje konversation så är det viktigt att de får ett kvitto på att jag har förstått och att de har gjort rätt. Att man är positiv och ger dem beröm att det går bra så att de ska våga säga någonting igen nästa gång.

- *Vad tar du hänsyn till när du ger muntlig feedback?*

Det är lite som jag sa innan. Allting är att försöka stärka deras egen självkänsla i språket för att våga kommunicera mer och göra mer – producera.

- *Hur mycket feedback ger du?*

Det är jag inte medveten om. Det är jag intresserad av att få reda på av dig efteråt [skratt]. Det vet

jag inte. Det har jag ingen aning om. Jag hoppas jag ger bra feedback. Det är sånt man bör fråga eleverna om eller nu när du har undersökt mig.

- *Vad är ditt huvudfokus när du ger muntlig feedback?*

Det är lite samma frågor – de går in i varandra. (hänvisar till frågorna som redan ställts)

- *Hur ofta använder du feedback-typerna som du ser på terminologilistan? Finner du några mer relevanta än andra? Varför/Varför inte?*

Clarification requests använder jag en hel del. Om de har svarat någonting och jag inte är riktigt säker på vad de menar – att de förstår att jag vill att de ska utveckla det lite mer.

Elicitation (implicit) är att du ger en ledtråd om det rätta uttrycket utan att du säger det.

Intervjuade: Det gör jag nog också. Det gjorde jag med elev X. Jag försöker ge ledande... ställa lite frågor. Repetition (implicit): det gör jag inte så mycket. Ibland. Det beror på vilken elev det är. Recast (implicit/explicit): det här gör jag ju. Det är samma som man gör med sina barn hemma: ”jag gådde till skolan idag. – Jaha, du gick till skolan idag”.

Metalinguistic feedback (explicit): det här, Use past tense in your sentence, det kan jag göra om det är en elev som är högre upp. Det hade jag inte gjort i denna grupp. Det är många som inte vet vad past tense är överhuvudtaget. Explicit correction: det här tyckte jag var lite väl hårt. Det är bättre att jag säger ”Oh, you went”. Det känns som om jag smäller dem på fingrarna. Det kan vara om det är någon kaxig elev, då kan man fråga vem är det som vet mest. Sen har jag elever som kan mer än mig också ibland.

Feedback studenterna mottar och sin egen bedömning

- *Hur reagerar dina elever på din muntliga feedback? Får du någon respons?*

A: Ja, det tycker jag ju. Jag tycker de lyssnar på mig om man nu tittar på denna gruppen. Elev X var rätt så negativ igår och tyckte det var jättejobbigt. Men hon kom och hade gjort allting. Jag tror att hon blir nog rätt så glad – att hon fick lite beröm och kunde själv säga att det gick bra. Jag tror inte hon har så stor självkänsla i det engelska språket. Jag tycker de lyssnar på det jag säger - det tycker jag nog.

B: Hur är det när du ger dem Corrective Feedback, när du exempelvis rättar eller kommenterar deras språkbruk? A: Det är alltid vissa elever som lyssnar och som gör – man märker att de ändrar sig och tar till den feedbacken som man ger. Andra elever tittar bara på betyget och sen har de nog inte riktigt läst igenom. Det är nog typiskt tonår, att de inte tar till sig. Det är det trixiga

man har hela tiden till att få dem att fatta.

B: när tror du de börjar fatta och ta till sig feedbacken?

A: Jag tror det är när de kommer till gymnasiet. Elever är så institutionaliserade när de går här. Sen när de har gått på samma skola hela tiden så de har inga referensramar till någonting annat. När de kommer ifrån denna skola och träffar andra elever så märker dem – ”Vi kan ju faktiskt en hel del” eller ”Vi kunde inte så mycket”. Plus att de kommer med andra elever som har kanske samma intressen först då börjar man märka – ”Jaha, det var ju inte så dumt.” Sen finns det de som förstår studieteknik redan i högstadiet men det är ju inte alla. Jag tror man behöver ha distans.

- *Tycker du att elever utvecklar sin engelska när de mottar muntlig feedback?*

A: Det hoppas jag ju – att dem gör. Det blir mer positivt klimat om man får höra att man gör något bra, eller om man blir korrigerad – man blir medveten om vilka fel man gör så att man kan göra något åt det. Men det är utifrån hur eleven är. En del kan ta kritiken negativt och stänga sig och sen lägga över problem hos mig.

B: händer det senare och blir det en långvarig effekt – att elever låser sig på grund av feedback?

A: Jag hade en elev som tyckte tyska är skit. Allting var jättehemskt. Vi hade ett samtal med hennes mamma och hon kom hit de tyckte allting var fel med min undervisning. Allt jag gjorde var fel. Mamman sa: vi har ju tyskar som kommer hit och bor och de lär sig tyska jättesnabbt. Men skicka du iväg henne till tyskland så tror jag också att hon lär sig tyska jättesnabbt. Om hon har det hela dagarna. Det är väsentlig skillnad att komma till lektionen och inte lyssna och inte delta – och inte lyssna på vad jag säger. Så fick jag ha eleven en halvtimme innan lektionen men hon hade stängt av. Hon projicerade felet på mig att jag var dåligt lärare. Men när hon öppna sig och kunde säga vad det var hon gjorde, och fick feedback. Då vände hon ju helt. Så hon har jag på Facebook och har kontakt med än idag.

Det är oftast så om det är blir någonting som man inte kan och man ställer ribban högt – då är det lättare att lägga felet på någon annan och oftast är det läraren som blir fel. Att man blir dum i huvudet och då tar man inte till sig den feedbacken man får. Det är bara ännu ett tecken på att den är dum i huvudet för att hon fattar inte att jag inte fattar. Istället för att se vad det är jag kan göra åt och bara lyssna på själva feedbacken så blir det bara en blackout. B: Ja, det är jätteintressant. Just det här med relationer och att det kan bli en ond cirkel. A: Precis, det är A och O i undervisning det här med relationer. Om man märker att en elev som inte vill. Oftast ligger det en frustration att det är för högt eller om de inte förstår eller något annat. Då får man backa själv och

möta med empati. Vad kan jag göra? Jag märker att du inte lyssnar eller så, kan jag göra någonting? Märker de, istället för att jag börjar skäller på dem ”Du gör ju aldrig läxan eller du kan ju inte du lyssnar inte!”. Möter man med empati så blir det deras ansvar plötsligt. Att jag står kvar här och jag är här och kan hjälpa till. Det blir deras ansvar.

- *Vad lär sig eleverna när de får tillgång till muntlig feedback?*

A: Vad lär de sig egentligen? Den frågan har jag också undrat. När de skriver uppsatser så ser man att de gör bättre och utvecklar sig, språket ändrar sig, men det är den feedbacken som man skulle vilja ha när de kommer till gymnasiet efteråt. När de får en distans från min undervisning här. Det är ju den enda undervisningen de är vana vid. De har ju inte haft någon annan. När de kommer till gymnasiet och har gått där en termin då skulle jag vilja ha en feedback därifrån – vad skulle jag kunna bli bättre på? Men det existerar inte. Jag får väl forska på det för det skulle jag vilja ha. Det är ju ett sånt ensamt yrke. Jag går ju in och stänger dörren och kör min undervisning som jag alltid har gjort. Det är ju trevligt när du kommer så får man lite så ”Oh, jaha, så kan man också göra” eller om man går in och vikarier för någon, men det är ju rent slumpmässigt. Men någon fortbildning inom det får vi inte.

B: Nä, det viktigt är ju viktigt att få nya perspektiv. A: Ja, och se ”Aha, ja, så kan man också göra”. Det är ju det som är roligt i ens yrkesliv att man kan utveckla sig. Plus att det hade stärkt min självkänsla också om jag hade vetat att dem elever jag har när de kommer vidare så kan dem det och dem känner sig säkra på det. För det vet jag ju inte riktigt för det är en eller två som kommer hit, men oftast är det dem duktiga som kommer tillbaka och det kanske inte dem som gick i skolan och tyckte skolan var pest. Vi har ingen som helst koll på vår vara att den verkligen håller, för vi är ju ett företag. Jag förstår inte att skolverket har något sånt.

- *Antar du att alla studenter lär sig från feedback? Hur?*

Ja, det beror på var de står någonstans.

Attachment 5 – Anna interview

A: Intervjuperson

B: Intervjuare

Läraryntervju

Bakgrund

- *Hur gammal är du?*

Jag är 52.

- *Vad har du för utbildning?*

Jag är ämneslärare i engelska, svenska och franska.

- *Hur länge har du undervisat?*

A: Jag har jobbat sen januari -86.

B: Det är länge.

A: Mm, allt från årskurs fyra till komvux. I engelska speciellt.

B: Okej. Komvux också?

A: Ja, där började jag. Allt med gymnasiet, vuxenundervisning på grundnivå och vuxennivå.

B: Tänkte på din utbildning. Är det högstadiet?

A: Ja, och gymnasiet.

- *Hur länge har du arbetat på denna specifika skolan?*

Jag har arbetat här i sex år.

- *Vilka årskurser under visar du i?*

Från årskurs sex till nio.

- *Vad är det för typ av studenter du undervisar?*

Det är ju ingen specialundervisning. Det är ju vanliga klasser och grupper. Det är inte dem som behöver gå i liten grupp till exempel. I år har jag vanliga stora klasser.

- *Vilka ämnen undervisar du i?*

Engelska, svenska och franska.

Undervisa andraspråksinlärare av engelska med olika behov

- *Hur hanterar du en muntlig uppgift med elever som har olika förmågor?*

A: Är det en diskussionsuppgift eller dialoger?

B: Det kan vara vad som helst.

A: Ja, att alla ska på sin nivå försöka kunna bidra med någonting. Kanske ha en enkel variant som de som har lite svårare för sig kan göra, eller att man gör grupper så att dem som har lite svårare kan hänga på. Eller att man kan göra grupper av olika slag. Att de som har lite svårare är för sig. Som nu på svenska har jag valt ut de som själva är osäkra. Det är bra att kunna gå till dem å ge dem respons. Man kan ju välja ut så att de som pratar lite är i en grupp så att de inte åker snålskjuts på de som pratar mycket.

Feedback

- *När använder du muntlig feedback i din undervisning?*

A: Jag kan till exempel göra det idag när jag har gjort en skriftlig feedback som jag tycker är den huvudsakliga. Det kan vara som jag har gjort idag. Jag har suttit själv i lugn och ro och skrivit ner det jag tycker de behöver utveckla i en text, skriftligt, och gjort markeringar i texten. Sen behöver jag kanske fylla på det de inte förstår. Jag har strukit under grammatiska grejer och dem förväntas själva komma på ”det ska vara här och det ska vara här”. Men om de inte själva gör det så får jag fylla på. Det kommer bli såna följdfrågor idag: ”Varför strök du inte under det?”. Du får tänka efter själv, ska det vara det? Vad ska det vara istället? Att ge dem följdfrågor – som ett komplement till det muntliga. Det kan också vara snabb feedback när de har varit osäkra och gjort framförande. Som nu på svenskan. Snabb respons, muntligt: ”du har gjort ett bra jobb! Bra! Detta var speciellt bra. Det här kan du tänka på!” Sen får dem det sen ordentligt nerskrivet också. Så att de känner sig nöjda med ett jobb de gjort – som ska vara stärkande liksom. B: Så det skriftliga och det muntliga går hand i hand?

A: Ja, för jag tycker det skriftliga det är det jag bygger det mesta på. Det är ju ord – och då kan de gå tillbaks och titta ”vad skrev jag egentligen?”. Det är inte färgat. Om det då är en lite jobbig respons – att det inte var så bra gjort, då har jag tänkt igenom när jag skrivit ner det och det är inte färgat av några gester. Att jag ska säga: ”Du kunde gjort lite bättre” och kanske man är för positiv i kroppsspråket och så tar de inte det till sig. Det jag har läst om skriftlig respons är att den ska vara snabb. Och att det skriftliga är mer värt än det muntliga. Det är det som är min

uppfattning.

- *Hur ger du elever muntlig feedback?*

A: Jag tycker i samtalet man har där de ska förbättra någonting eller dem skriver någonting, eller komponera ihop någonting. Att jag går runt och frågar: ”Hur gör man där?”. Att jag ställer en följdfråga för att jag tror att de kan svaret redan eller att jag frågar dem ”Har du frågat kompisar?”. De måste inte fråga mig hela tiden. De kanske kan lista ut saker själv eller fråga kompisar. Oftast frågar dem för att de oftast inte orkar ta reda på saker. Att försöka göra dem självständiga i sitt eget arbete och att dem sen, om de fått in det här. Att de själv ställer frågor: ”Men vad brukar hända? Vad skulle det vara om man byter ut någonting?”. Att de själv ställer dem här frågorna som jag matar dem med. Om det handlar om grammatik, ordval och sådana här saker. Ibland när de är stirriga så säger jag: ”Det här är ohållbart. 19 av 20 frågor kan ni själv svara på, hitta, fråga en kompis som ni vet också kan det. Det är liksom inte nobelpris frågor. Det är inte frågor som jag måste svara på utan ni gör ett bättre jobb om ni själv tänker efter, ni frågar en kompis eller själv börjar bläddra i era papper boken. Ställ frågorna själv till er – då blir ni mer självgående.

B: Det är jättebra. Då får man själv öva på strategier.

A: Exakt.

- *Hur viktigt tycker du det är att ge muntlig feedback?*

A: Det är väl när de är osäkra. Dem vill ju veta att de är på rätt väg. De vill veta att de har gjort ett bra jobb. De vet ju inte själva förstås. När man är i process och ska skriva någonting så vet jag ju själv: ”Är det här bra? Är det såhär jag ska göra?”. För det är det en snabb check att ”Ja, du är på rätt väg!” eller ”Det här är bra, sudda inte ut det!” Det är många som bara raderar. ”Det här är bra, fortsätt så!” fastän de säger ”Men kompiserna har gjort på det viset. Vilket ska jag göra?” Lita på dig själv här nu.

B: Just det. Att man själv litar på det man investerat och gjort.

A: Ja, lita på sin egen förmåga. Allt måste inte vara exakt likadant som någon annan som är duktig.

- *Vad tar du hänsyn till när du ger muntlig feedback?*

A: När man gör det i klassrummet så är det alltid det att de har olika nivåer. Man måste göra det med respekt. Jag kan ju inte säga: ”Gör du såhär så får du F.” Så går det inte. Man får göra det med respekt utan att avslöja för någon annan, för det är ju deras arbete. Det är ju alltid svårt om

man ska göra det när andra sitter i klassrummet. Där får man försöka ställa samma typ av frågor hela tiden till alla. Så att man inte: ” Men lilla vän. Det här går inte. Låt mig ta över”. Försöka vara rättvis, och lika. Behandla alla lika. Alla har lika mycket rätt att få hjälp. Det är viktigt för annars kan jag ju inte ha någon muntlig feedback. Då får jag göra det skriftlig: ”Då får ni maila mig till mig så får jag svara där.”.

B: Ja, det är ju verkligen viktigt med relationer tycker jag och att det verkligen funkar. Att man är rättvis.

A: Ja, för jag kanske pratar mycket med en och sen säger till någon annan ”Nej, det där vill jag inte titta på. Eller det där skiter jag i eftersom du har skrivit si å så.”

B: Just det.

A: Sen finns det vissa som jobbar mer effektivt än andra (Lärare imiterar en dialog med en elev):

- Nu ser jag att du inte är riktigt fokuserad på det du ska göra. Jobba med det nu när jag kan hjälpa dig istället för att sitta hemma.
- Men jag kan göra det hemma!
- Men då får du inte den här [gest] guidningen.

- *Hur mycket muntlig feedback ger du?*

Det beror på. Märker jag att det gör nytta så ger jag mer. Men märker jag att jag pratar för döva öron och att dem i alla fall envisas lämna in nya versioner i samma fel så... Det är jättesvårt att säga. Inte mer än jag behöver.

- *Vad är ditt huvudfokus när du ger muntlig feedback?*

Att genom det jobbet jag gör, att de själva hitta sina egna strategier och kunna själv klara sig vidare. Det är verkligen huvudfokus. Och känna sig stolta över det de gör. Hjälpa dem se kvalitéerna.

- *Hur ofta använder du feedback-typerna som du ser på terminologilistan? Finner du några mer relevanta än andra? Varför/Varför inte?*

Repetition: Om en elev säger fel. Så upprepar jag gärna för dem andra fast på rätt utan att liksom peka ut ”Nu gjorde du fel!”. Finns ingen anledning att påpeka: ”Nu gjorde du fel. Det ska vara såhär istället.” inför alla, om det är en helklassituation. Och likadant till exempel när man skriver på tavlan och någon skriver fel. ”Vad kan vara svårt här?” och inte peka på vem det var. Det är helt ointressant vem som gjorde fel. Det är bara bra att göra fel också.

Recast (Explicit/implicit): Man skulle kunna använda denna här också. ”Tänk på att använda the past tense!”. Sen kan man blanda förstås.

Explicit correction: I vissa sammanhang kan man upprepa det här felaktiga. Ibland hör dem själva: ”Så här kan det inte vara”. Säger du ”goed” och så säger jag: ”Vad heter det egentligen?” Så säger jag ”Du menar... [went]” så jag hjälper dem på traven – hur de ska säga.

B: hur ofta hade du sagt att du använder dessa här typer? A: Jag hade sagt nummer fyra (Metalinguistic clues) tror jag. Det beror på vad syftet är. Om jag säger nu ska vi arbeta med grammatik i två grupper så kan jag säga: ”Nu ska jag peta i det ni säger hela tiden så ni vet om det.” Fyran är mest relevant – man begriper man förstår eftersom jag upprepar det rätta. Nu är jag inte riktigt på den nivå på engelskan för vi pratar mer om innehållet, och grammatiken följer som ett verktyg. På franskan till exempel då använder jag direkt nummer fyra. Vad jag tror i alla fall [skrattar].

B: Jaha, så på engelskan var det innehållet som du frågar efter mer.

A: Precis, och typen av korrektion blir mer skriftligt.

B: Och de övriga typerna - dem andra använder du inte lika mycket? A: Nej. Det beror på. Är det ett litet sammanhang med bara några få elever så kan man göra det. När man är en grupp eller nått sånt här.

Feedback studenterna mottar och sin egen bedömning

- *Hur reagerar dina elever på din muntliga feedback? Får du någon respons?*

Jag vet inte. I dem sammanhang när jag har lyckats med det här att ställa frågor till dem. Dem frågar och får bara motfrågor av mig. Efter ett tag – så kanske de som vill någonting och har en drivkraft dem ser ju ”Aha, det är så här man kan tänka”. De kan uppskatta det. Men de som inte orkar - de kanske slutar fråga för de bara får motfrågor. För de ser inte vitsen. De ser inte kopplingen. Det är lite olika beroende på vart de är själv i sitt lärande. Hur intresserade de är och vilken drivkraft de har, tror jag. Jag har aldrig hört eller märkt någon säga: ”Vilken bra feedback jag fått av dig” [skratt].

- *Tycker du att elever utvecklar sin engelska när de mottar muntlig feedback?*

Ja, som sagt om de har intresse. De som är på spåret redan och har drivkraften. Redan har kommit en bit i sina strategier – kan göra det.

- *Vad lär sig eleverna när de får tillgång till muntlig feedback?*

Förutom det med strategierna så kan dem ju också kanske bli se lättare och inte bli osäkra på sina förmågor: ”Det här var inte så illa, så skrev jag förra gången och så gjorde jag och det var rätt bra!” [Imiterar elev]. Syn på att de gjort något bra och att de kan vara nöjda med det.

- *Antar du att alla studenter lär sig från feedback? Hur?*

A: Det beror på hur låsta det är. Vissa kan vara låsta i någonting - att de har en uppfattning om sig själva om att de är bättre än dem är. När jag försöker med respons som är på en lägre nivå för att jag ser att de är på en lägre nivå och de själv ser sig högt uppe, då är det svårt att nå ut, eller de som inte är intresserade; De säger ”Ja” för att jag ska sluta prata. Det är väldigt olika.

B: Hur gör du då som lärare? A: Då ser jag att det inte händer något, om vi till exempel säger texter. ”Jag märker att du inte tar det till dig. Har du själv någon anledning? Förstår du inte vad jag säger?” Det blir ju inte bättre för de säger ”Ja” när de inte fattar då får jag ta ett snack med dem. Eller är de nöjda med ett E eller vad det än är för någonting, då behöver jag inte lägga ner massor med energi på feedback. Feedback är ofta knutet med att de ska höja sig. ”Vad är ditt mål i engelska? - Jo, men det är att snacka med folk” Då vet jag vart ribban är. Ofta tänker jag långsiktigt då försöker jag ge respons efter det. Men om någon säger: ”Jag vill ha A och ska jobba inom utrikesdepartement” eller något sånt där då har de helt andra målsättningar. Det beror mycket på deras målsättning och jag hör hur de tänker.

- *Tror du att elever lyssnar och svarar på din muntliga feedback?*

*Intervjuperson refererar till ovanstående frågor.

- *Förstår studenterna din muntliga feedback?*

*Intervjuperson refererar till ovanstående frågor.

- *Hur låter du studenterna bedöma sin muntliga engelska?*

Nu när jag har sjuor så ser jag att många har flöde. Men de kan inte avgöra när det ska vara det här talspråkliga eller skriftspråkliga. En som skrev ”like” på tre, fyra rader flera gånger – precis som när man tänker ”like”. Då har han ett flöde men han är inte medveten om att det egentligen är talspråk. Eller en som skrev ”Ju” med ”Jo”. Detta är mer skriftlig men muntlig [funderar]. Vet inte. Jag tror nog det handlar om självförtroende. Vissa har ju varit ute och rest mycket och vet att de klarar sig framåt. Några andra kan men har inte testat. Det kan jag inte svara på. Det är en fråga som skulle varit kul att ställa dem: ”Vilken nivå är du i muntligt? Vad anser du själv?”

Attachment 6 – Feedback types sheet

(Ahlner 2012, pp. 5-6)

- *Clarification requests* (implicit): indicating a need for clarification of an utterance by signalling to the speaker that the utterance was wrong, e.g. using phrases such as “I don’t understand” and “I beg your pardon?”

- *Elicitation* (implicit): trying to bring out the correct answer from the speaker, without providing the correct form, e.g. “I can see a rhinoceros “ – “No, it’s a ... (hippopotamus)”.

- *Repetition* (implicit): repeating an incorrect utterance, often using intonation to point out the error, e.g. “I goed to the circus yesterday” – “Goed?”

- *Recast* (implicit/explicit): rephrasing an utterance, without changing its meaning, e.g. “I go to the circus yesterday” – “Oh, you went to the circus yesterday”.

- *Metalinguistic feedback* (explicit): commenting on, informing of or asking questions about an utterance but not supplying the correct form, e.g. “Me and my Mom go to the circus yesterday” – “Use past tense in your sentence”.

- *Explicit correction*: informing the learner of the error and providing the correct form, e.g. “I goed to the circus yesterday” – “No, not goed - went.”

The term *uptake* is used when a student responds instantly to teacher feedback. There is both successful uptake, *repair*, and unsuccessful uptake, *needs-repair* (Lin, 2009, p. 91).