TEACHER´S ORAL FEEDBACK IN A CLIL CLASSROOM

Bachelor's Thesis

Noora Pirhonen

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Noora Pirhonen	
Työn nimi – Title Teacher´s oral feedback in a CLIL classroom 	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Kanditaatintutkielma
Aika – Month and year Tammikuu 2015	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 23

Tiivistelmä – Abstract

Luokkahuonetta on tutkittu monesta eri näkökulmasta, ja myös opettajan palautetta on tarkasteltu eri perspektiiveistä. Suullista palautetta on kuitenkin tutkittu melko vähän, ja tämä tutkielma tuo lisää tietoa kyseisestä aiheesta. Se keskittyy tarkastelemaan CLIL-luokkahuonetta, joka tuo oman näkökulmansa suullisen palautteen tutkimiseen.

Aineisto koostuu kahdesta nauhoitetusta tunnista yläkoulun kahdeksannella luokalla. Lisäksi nauhoituksista tehtiin litteraatit, joita hyödynnettiin tutkimuksessa. Työn tarkoituksena on selvittää, kuinka paljon suullista palautetta CLIL- luokkahuoneessa käytetään, sekä kuinka erilaiset suulliset palautteet voisi jaotella kategorioihin.

Tutkimuksessa selvisi, että eniten tunnilla annettiin arvioivaa palautetta, joka koostuu joko hyväksyvästä tai paheksuvasta suullisesta palautteesta. Suurin osa tästä arvioivasta palautteesta oli positiivista, mikä viittaa siihen että opettajat pyrkivät palautetta antaessaan motivoimaan oppilaitaan. Toiseksi suurin palauteosio koostui "muusta" palautteesta, joka pitää sisällään työrauhaongelmiin puuttumisen sekä opettajan yleisen palautteen koko luokalle. On huomattava, että kaikki suullinen palaute ei siis aina liity tehtävän läpi käymiseen, vaan opettaja voi antaa palautetta esimerkiksi pitääkseen yllä hyvää ryhmähenkeä ja estääkseen häiriötekijöiden syntymisen tai jatkumisen. Viimeisin palautekategoria pitää sisällään kuvailevan palautteen, jolla tarkoitetaan oppilaan vastauksen korjaamista ja oikean vastauksen perustelua. Oli yllättävää, että kuvailevaa palautetta oli vähiten, sillä opettajan ajatellaan johtavan tunnin kulkua ja yksi siihen kuuluvista tehtävistä on vastausten korjaaminen ja tarkempi tieto.

Kahden opetustunnin materiaali on hyvin suppea, eikä tutkimustuloksia voi yleistää. Saadaksemme yleistettävämpiä tuloksia tarvitsemme lisää tutkimusta aiheesta, ja isomman aineiston, jota tutkia.

Asiasanat – Keywords classroom, feedback, oral feedback, evaluative feedback, CLIL

Säilytyspaikka – Depository

Muita tietoja – Additional information

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1   INTRODUCTION

Classrooms have been studied a great deal, and there are countless areas of research to focus on. Teaching is often considered to be a rather traditional and slowly changeable profession. However, there are also classes that challenge the view of teaching, focusing on a particular issue, such as Content and Language Integrated Learning, or CLIL. CLIL focuses on teaching a subject through a foreign language (Coyle Hood and Marsh 2010:1). If one decides to focus on the role of the teacher, one major part of teaching is the role of feedback. Feedback has several forms, such as written feedback (see for example Hyland 2003) or even the teacher´s facial expressions and gestures during the class. Moreover, oral feedback forms a group of its own, consisting of different possible categories and divisions, as well as studying the Initiation-Response-Feedback/Follow-up pattern (Nikula 2007). However, there are still more issues to study in the field of oral feedback, and this study will focus on those issues in more detail, concentrating especially on the type and amount of teacher´s oral feedback in a CLIL classroom.

Oral feedback as a topic strongly relates to the area of feedback and the role of the teacher in the classroom. Oral feedback has been studied according to the situation it is used in (Harmer 2001). In communicative assignments feedback does not need to be that precise, whereas in accurate assignments, where one needs to use a particular form of the word or for example the right tense, it is better to give feedback that points out the error or even corrects it. However, oral feedback used in a CLIL classroom in Finland is a relatively new topic, and needs to be studied more in order to be able to gain more information about the issue.

The most important concepts are first introduced along with the literature review and the research relating to the topic of oral feedback and CLIL classes. The main questions I aim to find answers to are how much feedback is given in the classroom and how one could classify the different types of

oral feedback used in a CLIL classroom. After the review the research questions, the data and the methods for the study are introduced in chapter 3 and the data is analysed in chapter 4.

2 FEEDBACK IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND CLIL CLASSROOMS

2.1 Feedback in the classroom

Classroom study is a popular area of research, and there are several study areas one can focus on. For example, one can concentrate on the relationship between the teacher and pupils. The relationship can include several issues, but one that interests many researchers is the dialogue between them. According to Geekie and Raban (1994:177), there are different approaches to classroom discussion, and that a pupil´s and a teacher´s individual conversation is in fact comparable to a child´s and mother´s talk. Furthermore, this could mean that even though a classroom is often seen as a formal and even unpleasant learning environment, there can also be individual teaching. Teachers can control what happens, but pupils have an important role of their own. This is particularly interesting from the point of view of a feedback study and the role of the teacher and pupils in the classroom.

The National Core Curriculum for Basic Education (2004) creates the base for Finnish basic education, and provides guidelines for teaching. However, it does not directly address feedback in any section, for example by giving reasons for using feedback or how to use it in teaching. It contains information about different working approaches, which feedback could be a part of, but there are no direct guidelines for its use. Furthermore, the guidelines are relatively broad in a sense that they do not provide direct

ways to execute the issues. For example, the curriculum names different working approaches, one of them being "motivate the students to work purposefully" and the other "promote social flexibility, an ability to function in constructive cooperation, and the assumption of responsibility for others" (National Core Curriculum 2004:17). Both approaches require the use of feedback in order to receive good results: pupils´ motivation is a combination of several matters, but using positive and constructive feedback in the classroom will definitely help to achieve the goals mentioned in the curriculum. Constructive cooperation, as well, is more easily created with feedback as a part of teaching.

Looking at the issue of classroom talk from another angle, it can be divided into different subcategories. Teachers often tend to function according to the same, familiar patterns while teaching. This is in fact not always a negative matter: it makes teaching easier for pupils to follow and thus can improve the overall performance of the class. According to Arminen (2005:113-116), there are several different patterns of classroom talk, the first one being *lecturing format,* in which the teacher spends a notable amount of time speaking aloud and alone to pupils. From the point of view of conversational analysis this format may seem vague and pointless, because it is the teacher talking most of the time. However, even lecturing is often based on cooperation between the participants, which means that there are issues to study when using this pattern, too. *Pedagogic cycle* consists of three parts: initiation, reply and evaluation (ibid.). It is a simple and a relatively popular way of teaching, enabling pupils to participate with the help of the teacher´s questions or initiatives about a topic. Repairing pupils´ answers somehow is a common practise as well, and Arminen (2005:114) calls those *repair sequences*. Basically this means that the teacher takes responsibility for both the initiative and the correction, depending on the pupil´s reaction to the issue. The last pattern of classroom talk is *correctional activities* (Arminen 2005:115). These take part in every classroom, but can be put into practise in different ways. Their purpose is important not only because of achieving a good classroom atmosphere, but

also because teachers need a way of keeping order in the classroom. Without a proper order, it is difficult to make use of the other patterns.

Conversational analysis can be used to draw conclusions about certain areas of interests in a classroom. For example, Ruuskanen (2007:93-113) examines how a teacher formulates certain questions and how pupils respond to it. In other words, discussions are analysed and divided into groups according to their type. The groups consist of two types of answers from pupils: a right answer produced by one pupil and an answer that demands help from others to answer correctly. There are also different ways to handle the answers the pupils produce. First of all, the teacher can evaluate the answer to be incorrect. Secondly, the teacher accepts a wrong answer and tries to help the pupil to get it right. Finally, the teacher receives an answer that was expected. This, furthermore, affects the use of feedback in the classroom.

2.2 Oral feedback and other types of feedback in the classroom

Feedback can be divided into different subcategories, such as *written* or *oral* feedback. We have quite substantial results concerning *written feedback* (for example Tainio et al. 2007, Hyland 2003). *Written feedback* is an area of its own, and one has to remember that feedback depends greatly on the type of task pupils are assigned to perform. It is also significant to know in which area of writing the task is designed in the first place. For example, if the pupil is asked to use different tenses, one should mainly focus on those aspects when giving feedback, even if there are other mistakes or issues to focus on as well. Harmer (2001:110-111) has studied written feedback techniques and divided them into two groups: *responding* and *coding*. *Responding*, as can be concluded from the name, is a type of a technique in which the teacher spends time reviewing the written text and writes down his/her impression about it. This might take time, but by using this technique teacher enables pupils to develop their skills for future writing assignments as well, while learning about the current task. Sometimes the responding technique can include suggestions of improvement, but the

technique itself does not solely focus on writing errors. *Coding* appears to be more formal and error-focused. This approach includes the use of certain codes for different errors or other issues in the text. A teacher can without problems use short symbols to give feedback, and it might be easier for a pupil to read, when all the codes have been clarified earlier. Finally, a teacher can concentrate on only one or two main issues in the feedback by *focusing*. This resembles the practise of not everything needing to be commented on: one can only focus on one important factor, naturally informing pupils of this method as well.

In addition to the division made between written and oral feedback, feedback has been divided into other subgroups as well. For example Hargreaves et al. (2000:23, see also Arminen 2005) have divided feedback into two different subgroups on the basis of different feedback strategies: *evaluative* and *descriptive*. Researchers interviewed and examined 23 teachers and observed lessons to form conclusions about the use of feedback in a primary school. *Evaluative feedback* strategies included giving rewards and punishments or expressing approval and disapproval. Rewards could mean, for example, stickers or granting the pupil a chance to come and write on the blackboard, and a punishment could be, for example, taking away the reward. Approval and disapproval was made clear with different options: they could be written down, verbal or even gestures that the teacher made. *Descriptive feedback* includes several points, all of them focusing on correcting an error or describing why the answer is correct, either with the help of the teacher or pupils themselves. Overall, it is in great part the teacher who decides what feedback strategy to use, and thus his/her values and beliefs can affect the end result. Moreover, the teachers in this particular study believed that pupils´ own perceptions about their learning also have an influence on their skills, so the teachers wanted to use evaluative strategies to help them keep up their positive feelings about learning.

When focusing on *oral feedback* especially, a division can be made on the basis of a task type or activity. Harmer (2001:104-109) specifies oral feedback according to the situation it is being used in: if the assignment demands accurate use of a language, feedback from the teacher usually first

indicates somehow that the answer is incorrect and, secondly, helps the pupil to fix the error if needed. It is essential to inform the pupil whether the phrase used was correct or not, so that the pupil learns from his/her mistakes and understands how to correct the error. Furthermore, if the task is communicative and the goal is to improve oral skills, the teacher should not correct grammatical errors, and should use gentle correction. Interfering with pupils´ fluent speech activity can cause more problems than help, because it can interrupt students´ flow of thought. In communicative tasks it is highly important to let pupils interact with each other: even if there are grammatical mistakes or other minor errors, they still learn to use the language and improve their skills. However, it is for the teacher to decide when it is profitable to interfere and help them to correct their speech. Sometimes it is the pupils that ask for help, which often indicates their interest in developing their language skills.

2.3 Content and Language Integrated Learning

Content and Language Integrated Learning, or CLIL, according to Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010:1) is "a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content *and* language." What this basically means, is that pupils learn school subjects through a foreign language. For example history, biology or mathematics can be taught in a foreign language.

According to Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010:9-11), there are several reasons for the use of CLIL in schools. First of all, technology brings new challenges for pupils and teachers, and integration of several learning strategies and issues has become an important issue in classrooms. The CLIL approach helps the educational practise to adapt to these changes more easily. Secondly, motivation is an issue that influences learning results significantly (see also Harmer 2001). If pupils voluntarily choose to study through a foreign language, they most likely are more motivated to learn and gain good results. Finally, the fact that children learn languages well if they are integrated into other types of activities and learning happens in a

natural environment promotes the usefulness of CLIL. Rather than always learning a new language in a specific language classroom, it can be combined with other subjects.

CLIL classes differ from basic classes in many areas, but the most significant difference is the language of teaching and learning. English is the most popular language used (Dalton-Puffer 2011:183), which also tells us a great deal about the popularity and usefulness on English. However, using CLIL also causes new, different issues to be taken into consideration in teaching. Now that pupils learn languages through CLIL, teachers are facing a new challenge: one has to gain expertise in two subjects instead of one. This, furthermore, often means that CLIL teachers are not native speakers of the foreign language they teach, or even language experts (ibid.). They are experts in the field that they teach, such as mathematics. Moreover, this can affect teaching and even giving and receiving feedback. Teachers may use simple feedback forms only because they already have so much to handle, or only use certain feedback strategies that are suitable for CLIL teaching.

CLIL classrooms have been studied in Finland as well, and for example Nikula (2007:199-201) has studied the IRF (initiation, response, feedback/follow-up) structure, revealing interesting facts about the use of it in CLIL and EFL classrooms. The study focused on the language use in two different classrooms, and the data consisted of five recorded CLIL classes and five EFL classes. CLIL students were slightly younger than EFL students, and their group size was smaller. Nikula found out that the IRF structure was used more in the EFL lessons and, moreover, student-initiated IRFs were more popular in CLIL lessons. Thus, the role of the IRF structure differs greatly in the two classrooms: in EFL lessons the teaching material was in a significant role, and this also meant that the IRF structure was in common use. However, even if the structure was used in CLIL lessons as well, the outcome was different. Students were expected to learn the use of the language itself, while in the EFL lessons it was more important to produce correct and often brief answers.

3 THE PRESENT STUDY

3.1 Research questions

In the light of the background information and previous research, the study aims to find out more about oral feedback used in a classroom. Moreover, it focuses on a CLIL classroom, to bring new information and insights in to the field of classroom research. There are few studies that have focused especially on CLIL classrooms, but this particular study gives more information especially relating to Finnish CLIL lessons.

The main interest is in the different types of oral feedback in a CLIL classroom. It is interesting and useful to find out exactly what kind of oral feedback teachers give, and how it is received by the pupils. Evaluative and descriptive feedback strategies (Hargreaves et al. 2000) are one of the focus areas the study is based on. I will form other subgroups as well in order to classify the data as well as possible. I also want to examine the amount of feedback given, because it is important to study not only feedback types, but also examine how frequently the phenomenon occurs. In addition, I will find out whether there are certain feedback types that are used more than others. This, in turn, helps other researchers to gain a better overall picture about oral feedback in the classroom and possibly help teachers in their work. Not all feedback can necessarily be divided into their own subgroups, but those types that appear more often deserve to be analysed.

Therefore, my research questions are the following:

1. How can one classify the different types of oral feedback used in a CLIL classroom?
2. How much feedback do teachers give to their pupils?

3.2 The data collection

The data for the study consists of recorded CLIL classrooms. The material was gathered in the year 2010, in collaboration with the department of languages and the Centre for Applied Language Studies (CALS) in the University of Jyväskylä. Originally the material was used for a Con-CLIL project, but it is also available for teaching or additional research. The recorded material was gathered in Western Finland.

I will analyse two classroom sessions, where both the language used in the classroom and the subject taught are English. The material consists of one teacher and one class of pupils. The pupils are in the 8th grade in secondary school, and the teacher is a male and a native speaker of English. I chose this material because recorded classrooms are a good and reliable way of finding information and analysing both the teacher´s and pupils´ behaviour. Simply by observing classrooms one can find a great deal of interesting issues, but the reliability of the findings are weaker. It is more difficult to pay attention to everything that happens in the class if one observes it without recording anything. There are several matters to pay attention to at the same time, so it is more likely that something could be ignored, and thus the results of the study would be less reliable. Psathas (1995:45) has studied conversational analysis and also reports that it is important to have recordings when analysing material, simply because the material can be replayed as often as needed to gain the best results.

3.3 The methods of analysis

The study is in most part qualitative and the method I am using in my research is *content analysis,* which is a procedure where documents are analysed systemically and objectively to get an extensive image of the phenomenon (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009:91-124). With the help of content analysis one can structure the contents into a compact and clear form without losing the information it contains (ibid). Content analysis can be divided into different subgroups, and I will be focusing on *data-based*

analysis. Its goal is to create a theoretical totality with the help of the data and not rely on any previous study or model of analysis, like the theory-based analysis and the theory-bound analysis (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009:95-100).

My goal was to make valid transcripts of the videos. I already had simple transcripts made for the project in 2010, but I had to specify them, and most of all focus on my own study topic when doing so. The examples that I chose for the analysis section are relatively easy to follow and quite simple, because the main interest is not on how the words are said, but rather on *what* is said. With the help of the videos and the transcripts it is easier to find information, and in the end discover the main issues. The results can also be considered to be more reliable when I analyse the material thoroughly. Without recordings it would be impossible to make reliable transcripts, which are one of the key issues when analysing the material (Psathas 1995:46).

Analysing the data takes several different steps before reaching the results. Tuomi and Sarajärvi (2009:109) have constructed the process of data-based content analysis, and I have followed these steps to an extent. Listening to the material, making notes and finding and listing the reduced issues one is researching are the first steps to take. Those are followed by the analysis of the found expressions, forming of larger groups and subgroups and, finally, combining of the groups and forming a main concept. In addition, I will quantitatively count the amount of data and amount of different feedback types, forming clear tables of the findings for the readers to study. With this process I believe I will gain the best results.

4 TEACHER´S ORAL FEEDBACK AS A PART OF TEACHING IN A CLIL CLASSROOM

In the analysis a division between evaluative and descriptive feedback by Hargreaves (2000:23) is followed. The material is analysed and divided into two sections. However, not all feedback can be classified as evaluative or descriptive, so a new category was created that is more suitable for the rest of the feedback material found in the data. First, the qualitative data is presented, shown in tables 1-4 (4.1), and second, the findings are presented by showing examples of the different subgroups and discussing them in 4.2.

4.1 Feedback categories

125 different oral feedback items were found from the data. They were divided into three basic groups: evaluative feedback, descriptive feedback (Hargreaves 2000:23) and other feedback (table 1.).

Table 1. Types of feedback.

Feedback type	Number of feedback events	Percentage %
Evaluative	69	55.2
Descriptive	25	20
Other	31	24.8
Total	**125**	**100**

Over half of the feedback was evaluative, making it a clear majority of the feedback types used in the classroom: 69 out of the 125 items were evaluative. Feedback that was classified as "other" was the second largest subgroup, consisting of 31 different feedback initiations. Finally, descriptive feedback formed the third group with 25 feedbacks. In table 2, table 3 and table 4 one can see the different types of evaluative, descriptive and feedback related to the category "other".

Table 2. Evaluative feedback.

Evaluative feedback	Number	Percentage %
Approval, reward	58	84.1
Disapproval, punishment	11	15.9

Total	69	100

Evaluative feedback, according to Hargreaves (2000:23), is divided into two basic subcategories: *feedback that shows approval and/or rewards*, and *feedback that shows disapproval and can include a punishment as well*. The dominant category in evaluative feedback is clearly the one that shows positive feedback: out of the 69 evaluative feedback items 58 were showing approval. Moreover, only 11 out of the 69 can be considered as negative feedback. The results prove that the teacher indeed spend more time giving positive feedback to the pupils instead of showing disapproval or giving punishments, at least in this particular classroom. The results are more thoroughly analysed in the qualitative section with suitable feedback examples.

Table 3. Descriptive feedback.

Descriptive feedback	Number	Percentage %
Why the answer is correct	3	12
Help from the teacher or the pupils	22	88
Total	**25**	**100**

Hargreaves (ibid.) has divided descriptive feedback into two sections: *someone describing why the answer is correct* and *help from the teacher or the pupils*. Descriptive feedback formed the smallest subgroup of the feedback events, and it not only shows that teachers do not necessarily spend a great deal of time explaining why something is correct or incorrect, but that they often want to involve other pupils in the discussion. 22 out of the 25 descriptive feedback items included help from the teacher himself or from the other pupils, whereas only three examples included the teacher explaining why the answer was correct. One can say that the teacher decidedly strives away from the teacher dominant class by activating the whole class.

Table 4. Other feedback.

Other	Number	Percentage %
Working atmosphere	10	32.3
General feedback	21	67.7
Total	**31**	**100**

In addition to evaluative and descriptive feedback, there were 31 feedback items that are listed in table 4. Some of this feedback was related to the *working atmosphere*, and the larger part was simply *general feedback to the whole class*: teacher giving positive feedback to the pupils for paying attention or teacher discussing with the pupils the previous classes or the assignments they had done. The general feedback was for the most part always positive, whereas the feedback related to working atmosphere was somewhat negative.

4.2 From approval to discipline

Evaluative feedback was the most dominant feedback type found in the data, consisting of approving feedback and disapproving feedback. The next example (1) is a common way of showing approval by the teacher. The class is going through grammar and the perfect tense, and the teacher has asked a pupil to translate the English sentence into Finnish. The teacher does not wait for someone to offer to participate, but instead instructs one pupil at a time to do it, giving out turns one after another.

Example 1[1]: Evaluative feedback, approval. [2]

Teacher	how about this one here. (.) now konsta are you feeling <wise> this morning?
Konsta	u:m (.) uh (.) m:inua (.) ei yleensä (.) kutsuta: (.) juhliin.
Teacher	**yeah. (.) that's good. (.) yeah. (.) that's a perfect as well.**

The way the teacher appoints the pupil to answer is somewhat indirect: he uses a question to point out the next pupil to read the sentence. Once the pupil answers, and the answer is correct, one can see the approving answer

---

[1] In all examples, the names of the pupils have been changed, so that they cannot be recognised.
[2] Pauses in the text are marked with this (.) sign, and stressed words are marked with < > before and after a word.

from the teacher. Often he says *yeah* to confirm that the answer is indeed what he was looking for, but then he also continues with *that´s good* and *that´s a perfect as well*. Moreover, the teacher clearly wants to show that he is pleased with the answer and reveal that the pupil performed well. Out of the 125 feedback items found in the data, 58 can be classified as showing approval and/or rewards. The large amount can possibly be explained with the fact that teachers often feel obliged to comment on something after a pupil has given an answer. However, it also depends on how the teacher decides to react to the answer. In this case, the teacher often started with *yeah*, implying that a pupil is right, but he also continued with some words of compliment. This is a very positive way to react to pupils´ answers and, moreover, it creates a welcoming atmosphere and a feeling that no one needs to be afraid of answering.

In the next example (2) the teacher has asked the class to take out their notebooks, and is now checking whether everybody has them with them. One of the pupils admits that the notebook is at home, so the teacher reacts to the situation by showing disapproval and giving a slight punishment. To understand the next example better it is important to know that in this class the teacher uses "yellow cards" to maintain order. Yellow cards are given for example if one is late from class, has not done one´s homework or has forgotten books or assignments home.

Example 2: Evaluative feedback, disapproval and punishment.

Teacher	okay i've got <u>one</u> mo:re bit of paper. hope this isn't confusing (.)
	now >mauri< did you have you:r (.) notebook with you?
Mauri	uhh no. It's home.
Teacher	oh it´s home.
Mauri	yeah.
Teacher	**a:nd >if you forget your books<?**
Mauri	**yellow card?**
Teacher	**yellow ca:rd.**
Mauri	**jokay.**

This example shows that if rules are not followed, consequences follow. The pupil has not brought the notebook to the class, so the teacher uses his principle of giving a yellow card. It is clear that this system is already familiar with the pupil, as the teacher only has to ask *if you forget your*

books?, he knows to answer *yellow card*. In this example one can see well how clear the rules are to the pupils, and that Mauri accepts the punishment without resistance. The yellow card rule does not seem to be too harsh on the pupils, since the teacher has made the rules clear and follows them consistently. Disapproval is shown, even though he does not say anything about it directly. This system seems to be working well in this particular class, and is still a relatively kind way to punish the pupils.

In addition to evaluative feedback shown above, there were many situations in the data that are categorized as descriptive feedback. In example 3 below, the class is going through a handout about Great Britain, and the teacher is asking whether there is a typical ending in the counties in the UK. Alma raises her hand, and answers the question correctly. However, the teacher wants to elaborate on that answer, and thus this example is classified as a type where teacher is describing why the answer is correct.

Example 3: Descriptive feedback, describing why the answer is correct.

Teacher	could anybody say what the typical ending is at the names of counties (.) in the uk.=alma.
Alma	uhh shire.
Teacher	**yeah, that's right. (.)**
Teacher	**normally they end in that >there that syllable<=**
	often we: (.) we say shire when we say the names.
	hampshire (.) <u>yo</u>rkshire (.) okay.

First, the teacher comments on the answer with approval: *yeah* and *that´s right*, but second, will continue on the subject by explaining how this ending is often pronounced. In other words, he wants to expand the pupils´ knowledge on the topic. Furthermore, the answer is correct, but the teacher wants to explain this topic in greater detail. Few examples like these were found in the data, so one can say that it is not a very common strategy, at least in this teacher´s classes.

In example 4 below, one can see an example from the data where the teacher is helping the pupils. Most of the feedback listed as descriptive in the data actually consists of a dialogue that demands help from the teacher himself or the other pupils in the class. Often this help is guided through

teacher: he directly asks help from the others, or then gives hints about the right answer in order to get the right answer from the pupil. In this particular example the class is talking about religions and the teacher asks one pupil what a Protestant is. The discussion followed shows that another pupil helps the first one and gives the right answer.

Example 4: Descriptive feedback, help from a pupil.

Teacher	okay <u>til</u>da what's a protestant?
Tilda	<uhh it's uhh different uhh group of religion?>
Teacher	<y:eah> basically.=are they christians, or are they muslims or, (.)
	no sh-
Tilda	i don´t know.
Teacher	no worries. does anybody know? what's (.) <u>basically</u> what's b<u>a</u>sically
	the difference between protestants
Mauri	**uhh they're christian an' they ar::e uh it was- was it that uhh (.) uhh**
	when henry the eight started his own church there#
Teacher	**nice. yeah. (.) that's- yeah, basically it's connected with him.**
Mauri	**yeah.**

First, the teacher tries to ask more detailed questions to get a more precise answer, but as the first pupil does not seem to know, he expresses that it is okay by saying *no worries*. Then he moves on to aim the question for the whole class and directly asking *does anybody know?*. This leads to another pupil giving the answer that he was looking for. As one can see, the teacher quite easily moves from one pupil to asking the whole class for help, and the class reacts to this by offering their help.

Example 5 below also shows the structure of helping out, but in this case it is the teacher who then stands out and helps the one pupil he was asking the question from. The class is going through an assignment, and they are talking about Newcastle and what would happen if coal was brought there. It is important to notice that the teacher does not actually give the right answer straight away, but instead tries to lead the pupil to change his original answer with a question.

Example 5: Descriptive feedback, help from the teacher.

Teacher	okay. (.) whaddo you think it means uh jouni in the corner,
	whaddo you think it means if you take coals to newcastle? (.)
	is that a <u>good</u> idea or a \bad idea\?
	(.)
Jouni	good.

Teacher	**>good idea. so if you take-< yeah if you- if you take coal (.) to somewhere where they already have lots an' lots of coal. (.) try the other answer.**
Jouni	**no.**
Teacher	**yeah, it's a bad idea.**

The question is relatively simple, demanding a one-word answer from the pupil. When the teacher notices that the answer is incorrect, he then asks a more detailed question about the topic, leading the pupils to change his answer into a correct one. In my opinion this works well, and is much more fruitful when it comes to actually learning the issue, rather than immediately pointing out that the answer is wrong and telling the right answer himself.

Hargreave´s *evaluative and descriptive feedback* (2000:23) are major categories of the feedback types seen and analysed in the data, but in addition to these groups, I have defined a third one to include the rest of the feedback in the analysis. Into *the other feedback group* I have chosen the type of feedback that concerns for example the working atmosphere in the class. There are few classes where the teacher does not have to control the overall focusing and atmosphere in any way. On the contrary, especially with younger pupils it is crucial to have the right ways to maintain a good, focused classroom environment. In example 6 below, the teacher attempts to talk about issues related to the day´s topic, but is interrupted by a noise coming from the class. He very directly shows that this noise is bothering him, and even names the one pupil who is responsible for the noise.

Example 6: Working atmosphere.

Teacher	**>sakari I've a̲sked you to be quiet. =okay? so could you please be quiet?< (.) thank you very much there.**

As one can see from above, feedback can be relatively short, and constructed in a way that the pupil actually has to consider his actions by most preferably quieting down and giving the teacher a chance to continue. The teacher is indicating that it is not the first time he has asked the class to be quiet, and follows with a direct question to the pupil *so could you please be quiet?*. This cannot be analysed as a command, but rather as a polite request to get back to work. The question is even followed with a *thank you*

very much there, in order to show that it would be important to stay quiet and that the teacher really appreciates if his wishes are followed properly.

The last example (7) from the data is listed as general feedback. There were several moments in the data where the teacher clearly wanted to give feedback relating to some particular assignment or topic. Sometimes the feedback was more directed at one pupil, but mostly it was meant for the whole class. In example 7 the class have returned from their Christmas holiday and are on their first English lesson since before Christmas. They have gone through some grammar, and the teacher now wants to say something about their work for the whole class.

Example 7: General feedback for the whole class.

Teacher   **now this is your <u>first</u> lesson of the year? (.) an' we've just done ten minutes of quite complicated (.) grammar? (.) so d<u>o</u>n't worry t<u>oo</u> much (.) if you h<u>a</u>ven't understood everything. (.) okay?**

Right after the exercise the teacher is giving feedback to his pupils. Moreover, he also places himself into the role of a pupil. He realises that this grammar topic today must have been hard on the pupils, and wants to make sure that everyone gets some good feedback. The teacher wants to make clear that not everything has to be learned right away, and that it is fine if some issues still feel uncertain or complicated.

There are indeed several different feedback strategies one can take advantage of in the classroom. First of all, the teacher has to consider the situation and give accurate feedback according to it. Depending on the situation, some issues may demand more feedback than others, whereas others need to be discussed with the whole class. Secondly, feedback might not be considered amongst the most important topics in the classroom and in teaching, but the results of this study show that it forms a relatively large part of the teacher´s actions, and is a way of leading the discussion to where it needs to be led. Most importantly, one can never assume that giving feedback always follows the same patterns. I have divided the results of my study into different groups, but all the situations are somewhat different

from each other, and it is always the teacher who decides what sort of feedback he or she considers to be appropriate for a certain situation.

5 CONCLUSION

The present study consisted of two recorded classroom sessions, and after the analysis 125 different feedback events were found. These events were then categorised as evaluative, descriptive and others.

The main feedback used was *evaluative*, forming the largest subgroup with 69 feedback items. This could mean that teachers want to give evaluative feedback to pupils after a particular task or assignment in order to help them realise when they have worked well. On the other hand, teachers can show when there is still room for improvement. The second largest part was *the other section*, consisting of feedback for the whole class or feedback about the working atmosphere. Altogether 31 feedback items were classified under this category. This implicates that not all feedback has to be tied up to assignments and improving pupils´ performance in a certain field of language, but rather it is important to give feedback that helps to maintain a good and positive environment in the classroom and prevent problems that are formed because of bad working atmosphere. Finally, *descriptive feedback* formed the smallest unit, consisting of 25 feedback events. This was somewhat surprising, because descriptive feedback includes correcting errors and describing why something is correct. It is an area that most people would say teachers are in the class for: to correct mistakes and explain issues to the pupils. However, this low percentage of all the feedback items may be explained with the fact that teachers guide the pupils to work together, which in part helps them to find the right answers without

the help of the teacher. Moreover, it is not always the teacher who should operate as the leader, but the whole class together, often lead by the teacher.

The data for this study is relatively small, so one has to admit that the results found in this study cannot be properly adjusted into practise. More classroom recordings in CLIL classes are needed in order to form a valid and trustworthy opinion about the issue of oral feedback and its role in teaching CLIL classrooms. However, this provides a good starting point for the future researchers, and helps to understand the role of oral feedback better as a whole unit. In addition, it would be useful to study the role of feedback as a whole, especially in the CLIL classroom, since it has been studied less than basic classrooms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arminen, I. (2005). *Institutional interaction: studies of talk at work*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Coyle, D., Hood, P. and Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 31, 182–204. (http://anglistik.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/dep_a nglist/ARAL_2011_CLIL_article.pdf)

Geekie, P. and Raban, B. (1994). Language learning at home and school. In C. Gallaway and B.J. Richards (eds.), *Input and interaction in language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 153-180.

Hargreaves, E., McCallum, B. and Gipps, C. (2000). Teacher feedback strategies in primary classrooms: new evidence. In S. Askew (ed.), *Feedback for learning*. London and New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. Essex: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

National Core Curriculum for Basic Education (2004). Helsinki: Finnish National Board of Education (17.05.2014). (http://www.oph.fi/download/47671_core_curricula_basic _education_1.pdf).

Nikula, T. (2007). The IRF pattern and space for interaction: comparing CLIL and EFL classrooms. In C. Dalton-Puffer and U. Smit (eds.), *Empirical Perspectives on CLIL Classroom Discourse*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 179- 204.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversational analysis: The Study of Talk-in Interaction*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Ruuskanen, L. (2007). Suomenoppija vastauspolulla – opetussyklin toteutuminen suomi toisena kielenä- oppitunnilla. In L. Tainio (ed.), *Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa: näkökulmana keskustelunanalyysi.* Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 90- 116.

Tainio, L., Kleemola, S., Ruuskanen, L., Karvonen, K., Lehtimaja, I., Vepsäläinen, M., Joutseno, J., Turkia, N., Ristevirta, J., Saharinen, K. (2007) *Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa : näkökulmana keskustelunanalyysi.* Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Tuomi, J. and Sarajärvi, A. (2009). *Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi*. Helsinki: Tammi.