

# English teachers' experiences of writing tasks

Master's thesis  
Joanna Turunen

University of Jyväskylä  
Department of languages  
English  
May 2016



## JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA	Laitos – Department KIELTEN LAITOS
Tekijä – Author Joanna Turunen	
Työn nimi – Title <b>ENGLISH TEACHERS' EXPERIENCES OF WRITING TASKS</b>	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Maisterintutkielma
Aika – Month and year Toukokuu 2016	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 97 sivua + 2 liitettä
Tiivistelmä – Abstract <p>Kielen oppiminen ja opetus sekä motivaatio ja jopa opettajien työtyytyväisyys ovat runsaasti tutkittuja aiheita, mutta opettajien henkilökohtaisia kokemuksia kirjoittamisen käytöstä ei ole tarjolla. Opettajien kuuleminen tarjoaa kuvan opettajan työn arjesta ja sen vaikutuksesta kirjoitustehtävien käyttöön. Edes opetusoppaat eivät välttämättä tarjoa samanlaista näkökulmaa, ja kokeneiden opettajien kokemusten kuuleminen voi siten tarjota arvokkaan tuen esimerkiksi tuoreille opettajille.</p> <p>Kirjoittamisella tarkoitettiin tässä tutkimuksessa kokonaisten, englanninkielisten tekstien tuottamista. Koska tutkimuksen tarkoituksena oli kuulla englannin opettajien kokemuksia ja mielipiteitä kirjoittamisen käytöstä, tutkimusmetodiksi valittiin yksilöhaastattelu, joka antaisi opettajien oman äänen kuuluu. Tutkimuksessa haastateltiin kahdeksaa kokenutta englannin opettajaa Keski- ja Etelä-Suomesta sekä yläkoulusta että lukiosta.</p> <p>Tulokset osoittivat, että merkittävin tekijä tekstien kirjoittamisessa opettajille on aikapula, sillä kirjoittaminen vaatii paljon aikaa sekä oppilailta että opettajalta, jolle oppilastehtävien käsittely tarkoitti yleensä ilta- ja viikonlopputöitä. Haastatellut opettajat käyttivät monipuolisia kirjoitustehtäviä, ja opettajia motivoi oppilaiden motivaatio ja panostus sekä erityisesti luovan kirjoittamisen, fiktion ja runojen, käyttö sekä niiden kautta välittyvä oppilaiden mielikuvitus ja luovuus. Kirjoittamisen käytössä oli näkyvä ero yläkoulun ja lukion välillä.</p> <p>Tutkimuksen tulokset tarjoavat katsauksen opettajien kokemukseen kirjoittamisen käytöstä opetuksessa ja antavat siten makua esimerkiksi uusille opettajille siitä, millaisia asioita kannattaa huomioida kirjoitustehtäviä teettäessä. Tulokset suosittelevat myös väljempää aikataulua opetukseen, sillä kuten myös työtyytyväistutkimukset osoittavat, opettajien työtaakka ja kiire tuskin auttavat oppilaitakaan. Oppilaiden kykyä tuottaa tekstejä voisi kehittää antamalla opettajille aikaa opettaa kirjoittamista ja antaa palautetta oppilasteksteistä.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords EFL, teachers, motivation, writing	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository JYX	
Muita tietoja – Additional information	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. WRITING IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING	7
2.1 EFL in Finland	7
2.2 Writing	9
2.2.1 Second language writing	9
2.2.2 Writing as a skill	12
2.2.3 Different writing task types	15
2.2.4 Feedback on writing	18
3. MOTIVATION	23
3.1 Defining motivation	23
3.2 Motivation in the classroom	24
3.3 Teacher motivation	27
3.4 Motivating students to write	32
4. THE PRESENT STUDY	36
4.1 Aims of the study	36
4.2 Data collection and the participants	37
4.3 Methods of analysis	39
5. ENGLISH TEACHERS' EXPERIENCES OF WRITING TASKS	40
5.1 Experience of using writing	41
5.1.1 Views on writing and the importance of the skill	41
5.1.2 Teaching philosophies about writing	46
5.1.3 Writing in class and writing at home	50
5.1.4 Presenting of student texts	53
5.2 Writing tasks and feedback	55
5.2.1 Writing tasks	55
5.2.2 The best experiences of writing tasks	60
5.2.3 The worst experiences of writing tasks	62
5.2.4 The use of creative writing and student-teacher correspondence	65
5.2.5 Feedback	70
5.2.5.1 Students correcting their own texts and process writing	74
5.2.5.2 Peer feedback	78
5.3 Writing and motivation	80
5.3.1 Influences on teacher motivation	83
5.3.2 Memorable experiences affecting motivation	87
6. CONCLUSION	90
7. BIBLIOGRAPHY	95
APPENDIX I: Framework for interviews	98
APPENDIX II: English translations of the interview quotes	99

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Traditionally writing in foreign language teaching has been a way for students to demonstrate their language skill and for teachers to evaluate it. However, I argue that Finnish students' proficiency in English is increasingly higher and it would justify the language being taught and learnt as a second language – therefore, writing in English should be taught accordingly. Writing is a skill much more versatile than merely producing accurate language. English is also the language that is used increasingly more in the Finnish society. It is no longer an asset when applying for a job, but self-evident: it is assumed that people have a high enough proficiency in English to be able to work and study with it (see for instance Elinkeinoelämän keskusliitto (2014)). Interviewing university students from various fields, one finds that no matter the major, English is very prominently present in the literature and materials, even as the language of communication. Finnish education has responded to this over the years and nowadays English could be viewed more and more like a second language, as for example students are expected to produce very different kinds of texts in English and other languages taught in Finnish schools. However, it is not clear if students are explicitly taught writing as the versatile, process-like skill it is.

Language learning and teaching is a widely studied field. There are numerous books and guides on how to teach and learn languages, both second and foreign, and similarly there is an impressive amount of research on the different areas of a language skill, for instance reading (see Kern 2000) or oral skills (see Kaski-Akhawan 2013). There are books on second language writing, such as Hyland (2003), assessing writing, such as Weigle (2002) and guides to teaching writing, such as Hedge (2005) and Harmer (2013); there is also a good deal of research on various aspects and forms of feedback. Polio and Williams (2011: 491-492) add that there are also a lot of studies about the composing process of second language writers, but little results that are useful to the teacher who tries to teach writing in the classroom. Motivation is not lacking in research either, see for example research by Dörnyei. Even teacher motivation is a field that has started to spark interest and studies, such as Leppänen (2011) and Mäenpää's (2005) studies about the job satisfaction of teachers.

For all that, there is a clear vacuum for a study like this. As suggested above, there is little that has not been researched and written about second or foreign language learning, feedback, motivation, literacy or even writing. However, should one, perhaps a new, inexperienced teacher, want to learn about the reality of the teacher's profession and what kind of

considerations the teacher has to consider with writing, there is not much there. This study presents literature on writing and motivation, and it is interesting to see how the literature correlates with the reality. There are few guides to teaching that discuss, for example, how much time one should actually reserve for a writing assignment or how the Finnish classroom regards activities and methods presented in, for example, American literature. There are few sources where one has the opportunity to truly hear the experiences of individual teachers and to get to understand the realities of their profession's everyday demands. Such studies give readers, especially the inexperienced teachers, a far more realistic image of what exactly their life in the classroom might be like and what kind of things do they have to consider.

Manousou (2015) is one such study, as it studies English teachers' experiences of second language writing and written feedback. However, in Manousou (2015) the focus is very strongly on the feedback teachers give on student writing. This is where the present study steps in. This study aims to present a more comprehensive picture about the experience of using writing in English teaching. What do English teachers think about writing: how important is the skill, how much and how is writing used and how does the use of writing differ in secondary and upper secondary school. This study also explores what kind of writing tasks teachers report using, and what are the best and worst writing tasks teachers can remember using; do they use creative writing or teacher-student correspondence and what kind of feedback do they use. In addition, this study aims to see what kind of a relationship teachers feel the use of writing has with teacher motivation: what kind of factors affect teachers' willingness and ability to use writing and what kind of aspects of writing and writing tasks teachers feel motivate them.

As the goal of this thesis is to hear the experiences of English teachers, interviewing teachers was considered to be the most appropriate means of conducting this study. Therefore, eight experienced teachers of English from both secondary and upper secondary school from Central and Southern Finland were interviewed about their thoughts and experiences of using writing and what kind of an affect they feel it has on their motivation. The data was analysed qualitatively using content analysis as this study does not try to submit any quantitative conclusions or statistics, but instead present and discuss the personal thoughts and experiences of the interviewed teachers, hopefully allowing their voice to be heard.

This study aims to answer three research questions: 1) what kind of experiences do English teachers have of using writing tasks? 2) in the teachers' perspective, how do they teach

writing and what kind of writing tasks do they use? 3) how do teachers feel writing affects teacher motivation? The terms ‘writing’ and ‘writing task’ are used to refer to writing whole texts: written, independent texts in English which are longer than three sentences and usually have a purpose, an audience and a context, as suggested by, for example Hedge (2005) and Harmer (2004). The kind of writing skill this study discusses is a recursive process of planning, drafting, revising and editing, which aims to produce whole pieces of communication, described by, for example, Weigle (2002) and Hedge (2005).

The two following chapters will present the theoretical framework for this study: it is divided into two primary chapters based on the two topics of writing and motivation. The chapter on writing will present a brief overview of how English is taught in Finland and then discuss features of second language writing, writing as a skill, different writing task types and feedback on writing. The chapter on motivation will begin by defining motivation for the purposes of this study and then discussing motivation in the classroom, teacher motivation and motivating the students to write, which concludes the theoretical framework. The fourth chapter will present the aims of this study and the methods of collecting and analyzing data, and the fifth chapter will discuss the findings of this study.

## **2. WRITING IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

### **2.1 EFL in Finland**

Although I argue that English could be viewed as a second language in Finland, it is still called a foreign language in Finnish curricula and referred to as EFL in this context, English foreign language learning. Students have an increasingly higher proficiency in the language, which supports the argument of shifting English teaching towards second language teaching. Most students begin studying English on the third grade at the age of nine and continue through secondary school and either upper secondary school where they prove their competence in the matriculation examination or vocational education where English is taught as well. Generally English that is taught in secondary and upper secondary school is based on course books and the kind of writing discussed in this thesis is, I hypothesize, most prominently used as evaluated writing assignments and essays in the course exams.

Polio and Williams (2011: 494-495) suggest that in Europe foreign language teaching has tended to emphasize and prioritize oral communication over writing in the past years. This has

been a very visible theme in Finnish language teaching as well, and I in no way mean to downplay the importance of oral communication and teaching it; however, I argue for teaching writing as well. Polio and Williams also suggest that in countries where writing is taught in the native language, it tends to be overlooked in second or foreign language teaching: teaching writing can be considered futile. I strongly disagree with such a philosophy, as I will argue in chapter 2.2.1.

The National Core Curriculum (NCC) for both basic education (2014) and upper secondary school (2015) refers to writing in English, but in very different depth. The NCC for basic education does not give teachers any specific instructions for teaching writing, and it suggests that students should achieve the kind of level of writing where they are able to describe matters relating to their everyday life, both real and fictional, demonstrating a rather comprehensive language skill in vocabulary, language structures and idiomatic language use. It is also suggested that the student should be able to understand spelling. Sadly I can find few references to teaching students about writing as a skill, about the process of writing or even about writing being more than language accuracy.

The NCC for upper secondary school (2015) recommends teachers to draw students' attention to their need of English outside of school, for example in further studies and working life, and knowledge of genres and different text types and registers is emphasized on several courses. Writing in general is very well covered in the NCC: students should write for different purposes, use appropriate styles and write for different audiences, even write together. A variety of different kinds of texts are listed for course seven, including fictional, argumentative and descriptive ones. Compared to my experience of Finnish education, there have been very positive improvements and I believe that such instruction for teachers will guide them towards teaching writing. I only hope that there would not be such a leap between secondary and upper secondary school writing instruction, as I think secondary school students would benefit from more pronounced teaching of writing. I believe that receiving instruction on writing as a skill already in secondary school would help orientate students better for their further studies and their use of written English.

## **2.2 Writing**

Writing is a central theme in this thesis. The terms ‘writing’, ‘writing task’, ‘writing assignment’ and other similar expressions are used often, and in this study I use them to refer to students writing texts in English; a text in this study refers to a written, independent text that is longer than three sentences, but most often a whole piece of communication. The writing that is discussed in this thesis takes place in secondary and upper secondary school English teaching, where writing has generally been compositions and essays on various topics. First I will discuss some features of second language writing and characteristics of writing as a skill; these will be followed by views on different kinds of writing tasks and categorizing them and finally a discussion about feedback on writing. I will discuss writing and motivation in chapter 3.4.

### **2.2.1 Second language writing**

This chapter discusses some features of second language writing and the cultural differences in writing. I have chosen to explore second language writing in this thesis instead of foreign language writing, as I argue that in Finland English is taught as a second language rather than a foreign language despite the term used in the curricula. English writing, for example in the matriculation examination which is the final representation of what students have learnt, is very different than writing in French or Spanish or even Swedish, which is officially the second language of Finland. Generally foreign language writing equals short, communicative texts, in my experience, often with a practical purpose or a subject relating to oneself; that is something that students are expected to be able to write about. However, writing in English differs from these both in length and in content; the standard for English essays is also very different than for example a Spanish writing task. The English essay in the matriculation examination, which I expect to somewhat dominate writing in upper secondary school, is approximately 250 words long and the content varies from, for instance, speeches to advanced, argumentative essays (see the instructions for the matriculation examination (2011)). For this reason I will discuss second language writing rather than foreign language writing.

Kern (2000: 177) argues that first and second language writing involve essentially the same processes, but says that second language writing becomes more complicated because of the addition of new resources and norms, which I interpret to mean the different writing

conventions of the target language and the addition of a new, possibly foreign language. Hyland (2003: 50-51) describes second language writing to be distinguished from first language writing by the writers' bilingual and bicultural backgrounds and the previous experiences of the students, both as writers and as learners. I will argue that English in Finland could be called a second language because of the general, very high proficiency in it and the continuous exposure to both the language and the culture. Hyland continues to point out that all writers are different, so naturally teachers should be wary of making hasty conclusions about their learners based on cultural stereotypes. However, Hyland does state that culture cannot be ignored either in teaching writing, as it too closely connected to language, rhetoric styles, styles of learning and the way one understands knowledge, texts and identity.

It is important to be aware of cultural conventions and differences in writing. Weigle (2002), Kern (2000: 186-187) and Hyland (2003) emphasize this as they characterize writing as a social and a cultural phenomenon. Hyland warns inexperienced teachers of ethnocentrism in learning how to write and reminds them not to view second language writers as inadequate; on the contrary, Hyland suggests that appreciating differences in writing will enable cross-cultural understanding and it will allow the teacher to see that students' writing difficulties are not inherent qualities in the students themselves. Hyland argues that teachers are able to make genres and instruction relative to context by addressing students' native language experiences in writing openly and by comparing these experiences with the expectations for writing of the target language communities, such as the differences between writing in Finnish and writing in English. Hyland proposes that teachers should not try to replace the student's ideas and the practices they already have, for example from their native language, but that they should aim to add new to the existing ones, which allows students to take part, hopefully, successfully in new writing situations.

Weigle (2002) and Hyland (2003) argue that there is significant difference in, for example, between Western and Asian writing cultures. Weigle suggests that English writing conventions dictate writing to be linear, a straight line, and writer-responsible whereas writing conventions in oriental tradition would resemble an inward-pointing spiral. Hyland (2003: 37-40) describes the difference as contrasting showing knowledge and honouring important thinkers in Asian conventions with individual creativity and critical thinking in Western writing. The culture clearly dictates how the writer is perceived, as for example Hedge (2005: 22) states: writer-responsible approach in English would deem misunderstandings between

writer and reader the writer's fault. This is why, I think, it is especially important to actually teach writing in English, as understanding such conventions will by no means come automatically to students. Not meeting reader expectations, Weigle (2002) suggests, could result in the writer being thought of as illogical, inadequate or even stupid, and Hyland (2003: 37-40) agrees pointing out that for example the difference in Western and Asian writing conventions can lead to some serious misunderstandings about the quality of the writing. It is also very important to remember that there are, for example, topics that are inappropriate and culture-sensitive for some writers, as Hyland says (2003: 41), and the cultural differences affect many other aspects of teaching as well, including for example delivering feedback on student writing. The discussion about feedback will continue in chapter 2.2.3.

As Hyland (2003) pointed out in a previous paragraph, one cannot generalize or characterize students merely based on cultural stereotypes, as they are all different individuals. He describes the potential numerous differences in everything from language competence in both first and second language to individual differences in, for instance, age, motivation, learning style and personality traits, such as extroversion, willingness to take risks and the ability to handle criticism. Hyland (2003: 34-35) says second language writers have difficulties in expressing themselves in English because they have something they want to say, they have ideas, but they do not have the linguistic resources with which to express these thoughts; it, he suggests, can interfere with writing in the second language, as the linguistic and rhetorical conventions do not necessarily translate successfully from one language to another. This is something I can claim to be true based on personal experience and I dare to argue that this is especially true in Finnish classrooms: Finnish and English are very different kinds of languages, so I claim that converting ideas from Finnish to English is a more complex process than doing so with languages that have more similar grammar and syntax. It would seem to be fairly common to think in Finnish and then try to translate these thoughts into English, which can easily result in non-idiomatic language.

Hyland (2003: 29-30) argues that in order to produce effective, successful texts second language writers bring five kinds of knowledge, which the teacher should be aware of and pay attention to in teaching writing. These are content knowledge, system knowledge, process knowledge, genre knowledge and context knowledge. Content refers to, quite naturally, the ideas, concepts and the topic, system refers to understanding the syntax, lexis and other appropriate formal conventions of language, process, that is how to successfully accomplish the writing task, will be discussed in chapter 2.2.2, genre refers to the value and

communicative purposes of a genre, and context refers to, mainly, the sense of audience, which will also be discussed in chapter 2.2.2, the reader's expectations and cultural preferences. Hyland acknowledges that there are various differences between first and second language writers and between students and teachers that affect teaching and learning writing. He suggests that making writing conventions and the differences in them clear to students, encouraging students to consider their audience and offering them tools for using the language will lead to more effective teaching of second language writing.

### **2.2.2 Writing as a skill**

Writing is an area of language that is distinctly different from others, such as reading and speaking, and the current chapter will discuss writing as a skill: what kind of features characterize it, what is the process of writing like and what are a good writer and a good piece of writing like. Hedge (2005: 8) says writing has been a neglected area of teaching English, arguing that there is an abundance of literature on, for example, reading, but not specifically on writing. Polio and Williams (2011: 486-487) state that there is no comprehensive model of second language – or foreign language, I would claim – writing. They say writing in a second language requires three things: learning the new language, producing a text and making it appropriate for a specific discourse community. Kern (2000: 186-187) describes writing as both a creative, individual process and a normative, social one, and Hyland (2003: 29-30) would seem to agree characterizing writing as both individual and personal and social and interactional. Hyland continues to argue that writing cannot be reduced to merely a system of rules or technical and cognitive abilities: he claims that learning to write in a second language needs more than opportunities to revise and compose.

Kern (2000) and Hedge (2005) emphasize the connection between writing and reading, and I strongly agree that there is one, but more often, it seems, writing is compared to speaking. Reading offers the writer models of various different kinds of genres and registers; it is also a great source of inspiration and material, for both content and language. However, writing seems to be most often contrasted with speaking, the other area of language skill involving the learner producing the language. Weigle (2002: 19) says the two skills differ in many ways, although they can be used to achieve the same communicative goals; writing is not merely speech on paper, but she would characterize writing as a “distinct mode of communication, involving among other things very different sociocultural norms and cognitive processes.” She would summarize the difference between writing and speaking as permanence, distance,

complexity, vocabulary, formality, orthography and the time needed for production.

Hedge (2005: 7-8) claims writing to be considered a difficult skill, since it is devoid of such a wide range of possibilities to express oneself that are available while speaking: these are, for example, body language, tone, facial expression, gestures, pitch, stress and hesitation. She adds that the speaker is able to go back, revise their ideas and clarify when necessary. Harmer (2004: 1-14) points out that speech is naturally acquired, whereas writing is a skill that has to be taught; he continues to characterize the difference by emphasizing the distance and permanence, like Weigle (2002), saying that writing is able to go beyond time and space and that writing is permanent, whereas speech is for the present moment and transient. Harmer adds audience to Weigle's list presented above: speech generally has an audience of some sort, one speaks to someone and is able to interact with their audience, make choices based on their audience, such as clarifying or changing topic or tone. Writers do not have the instant feedback of their audience, nor do they necessarily need one. Writing can be done for an unknown audience and it can be for everyone, say, generations to come.

Polio and Williams (2011: 486-517) and Kern (2000: 171-190) discuss an aspect of the production time of writing, which is featured in Weigle's list above. Kern (2000) points out that writing gives the learner time to consider their ideas and the way to express them: the learner does not have to think about pronunciation, turns in conversation or keeping the thoughts they want to express rehearsed in memory. Writing makes it possible to consider both the language and the content with time, to find the best ways to express oneself and to check aspects of language, such as prepositions or the connotations of certain phrases. Polio and Williams (2011) report of studies related to this, for example, Kim et al. (2001, in Polio and Williams 2011: 487) discovered that when writing students paid attention to form even without the teacher's intervention; the students were also able to observe their language in writing, "as it is standing still." The study adds that doing so in speech decreases fluency, which is naturally very true: fluency in a non-native language, I think, is not achieved through emphasis on form, but through the confidence to keep on communicating. Polio and Williams point out that learners often notice and are able to correct several of their own mistakes when they read their writing; they say students also receive more feedback on writing rather than speaking. Polio and Williams also report of studies, for example, by Weissberg (2000) and Harklau (2002, in Polio and Williams: 487) finding that new language skills came out in writing before speaking, and that the students either were more comfortable or able to use these new language forms in writing before using them orally.

Harmer (2004), Kern (2000), Hyland (2003), Weigle (2002) and Hedge (2005) describe the four stages of the process of writing: planning, drafting, revising and editing. Hedge illustrates the process beginning with being motivated to write, which is followed by gathering ideas on the topic and then planning and outlining the text; the process continues by making notes and the first draft of the text, and then moving on to revising, replanning and redrafting until the final stage of editing the text before finishing. However, for example, Hedge and Harmer (2004) criticize the four-stage process presented above. Harmer's criticism has two reasons: first, it is not explained well enough how much weight each of the four stages is given and second, the process of writing is not linear, but a recursive one. Hedge (2005: 51-56) agrees saying that the recursive process allows the writer to move back and forth between the stages of drafting, revising and replanning while he or she writes: the plan develops along with the writing, since the writing promotes further planning. The weight Harmer mentions depends on what is written, according to Hedge: different kinds of writing require different kinds of processes, for example an e-mail to a friend demands very different kinds of planning and drafting than writing an academic article. She instructs that writers should consider to whom they are writing for and consider their audience as they write; they should draft their text and concentrate first on content, meaning and organization and move on to accuracy, such as spelling and punctuation, only later on.

Hedge (2005) describes a good writer and discusses the differences between a skilled and unskilled writer. She says a good piece of writing is the result of the writer's review and desire to improve. The good writer uses the process of writing while they work: they reflect on their writing, re-read and replan continuously as they work out how to say what they want to say most effectively, and they question their text, for example, in terms of clarity, content, language, cohesion and organization. According to Hedge planning is a tool for skilled writers, something that allows them to change and develop their ideas further while writing, whereas for an unskilled writer the original plan might become a straightjacket instead of an aid if it is not allowed to develop along the text. Hedge says drafting is for focusing on what one wants to express and redrafting for how to express it most effectively; editing is for reading through the text and trying to see it from a reader's perspective. That sense of audience is a major difference between skilled and unskilled writers, according to Hedge (2005: 22), as poor writers tend not to consider the clarity of their text or to aid the reader as they assume that their text can be followed with ease.

A good piece of writing has, thus, a sense of purpose, a sense of audience and a sense of direction, according to Hedge (2005). Harmer (2004: 22-25) adds that a text needs cohesion and coherence to be accessible to readers, and that coherence allows the readers to see at least the writer's purpose and her line of thought. Thus, based on Hedge and Harmer's thoughts, the good writer has something to say, she considers her readers and can control the style and register of her writing, she considers the clarity of her writing and she can develop her ideas and organize her text logically. A piece of writing has also accuracy and demonstrates the writer's language skill through, for example, the range of vocabulary and the complexity of both language and thinking.

Kern (2000) emphasizes the connection between reading and writing, as was discussed in chapter 2.1. Hedge (2005) agrees that reading is important and linked with writing, but even though reading offers various models of different kinds of text types and through them allows the student to become aware of what good writing is like, it is not enough. I, too, argue that a good writer needs to write a lot, as writing does not develop without practice, nor does any other skill. Hedge characterizes poor writers as less focused and less organized and as having less confidence in their writing, which for me is a key reason to emphasize the importance of allowing students opportunities to write. Students cannot develop nor can they become more confident in their abilities if they do not have the chance to gain experience. This will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3.4.

### **2.2.3 Different writing task types**

Hedge (2005) and Harmer (2004) argue that the writing ability develops by writing whole pieces of communication with an audience and a purpose, and suggest that the key to becoming a good writer is doing a good deal of writing. Another important consideration for developing the writing ability – and for student motivation - according to Hedge and Harmer, is a great variety of different kinds of writing tasks. This chapter discusses considerations for choosing writing tasks, presents possible continuums for categorizing such tasks and looks at some studies that have explored Finnish schoolbooks for EFL. For example, Hietala (2015) studied how satisfied Finnish upper secondary school EFL teachers are with the current textbooks: he found that teachers are generally pleased with the books, at least when it comes to the areas of language skills, including writing. This is, of course, good news, since textbooks seem to be such a dominating source in teaching.

It is important for teachers to know what kind of writing tasks textbooks offer, especially if their teaching is mostly based on the book. Studies, such as Asunmaa (2015) and Karjalainen (2016), have explored precisely this: what kind of writing tasks are represented. These kinds of studies are very helpful for teachers as they help show what kind of writing should be taught to supplement the books. Asunmaa (2015) studied what kind of writing tasks two ninth grade EFL schoolbooks offered, and Karjalainen (2016) analysed the creative writing tasks in a seventh grade EFL workbook. Asunmaa analysed writing tasks based on Hyland and Kern's categories, which are presented below as well, and found that there is a wide variety of different kinds of tasks and that most of them settle in the middle of Kern's continuum's form and content with a possible emphasis on analytical tasks. Karjalainen reports that there are creative writing tasks in the studied workbook, though perhaps not as many or as versatile a selection as would be best, and that most of the tasks are composition titles, which Karjalainen suggests, encourages students to write whole texts.

Hedge (2005: 86-88) discusses different kinds of writing students use and will need in their lives: she groups these into personal writing, creative writing, social writing, study writing, public writing and institutional writing. It is important for the teacher to consider the students' reasons and goals for writing, as naturally they will be more motivated to complete a task that they consider useful and that will benefit them. Hedge says that, for instance, diaries, journals and memoirs are examples of personal writing, stories, poems and plays of creative writing and text messages, e-mails, congratulations and invitations of social writing; essays, reviews and reports are instances of study writing, which tends to be academic or educational and often assessed by the teacher, letters of enquiry, letters to the editor, applications, complaints and forms are examples of public writing and reports, memos, legal contracts and academic papers of institutional writing. Hedge (2005) emphasizes that it is important for students to learn the appropriate conventions for different kinds of writing; she also points out that controlled activities should be balanced with ones that offer students more freedom to express themselves.

Harmer (2004: 62) recommends choosing writing activities that are relevant to the students and appeal to them, as an engaging task will involve students both intellectually and emotionally. Naturally such a task will have a more positive effect on motivation than a task which does not seem to have much relevance or anything to inspire the writers. Harmer (2004: 62) suggests motivating the students through, for example, visual, auditory or kinaesthetic stimuli, such as music, pictures or switching papers. Hedge (2005) adds that the

teacher should ask himself or herself questions about the usefulness and quality of the writing tasks he or she assigns, such as what is the aim of the task, what kind of strategies does the task encourage and should those be supplemented and what aspects of writing does the task focus on and how useful those aspects are.

Kern (2000: 191-193) presents a continuum for categorizing writing tasks that are most commonly used in foreign language classrooms. One end represents tasks that emphasize formal accuracy, that is the form of both the writing and language, and the other end emphasizes content and ideas. The writing tasks Kern has placed on the continuum from formal accuracy to content are copying and dictation, grammar exercises and controlled composition, translation, analytical essays, creative writing, letter writing, e-mails and computer conferencing, journal writing and notetaking and freewriting. Kern recommends letters, which he says is good task for communicative language teaching as it offers an authentic purpose for writing, among other reasons. He also recommends journals, which according to him encourage students to write, improve motivation and develop fluency.

Harmer (2004: 40-41) emphasizes the value of creative writing as it allows students to write for a broader audience than the teacher and it allows them to truly use their imagination. The content-focused end of the continuum seems to be favoured, and quite logically it is the one that encourages student motivation and a more positive attitude towards writing.

Hyland (2003: 120) presents another possible continuum for categorizing writing tasks. He suggests placing tasks on a continuum between ones offering most support and ones offering most independence. Hyland's continuum divides tasks in four broader functions: graphology, scaffolding, composition and extensive writing. Graphology involves the basic writing mechanics, such as handwriting, punctuation and spelling. Scaffolding is a wide category of tasks that work on language skills, such as comparisons and gap-fills, analyzing and manipulating model texts and controlled and guided composition. Composition entails "composition heuristics", such as planning, pre-writing, multidrafting and editing techniques, and extensive writing refers to writing texts for particular audiences, whether they be real or imagined. (Hyland, 2003: 120). Hyland (2003:133) emphasizes that extended writing tasks should be planned carefully: the teacher should make sure that the tasks contribute to the course goals and employ the skills students have been taught. He reminds teachers to consider, for example, the purpose, genre and audience of the assignment and to ensure that the task, the language and the assessment are clear to the students.

Hyland (2003: 113) suggests also categorizing writing tasks based on the five skills he thinks are important in producing an effective text: content, system, process, genre and context. Content refers, naturally, to the topics and ideas of the text, system to the appropriate use of language, process to the process of writing discussed in chapter 2.2.2, genre to the knowledge of the communicative purpose and rhetorical structures of the text and context to the audience, the reader's expectations and beliefs (Hyland, 2003: 113). Hyland (2003: 114-115) has created a graph for listing writing tasks and checking which skills they address; for example, brainstorming to create ideas ticks the boxes for content and process, analyzing authentic texts for patterns and features ticks genre and writing a multi-draft, full length essay represents all five skills. I think such a graph and such continua could be useful tools for teachers to evaluate the kind of writing tasks they use.

#### **2.2.4 Feedback on writing**

This chapter discusses feedback on student writing, both teacher's and peer's. Writing assessment is excluded on the grounds of keeping the content of this thesis manageable, but I recommend Weigle (2002), Hyland (2003) and Kern (2000) for further reading on the subject; assessing writing is an important consideration for teachers. However, the ways teachers use feedback and how they respond to student writing is more relevant to this study. Kern (2000: 270-274) suggests that foreign language teaching has tended to emphasize summative evaluation, that is, focus on measuring the student's achievement at the end of a course or a program. Hedge (2005: 121) argues that it would be more beneficial for teachers to offer feedback and encourage revision during the writing process, as, she says, an increasing number of teachers find giving feedback only for the product of writing as having significant disadvantages. Both Harmer (2004) and Hedge (2005) also point out the problem of students ignoring the given feedback, glancing at their scores but paying no attention to the actual feedback. Such a setting would suggest that the way foreign language teaching uses feedback on writing is dysfunctional.

Error correction seems to be the dominating form of feedback in foreign language teaching, as suggested by, for example Kontinen (2009) and Hedge (2005), who characterizes feedback on writing as being very ineffective if teachers tend to focus on minor issues on the surface of writing and ignore major issues in the structure of it. Hedge says error correction as the focus of feedback has to be reviewed and developed so that feedback will become a process of improvement: it will emphasize students reviewing and revising their writing along with the

teacher. Kern (2000: 267) agrees saying that grading merely on the basis of grammar errors “sends a message that producing error-free sentences is what foreign language writing is all about.” I believe this is exactly what has been happening in Finnish EFL, and for this particular reason it is so important to draw focus on writing and the kind of writing ability argued for in this thesis: to teach students that writing in English is more than language accuracy.

Polio and Williams (2011: 489) characterize error correction as controversial and state that “the effectiveness of error correction remains to be proven.” They suggest that grammar should not be emphasized in a writing class and that an emphasis on errors could result in students becoming focused on only their errors: students becoming afraid of taking risks with language and avoiding trying more complex language, thus, avoiding improvement. Polio and Williams do add that there are no comprehensive results and grant that students have better language accuracy on their revisions if they have had their errors corrected in their drafts. However, Polio and Williams (2011: 489) point out, that there is no proof of any long-term effects of error correction on student writing. This would, perhaps, suggest that error correction, especially as the predominant method of feedback, is not the most productive. Hedge (2005: 117) remembers to draw attention to the fact that teachers might have to settle for error correction with their over-whelming workloads. This discussion is continued in chapter 3.3.

Hyland (2003: 180-183) suggests – and I can agree from personal experience - that the most common way for language teachers to give feedback is handwritten commentary on the student’s essay with comments on the margins and at the end. Konttinen (2009) studied the content of such comments, more specifically, the reality of the teacher’s written feedback. She studied the essays of 30 Finnish students with their teachers’s feedback and divided the feedback into six categories: genre, creative expression, writing process, content, text functions and language structures. She found that of the total 622 comments zero fit the category of genre, three were about creative expression and four about the writing process. 54 comments were about the content and 55 about text functions. Shockingly, but not surprisingly, 506 comments, that is 81.4%, were about the language structures. I wish that the result could be considered less important as the study was small, but I am afraid that it might be a sadly accurate representation of what Finnish EFL writing is all about. How could students possibly develop a well-rounded, effective writing ability if they are told this blatantly that the focus is language accuracy?

Harmer (2004: 108-124) and Hyland (207-208) argue that a teacher should ask his or her students what kind of feedback they would like to have and then provide it accordingly. According to Harmer this will promote student autonomy and give the students a voice, and I fully agree. It is more likely that a student will pay more attention to his or her feedback if he or she has had the chance to affect it: if that student is involved in his or her own learning. Harmer adds that the teacher should aim to review student texts quickly in order to keep the students motivated and to show them that their hard work has not been forgotten. Hyland also recommends that teachers should encourage students to reflect on the feedback they have received, by writing their own responses to the feedback or keeping journals about it. Hyland (2003: 180-183) discusses also minimal marking as a way of giving students feedback, only signaling errors to students instead of correcting them. Having students correct their own essays is logically thinking a very effective way to have them at least read through their texts and feedbacks if not actually absorb them. Hyland (2003: 178-180) reports of studies that say second language writers appreciate the teacher's written feedback and that they do try to use most of the feedback they receive, assuming it is actually usable. It is curious, then, that Harmer (2004) and Hedge (2005) highlighted the issue of the teacher's feedback going to waste as students show little interest.

It would seem that most of the literature in this thesis suggests feedback on several drafts of writing, and Hyland (2003: 178-180) is one author who emphasizes that feedback is most helpful on the early drafts of the text. This is unfortunate if Finnish students do not often write drafts of their texts, as I would suspect they do not, as process writing would be very time-consuming. Hyland suggests that students prefer feedback on the content and organization of their text in the early drafts of the text and only later on accuracy; it is promising that Hedge (2005) characterizes good writers by their focus on content and structure during drafting and a focus on accuracy in editing. Hyland (2003: 185-186) summarizes that the teacher should consider all aspects of the student text in his or her written feedback: content, structure, organization, style and presentation, although, he points out, everything does not need to be discussed in every draft. Hyland says it is counterproductive to pay attention to all errors, but that instead teachers ought to prioritize the student's issues for the feedback. For further reading on feedback, see also Bitchener et al. (2005) and Ferris (2007).

There is a fine, complex balance between praise and criticism in the teacher's feedback. Hedge (2005: 124) suggests very traditional, good principles for the teacher's written

feedback, such as always mentioning what is good in the text and why, noticing improvements and problem areas and suggesting further ways to improve. She also suggests summarizing the student's strengths and weaknesses and emphasizes giving the student a sense of development. Hedge (2005) argues that feedback is a way to help students develop the strategies of good writers, and that the student's confidence can be improved through positive feedback; the correction of errors should be balanced with praise. Hyland (2003: 187-189) instructs teachers to write personalized comments and guide where it is needed while avoiding advice "that is too directive or prescriptive"; he suggests making comments text-specific instead of offering general rules and, like Hedge, emphasizes balancing praise and criticism, as the latter can discourage students.

Hyland (2003: 190-192) describes ESL writers – and I believe the same applies to EFL writers – as being insecure about their writing abilities, which is why the teacher has to consider his or her feedback carefully. Hyland says writers can be devastated by criticism, which leads to teachers trying to mitigate their negative feedback, so that their comments would not come across as harshly. They can also do this to manage their role, according to Hyland: the teacher should not be too dominant and overdirective, as, he says, very direct comments can "steal" writing from the writers and not help develop the student's cognitive skills nor writing ability either. However, vague feedback is a serious issue: Hyland (2003: 178-180) reports L1 research finding a significant amount of feedback as being of low quality and often misunderstood by the writers; research also found that students worked on their writing without any real comprehension of why they were doing it and that often the original idea was deleted rather than rephrased and amplified. Hyland (2003:190-192) says unclear feedback can lead to serious misunderstandings and through those to students becoming confused and them either ignoring the feedback or making pointless revisions; in the end vague, indirect and misunderstood feedback can even lead to frustration and hostility towards the teacher, which, naturally, hinders development and learning.

Praise is not unproblematic either. Hedge (2005) and Hyland (2003) both argue that it is necessary, in order to protect and strengthen the writer's possibly low confidence, but Hyland (2003: 187-189) warns not to overuse it. He says that positive feedback tends to be saved for the final versions of a text, thus rewarding the students for putting in the effort; Hyland points out that students appreciate positive feedback, even need it not to be disheartened by everything that is wrong with their text, but that constructive criticism is expected as well. However, Hyland claims that there are teachers who believe that too much praise, particularly

if given early on, can lead to students becoming complacent and weaken their motivation to improve. He also argues that there are students who find praise to be empty and insincere, which it very obviously is in cases where the teacher is simply desperately trying to find something good to say about the text, in order not to to crush the writer with criticism. Hyland suggests tangible suggestions for improvement, something the student can actually accomplish. I believe such suggestions would be very beneficial for the development of student writers.

Kern (2000: 284) and Hyland (2003: 192-195) suggest oral face-to-face conferences between teachers and students to be a very beneficial way of delivering feedback. They propose the method is generally better for learning and not merely for the improvement of the text but the overall writing ability; apparently face-to-face conferencing saves teachers time of marking the essays in the usual detail. Naturally, arranging to meet with each student personally to discuss their paper requires, I would claim, even more time, which is something Kern and Hyland acknowledge as well. Hyland argues that conferencing gives students more usable feedback than they would receive in writing, and he points out that this method of giving feedback works best when the students are actually involved in the discussion instead of just being passive recipients. There are, of course, issues besides time and resources with this method, one of them being cultural aspects: Hyland (2003:192-195) discusses the fact that there are cultures where students do not socialize informally with the teacher and they especially do not question such an authority figure. That rather defeats the purpose of the feedback being a discussion rather than direct orders from above.

Harmer (2004) and Hedge (2005) recommend peer feedback. Harmer (2004: 108-124) argues that peer feedback helps to activate students who might generally be very passive about their feedback and he says peer feedback also helps students to see feedback as suggestions rather than commands. Hedge views peer feedback as beneficial as well, in addition to other forms of students working collaboratively on writing: she and Harmer argue that peer feedback can help students being able to edit their own texts. Polio and Williams (2011: 493-494) would seem to agree, as they report that peer feedback instruction would be more effective than the actual peer feedback. This seems logical, since instructing students how to evaluate each other's work will give them the tools to review their own text as well. However, peer feedback is not without issues. Hedge emphasizes that it has to be carefully managed, and she and Harmer both have found that students may have difficulties in viewing peer feedback as valuable as the teacher's. Harmer adds that it is in no way obvious that all students will work

together well: some might even resent their peers' feedback. Hedge (2005), Harmer (2004) and Hyland (2003) emphasize that students have to be trained to do peer feedback and even then the quality and the focus of the feedback should be managed by the teacher. Hyland (2003: 198) adds that teachers are generally more positive about the use of peer feedback than students, who, according to him, usually prefer feedback from the teacher.

### **3. MOTIVATION**

#### **3.1 Defining motivation**

In order for a teacher to make learning most effective, he or she should ensure that their students have the optimal chances of being motivated. First, it is important to define what motivation means in the context of this study, as it is such a widely researched concept, and after that this chapter explores means of building a foundation for motivation. Learning to write fluently and well in a foreign language will be easiest when students are interested, feel safe and, in a word, motivated.

This thesis determines motivation as the will behind human action and accomplishment. Dörnyei (2001:7) explains it through three parts: why people do something, how hard they strive for it and how long they will continue pursuing it. The concept has been extensively studied and written about, and there are numerous different theories and definitions of motivation, but for practical reasons this study will only explore a few most closely related to classroom motivation. In a classroom environment motivation can refer to a student's will to learn and complete required tasks; often a student thought of as 'good' will be referred to also as 'motivated'. (Dörnyei, 2001)

One of the most common divides in a school setting is classifying motivation as intrinsic and extrinsic, as in Dörnyei (2001) and Reid (2007). Dörnyei (2001: 11) presents this divide along *self-determination theory*. Intrinsic motivation is motivation for the subject itself, such as learning the English language for the sake of the language, to enjoy a particular activity or to learn more to satisfy curiosity. Extrinsic motivation on the other hand is performing as a means to an end: it is fueled by external factors, such as rewards and obligations, for example grades, deadlines or graduating. Intrinsic motivation is, thus, self-determined and extrinsic a controlled form of motivation, and student motivation tends to place on a continuum between these different ends. Naturally, one hopes students to place closer to intrinsic motivation, as it

will allow a learner to be motivated by the subject matter and fuelled by the desire to learn more rather than external rewards or obligation.

It is also beneficial to be aware of another kind of divide in the field of motivation. These attitudes, as presented by Dörnyei (2001:16), relate to attitudes about the language community in question, in this case, English. Dörnyei points out that learning the language of a community the learner despises is unlikely to be successful, hence the teacher is responsible for taking attitudes into consideration as well as learner beliefs, as will be discussed in the following chapter. As has been argued in this thesis, English is a very important language to know in Finland, and it would be, thus, beneficial for the teacher to ensure that students are aware of the role of English and the importance of it both globally and in Finland. The language learner's goals are divided into two categories: integrative orientation and instrumental orientation. Integrative orientation reflects a positive attitude towards the language community in question, perhaps identifying with members of that community and hoping to interact with them. Instrumental orientation on the other hand refers to the language being learnt for potential, pragmatic gain, such as a benefit in applying for higher job positions or receiving better pay. To read more about motivation theories, see also for example Gardner (2010).

### **3.2 Motivation in the classroom**

Inspiring and maintaining student motivation is beneficial for learning, and a teacher should invest in making the learning environment and experience as good for the students as possible. Whereas the teacher is a major factor in student motivation both in how they perform and by character traits, the final responsibility for the work is on the students. A teacher should, thus, focus on areas of motivation he or she can consciously affect. Dörnyei (2001: 31-49) describes three basic motivational conditions: the appropriate teacher behaviour and a good relationship with the students, a good and supportive classroom atmosphere and a cohesive learner group with proper group norms.

I will begin by elaborating on the appropriate teacher behaviour. Numerous sources, such as Bennett (2005), Dörnyei (2001) and Alaste (2008), confirm that the most important factor in student motivation is the teacher's own motivation. An enthusiastic teacher who finds his or her own subject interesting and motivating is a very positive influence on student motivation. Students are quick to sense how the teacher views the subject, teaching and them, and both

enthusiasm and demotivation are contagious. If a teacher is inadvertently telling his or her students that the subject is not worth working for, the students are unlikely to do so.

Another influential factor in the appropriate teacher behaviour is the teacher's relationship with the students and his or her commitment and expectations of their students' learning; a teacher that is perceived as caring is more likely to make the students care as well (Turunen, 2014). The sheer magnitude of the power of a teacher's expectations can be surprising: Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968, in Dörnyei, 2001: 35) conducted an experiment where they administered an intelligence test to children, but the real experiment was on the teachers. The teachers were told of pupils that would thrive intellectually, but these pupils were selected randomly instead of based on their scores. At the end of the year, the pupils labelled by the researches had flourished as the teacher's expectations for them had acted as self-fulfilling prophecies. It is, thus, of major importance that the teacher be aware of what they expect and how they express their expectations. These expectations work both ways: low expectations might cause students to 'live down' and high expectations, if a teacher believes a student can succeed, can result in students flourishing as the children in Rosenthal and Jacobson's experiment. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) speak of “the pygmalion effect” in connection to teacher expectations, which can be either direct, such as offering extra learning opportunities, or indirect, such as better rapport or more detailed performance reviews. The negative effects of low expectations can be, as Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) point out, the teacher giving up on these students more easily, not waiting for answers from them, criticising them more often and praising them less often and perhaps praising these students after routine responses instead of actual effort and success. A teacher with low expectations might also seat students like this in the back of the classroom, pay less attention to them and not interacting with them as much as with the others or interacting with less interest and warmth (Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2011).

A third aspect of a caring, motivating teacher is their commitment, availability and consistency. Demonstrations of caring can be, for example, remembering students' names, showing interest in their lives and interests and making time for them. If the students write essays or papers, the teacher can show their commitment by reviewing them promptly. It is, naturally, very important for the teacher to treat their students equally and to be consistent also in, for example, following the rules the class has negotiated together (Tileston 2011, Bennett 2005). If the teacher is consistently late, it eats away the student's motivation to be punctual. As the previous paragraphs have demonstrated, the teacher's example is a powerful

influence. Somewhat alarmingly in a study conducted by Niemelä (2012) about language teachers' beliefs and uses of motivational strategies some teachers had indicated they did not have time or, even more alarmingly, interest in getting to know their students. Some considered teaching the language their only responsibility.

The second and third of Dörnyei's basic conditions for motivation, referred to above, are the atmosphere and the learner group. Tileston (2011: 10-12) says that if a learner feels somehow distressed, anxious or afraid, their brain enters a survival mode of sorts, and while it might be possible to learn in this mode, it is very difficult. The source of fear overpowers all other stimuli. One can conclude that for learning to take place, every learner should feel safe and accepted. A teacher can promote this by, for example, establishing tolerance and teaching that mistakes are a natural part of learning. They can use group activities, put effort into having students interact and promote cooperation instead of comparison and competition. Dörnyei (2001) claims that learning a foreign language can be a source of insecurity for learners, and a teacher should allow students to maintain a positive social image, and hence avoid humiliating them or putting them in the spotlight unexpectedly. Reid (2007) also discusses the importance of the physical learning space: the atmosphere could be completed by, for example, giving students a chance to make the space their own by presenting their own work in wall displays.

The actual teaching is important in maintaining student motivation. Boredom is an enemy of motivation, so it is important to vary teaching methods, topics and routines as much as possible, as is suggested for example in Dörnyei (2001). Tileston (2011) argues that a student should find the subject personally important to learn it for longer than just for the next exam. Choosing topics that interest students or relate to their lives and hobbies can also be a way for the teacher to show they are interested in their students and that they have listened to them. Interesting topics in themselves are motivational as well. The task level and purpose are important too. A task should feel and be presented as something useful for the students: a meaningless exercise with no real purpose will not be a motivational factor. Dörnyei (2001) says the task level should be just above the current level of the learner, and Alaste (2008) found in her study that students found challenging tasks more motivating than easy ones. Easy tasks tend to lead to boredom, but one should avoid tasks that are too difficult, as they will undermine a learner's self-confidence. This leads to the importance of experiences of success – and the teacher noticing a student's success – in maintaining motivation, as presented in, for example, Dörnyei (2001) and Alaste (2008).

Paying attention to student success is related to continuous feedback, which is one of the important factors in student motivation. Knowing where they succeed and knowing which areas they can develop, and most importantly, how they can do that, are key in aiding student learning. A teacher should take note of learner beliefs and attitudes as well. As was stated in the preceding chapter, learning the language of a despised community is unlikely to be successful and especially in Finland, where one hears that students study foreign languages increasingly less, a foreign language teacher should put effort into promoting their language. Learner beliefs can hinder progress, and a teacher should make sure that, as Dörnyei (2001) suggests, a student does not believe that learning a language requires a mythical ability acquired at birth and that they lack or that only children are able to learn a foreign language. They should consider these beliefs in their feedback as well and speak of effort instead of ability, even though success can be attributed to talent as well (Dörnyei 2001); this discussion is continued in chapter 3.4.

The importance of a teacher's expectations was emphasized in a preceding paragraph, and it is equally important that the students know what is expected of them (Dörnyei 2001). A teacher should teach learning strategies as well as their subject, such as skills needed in writing as well as the language, and for the students to have the best chances of succeeding, they should know how they can succeed. When presenting a task, a teacher could give examples and present strategies needed to complete the task in question. Equal transparency is motivational in evaluation also. Students ought to know what they are graded on and how they can receive a certain grade. Ideally, they should be involved in the evaluation as well, and if they can influence their learning, one can conclude that their commitment to their own learning might be greater. Dörnyei (2001) speaks for learner autonomy, a student's ability to take charge of his or her learning, and the responsibility and freedom it brings would logically thinking make for more motivated learners. Giving the students a voice is likely to improve their motivation.

### **3.3 Teacher motivation**

This thesis aims to study how Finnish teachers of English experience using writing tasks and how using these writing tasks affects teacher motivation. As teacher motivation is connected with student motivation, studying teacher motivation is also important. Several studies, a few of which were presented in the preceding chapter, personal experience, Klassen & al.\_(2014) and Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) state that perhaps the most influential factor in student

motivation is the teacher's motivation: a teacher who genuinely loves his or her subject, who is interested in his or her students and who enjoys his or her work is more likely to have motivated, interested students as well; see also Kunter and Holzberger (2014). Motivation can be contagious. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011: 187) suggest that teacher enthusiasm equals learner enthusiasm. They also propose that teacher motivation is related to teacher expectations and their impact on students, which was discussed in the previous chapter. One can conclude that satisfied, motivated teachers make for more motivated learners, and with that logic it would be important to help teachers maintain their motivation.

A survey of over 2,000 teachers in England, Australia and New Zealand by Dinham and Scott (2000, in Dörnyei and Ushioda 2011: 161) found that the option “I always wanted to become a teacher” was the most common reason for entering the profession. Also, the intrinsic rewards offered by teaching were considered the most satisfying aspects in all three countries. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011: 161) and Urdan (2014: 227-245) argue that the intrinsic component of motivation is a powerful force behind teachers' desire to go into and to remain in the profession. It is said that teaching as a profession is generally connected with an internal desire to educate or aid the development of young people, to share knowledge and to make a contribution to society; there are also more pragmatic reasons for entering the profession, such as a stable job and the lack of other career options, as suggested by Urdan (2014: 231). Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011: 161) claim that teachers who expect this kind of intrinsic rewards are willing to give up higher salaries and social recognition, which they suggest, is “a fact that is recognized and abused by many national governments.” (161). Durr & al (2014:198-213) and Urdan (2014: 227-245) suggest that the most intrinsically motivated, passionate teachers entering the profession are more likely to be disappointed and stressed and to face even burnout than those who have more realistic expectations of the reality of the teacher's work.

Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) emphasize the importance of teacher autonomy. Restricting a teacher's autonomy can become a critical issue in maintaining intrinsic teacher motivation. Autonomy can be considered one of the major motivational factors in teaching, and in order for a teacher to keep himself or herself motivated, he or she should have the opportunity to improve himself or herself. Bureaucratic pressure, too many restrictions from the school or the education board, can have a demotivating impact on teachers, Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) suggest. Finland could be said to have motivating teacher autonomy, as Finnish school teachers follow the National core curricula, but beyond that have very little restrictions on

how they should teach their subject and are, thus, free to be resourceful and to try and better themselves.

The intrinsic component of enjoying one's work and finding it meaningful surfaced also in studies by Leppänen (2011) and Kaski (2009) about the job satisfaction of English teachers in Finland; Leppänen interviewed nine English teachers from elementary to upper secondary school, and Kaski gathered her data through questionnaires administered to ten English teachers. Leppänen's interviewees enjoyed, for example, the meaningfulness of their work and being able to see the results of it and being able to work with the language they love.

Generally teachers were happy with students and their colleagues in both Leppänen's and Kaski's studies, and in Mäenpää's study (2005) about the job satisfaction of English teacher's as well.

This leads us to the aspects of a teacher's job that cause dissatisfaction and the number of challenges in maintaining teacher motivation. Mäenpää's study, in which she interviewed six English teachers about their job satisfaction, found rather alarmingly that only half of the interviewees were satisfied and that only one of the participants would choose their profession a second time. The general impression from the interviews was that the teachers were tired and in need of change. Similar dissatisfaction appeared in Leppänen's and Kaski's studies as well: the Finnish teachers that participated found their work stressful and perhaps too demanding.

Durr & al. (2014: 198-213) speak of the exceptionally high stress level as one of the challenges in maintaining teacher motivation. Urda (2014: 241) characterizes teaching as one of the few professions that "1) is primarily about nurturing the development of others, specifically children and adolescents; 2) involves working with groups rather than individuals much of the time; 3) is subject to public scrutiny and demands and 4) involves such a deep level of emotional investment and vulnerability." Urda also adds the low compensation and equally low status in society to the list. Leppänen (2011) and Kaski (2009) found teachers to be stressed as well. Leppänen (2011) reported that some teachers found it hard to separate their free time from work, which probably contributed to the feeling of overworking, having a large workload, sometimes having no free time at all and describing their work as mentally draining. Kaski (2009) too reported dissatisfaction because of hurry and the increasing amount of work. A recent study about the working conditions and job satisfaction of Finnish teachers by the Trade Union of Education in Finland (2016) found similar results. In relation

to the present study, it is interesting to ponder how this stress, workload and hurry affect a teacher's willingness, resources and motivation to assign writing tasks, which can be very time-consuming for the teacher to review, and as discussed in previous chapters, should be marked for more than grammatical accuracy and ideally used to provide written, constructive and encouraging feedback as well.

Perhaps the most important factor in teacher motivation is the teacher's self-efficacy, his or her belief in his or her own competence. Klassen et al. (2014: 100) report that teachers have a more significant effect on student achievement than almost any other demographic or social factor, which would suggest that it is truly very important to understand teacher motivation and to keep teacher motivated. Durr et al. (2014: 202-204) argue that a teacher who has low self-efficacy, that is a teacher who does not believe in their ability to manage a classroom or to engage students in learning, is more likely to suffer from burnout. Durr et al. (2014: 198-200) also report that teachers suffer from one of the highest levels of burnout worldwide. Teachers measure high levels in the three dimensions of burnout: "emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment" (Durr et al. 2014: 198-200). Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) and Durr et al. (2014: 198-213) argue that insufficient teacher training is a crucial factor in the development of teachers' self-efficacy. Durr et al. suggest that if teacher trainees were taught how to develop the appropriate skills, they would not be as susceptible to high levels of stress and even burnout: trainees should be taught how to manage the classroom and how build relationships with the students. This would be especially important, since Durr et al. suggest these two to be the causes of the highest levels of stress in the profession. See Bandura (1997) for further reading on self-efficacy.

Another reason behind the difficulty of maintaining intrinsic motivation in teaching is the difficulty of retaining intellectual challenge. English teachers tend to work with a language they love and enter the profession for intrinsic reasons, but they, like all teachers, usually end up teaching the same content over and over again. If their workload is immense, they have up to no free time and they suffer from chronic stress, the temptation of reusing lessons plans, writing tasks and following published, pre-made teaching materials might be real and justified. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) say that teachers often teach the same subject matter for years and do not really have any real opportunities to learn more themselves: they may become bored and routinized. A few teachers in the pedagogical studies at the University of Jyväskylä have said that after teaching elementary or middle school curricula for years, their own language skills have deteriorated. Dörnyei and Ushioda propose that teachers be

resourceful and keep themselves and their students motivated to be successful.

There are not very many opportunities for teachers to advance in their careers. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) argue that for the teacher who lacks in intrinsic motivation and has become bored and routinized by the years of teaching the same content, the work might become dreary. A classroom teacher of English is done career-wise, when they get a teaching position they like: if a teacher prefers to stay in the classroom instead of applying for head teacher, they do not have opportunities for promotions. According to Dörnyei and Ushioda, this inadequate career structure can be a major challenge in maintaining teacher motivation. They say that teacher motivation is not merely about the motivation to teach, but to make teaching a life-long career. The closed career path of a teacher, having no future career steps and no promise of promotions, could have a negative impact on a teacher's work morale. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011: 173) reported that several countries were thinking about adding titles such as super-teachers or master teachers, most likely as a solution to the closed career path of teachers.

As suggested by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) and Durr et al. (2014) teachers generally have chosen the intrinsic component of the pleasure of teaching instead of high salaries and social recognition, but the economic conditions are an important factor for teacher motivation. Teachers generally earn considerably less than other professions with a similar level of higher education, such as lawyers and doctors, but a study about Ethiopian teachers by Gemedu and Tynjälä (2015) illustrate the issue quite clearly. The participants in their study could not see a link between their performance and their reward, which affected motivation along with the salary that was so low that it was not enough for basic needs, such as food, clothes and shelter (Gemedu and Tynjälä, 2015: 17). The low salary combined with inflation made the cost of living unbearable for teachers, who wanted reasonable pay to address their needs in order to continue to be passionate about their work. Gemedu and Tynjälä also report that teachers' salaries were low compared to other professions, which lead to a belief that teaching is not valued in society. A teacher's financial situation is better in Finland, but one has to wonder if the reason for teachers' low salaries across the globe is founded in a lack of appreciation for the profession. Luckily, it is passion rather than financial gain behind most teachers' desire to teach.

### 3.4 Motivating students to write

I have argued that motivation is a key factor in language learning and teaching, and so it is in writing as well. This chapter will discuss motivations to write, writing in foreign and second language classrooms, ways for the teacher to motivate students to write and some ways for the teacher to begin teaching writing effectively. Weigle (2002) and Harmer (2004) point out that people have very different reasons for studying languages and for writing, therefore, naturally, their goals have to be considered when planning writing activities: an immigrant-based adult group will benefit from writing that will aid them in their everyday life whereas a post-graduate class at university will need very different kinds of writing. Harmer (2004: 39) argues that learning writing will be most effective when students write real messages for real audiences, or at the very least, when their tasks resemble ones they will do outside of the classroom as well. Hedge (2005: 9-10) adds that writing whole texts caters for different motivations, such as having to prove competence in English through compositions in exams or having no true need for written English, but enjoying it nonetheless, producing for example poems, stories and essays.

Harmer (2004: 1-14) characterizes the teaching of writing to have been focused on the written product instead of the writing process for many years; he says students were, perhaps, unintentionally, asked to look at the what instead of the how of text construction. This, he suggests, has led to students glancing at their essays for, perhaps, a grade or a score, but paying little attention to the feedback they have received. Hedge (2005) agrees that traditionally the focus in writing is on the end product, even though it perhaps should be on the process. Hedge (2005: 9-10) says that writing is often done for pedagogic purposes, to aid the learning of a language, for example learning new vocabulary or structures, and that much of writing like this is done at a sentence level. That, Hedge agrees, has its use for learning the language, but writing ability is more than producing correct, clear sentences: she argues that producing whole pieces of communication is the way to help fulfill real purposes. Kern (2000: 218) adds that for students writing might sometimes seem merely like following various kinds of rules, from spelling to organization, so that in the end, students might think of writing as “a pre-existing form into which they need to mold their ideas.” Kern continues to say that if students see writing as communicative and personally meaningful instead of only as language practice, they will be more interested in it. Kern (2000: 192), too, has found that foreign language teaching has traditionally used writing as grammar practice and admits that it has its uses in aiding language learning, but he argues that that kind of use does not develop

students' communicative or expressive abilities. Immersion, however, he says, is an important ability in developing the writing ability, which can be promoted through, for instance, creative writing, free writing and writing letters and journals (Kern 2000: 192).

I believe that motivation for writing begins by building the confidence of the writers. Hedge (2005), Harmer (2004), Dörnyei (2001) and Weigle (2002) all emphasize the importance of the student's confidence and beliefs about the writing ability. Weigle argues that student beliefs about writing ability can affect their success: if students see the ability to write as an inherent quality, a rather unchangeable talent, Weigle says they become anxious and think less of themselves as writers. Weigle suggests that if a student believes that success is the result of effort and not an inherent ability, he or she are likely to work harder. I argue that the same principle applies to, of course, all language learning: believing a skill to be something one either has or does not have instead of something that can be learnt with practice has surely a major effect on motivation.

Harmer (2004) agrees saying that the students' attitude towards writing will become more and more negative if their insecurities are reinforced; students may be anxious about various aspects of writing, such as handwriting, spelling and their ability to form sentences and paragraphs. He also speculates that writing only rarely even in one's native language, is likely to make writing feel like a foreign concept: perhaps the student has little to say or they have no interest in writing. This is why, Harmer argues, the teacher has to build the writing habit. Hedge (2005) agrees suggesting that one should write a lot to become a good writer; this, according to her, applies especially to poor writers who can end up stuck with a sense of failure. If a student feels like a terrible writer, Hedge says he or she is unlikely to be motivated to write and this, of course, results in little practice, which in turn leads to the writing ability remaining poor. Thus, the beginning of student writer's motivation lies in their belief about their ability to write.

One way to build students' confidence about their writing ability is to write in the classroom where the teacher can help the students. Hedge (2005: 13) points out that writing is often homework because of the lack of time: writing is time-consuming, so time in school is saved for speaking and listening and writing is done at home, where students are able to do it at their own pace. She says this is a problem because there are several students who benefit from writing in the classroom where the teacher can encourage the process of writing, which was discussed in chapter 2.2.2. Hedge suggests a poorer writer can develop confidence by writing

in a supportive environment; in the classroom teachers can quietly intervene and advise, make sure all students understand the task and are able to begin, encourage revision and reading other students' texts. She argues that helping students during writing is far more effective than help that is given afterwards. However, Hedge (2005: 14-15) does emphasize that it is also beneficial to allow students time write in their own time, for example writing personal, non-assessed tasks out of class: she says extensive writing is one of the strategies that can help students become better writers.

As has been already suggested in this thesis, motivation for writing can be built through writing whole pieces of communication, complete texts, which have a purpose, a context and an audience. Hedge (2005) and Harmer (2004) support this conclusion. Writing ability, then, can be built through the process of writing, which was discussed in chapter 2.2.2; naturally a key feature in both motivation and improving writing is variety, practicing various different kinds of texts. Hedge (2005) says one should not assume that all students, or even the majority of them, are talented writers even in their native language; she says many leave school without efficient writing ability. Hedge emphasizes also the importance of audience and context for writers to be motivated and to improve, as if they write only for the teacher and for purposes of evaluation, the practice is hardly useful for the development of the writing ability. She points out that not all students have a sense of audience even in their first language, therefore it is something that should be taught; especially in English writing where a sense of audience is required. Hedge (2005: 20) says it is easier to write with a context: if one should write a description of a town, the text will be very different depending on whether it is a postcard to a friend, an advertisement for a travel agency or a geographical report.

It is always possible to give students a real audience besides the teacher, that is, the other students. Hedge (2005) and Harmer (2004) suggest collaborative writing as both a means of motivation and developing the writing ability; Hedge points out that tasks that involve sharing one's work should be introduced gradually, especially with more inexperienced and insecure writers. Harmer (2004: 84) argues that seeing each other's work, reading out what has been written and allowing students to show their work by putting it up on, for instance, classroom walls will motivate students. He says teachers should encourage students to enjoy writing and to take pride in their work, while at the same time helping them to improve their writing ability.

The teacher, according to Hedge (2005) and Harmer (2004), can both motivate students and

better their instruction by writing himself or herself. The teacher can share his or her own work with students and, thus, lead by example, according to Hedge. She argues that if students see a teacher being motivated to write, doing so naturally and enjoying it, they will be encouraged to do it themselves and to see it in a positive light. She also suggests that teachers can write to their students, for instance, stories and letters, and claims that teachers have plenty of opportunities to write their own answer for a task they have assigned. Her logic in saying this will help the teacher to understand what he or she is asking of the students is sound, but considering how large the teachers' workload is already, I would deem such a demand as slightly unreasonable. Harmer (2004: 124-135) suggests correspondence between the teacher and the students, saying it will improve their relationship, but he does acknowledge the workload of teachers. Students writing journals is also something Harmer recommends as it offers them opportunities of reflection, in addition to using the language and practicing writing.

In conclusion, there are numerous different reasons for writing, just as there are for language learning, therefore the teacher needs to consider the learner goals in designing how and why writing is used. It is also important to use various different kinds of writing in developing the writing ability, and most importantly, to allow students to write whole pieces of communication with a context and an audience; writing as, for instance, grammar practice has its uses, but it is not enough. In order to help learners become good writers, they should be offered opportunities to do a lot of writing and become more confident as writers through practice, supportive beliefs about the writing ability and effective feedback, which was discussed in chapter 2.2.4. Teachers can aid student writer's confidence by, for example, writing in class where the teacher can support the writers and where they can work together as well; collaborative writing and presenting student work were suggested as ways of motivating and helping students. Teachers can also motivate students by example, which applies, naturally, to motivation in general: teachers are encouraged to write themselves both to understand their demands and the writing process and as a model for the students and it was suggested that teacher-student correspondence through letters will improve their relationship. Unfortunately this thesis cannot elaborate further, even though the topic is both interesting and important; therefore I recommend Hyland (2003) and Kern (2000) for further reading.

## 4. THE PRESENT STUDY

### 4.1 Aims of this study

Second language and foreign language writing, motivation, teaching and even teacher satisfaction are all subjects widely studied. However, there seems to be little information about the everyday use of writing tasks in a Finnish language classroom from the teacher's perspective. Teacher training in Finland inspires teacher trainees to try a multitude of different, bold teaching methods and ideas, but gives them just a small taste of what the everyday life in the classroom is like. One could say that practicality receives less focus, and, for example, Leppänen (2011), Kaski (2009) and Mäenpää (2005) reported teachers feeling tired and perhaps even overwhelmed with their workload. It would benefit future teachers to hear the experiences of professionals already in the trade. What the present study aims to do is to explore how Finnish secondary and upper secondary school teachers report using writing tasks, what they think about them and how they feel writing tasks affect teacher motivation.

The research questions for the present study are:

- 1) What kind of experiences do English teachers have of using writing tasks?
- 2) In the teachers' perspective, how do they teach writing and what kind of writing tasks do they use?
- 3) How do teachers feel writing affects teacher motivation?

“Writing” and “writing task” in this study refer to a variety of texts of more than three sentences, whole pieces of written communication, usually with an audience and a purpose, like suggested by for example Hedge (2005) and Harmer (2004). The research questions aim to find out what experienced teachers think about this aspect of teaching and how they feel it affects their motivation. In Finland English is called a foreign language, although I argue that English could be considered a second language instead. There are features in teaching English that apply more to second language teaching, but there are still areas where the language is treated as a foreign language. Based on my experiences of Finnish education and teacher training, writing texts has been mostly about the correctness of language. There has been little emphasis on how to write good texts, how to capture a reader or how to write an effective argument. This study aims to see what current teachers think of this, what they do and why they do what they do.

Underlying hypotheses expect to find out that it is impossible to say anything general and conclusive about students, since they are all different. In addition, as suggested above, even though English writing focuses more on content than it did before, how to write good texts is still not explicitly taught. One supposes that teaching English in upper secondary school still focuses mostly on the matriculation examination, and through this students are coached on how to write a 250 word essay that will receive a good score. It is also expected that motivation plays a crucial role for both teachers and students when it comes to writing tasks: if a teacher is excited about writing, students are more likely to feel positively about it, and vice versa, if students are excited about writing, the teacher will be more motivated to assign and to assess the produced tasks.

## **4.2 Data collection and the participants**

As the aim of this study is to explore the opinions and experiences of individual English teachers, interview was a clear choice for the method of data collection. As Dufva (2011:131-132) points out, interview lets one focus on the voice, opinions and ideas of the interviewee, and the interview can develop like a conversation. Tuomi and Sarajärvi (2011: 72-74) also describe interview as being a flexible data gathering method as it allows the interviewer to repeat, clarify and correct any unclear issues and expand on interesting topics and ambiguous or unexpected answers. It was thus the best possible choice for this study, since the purpose is to hear from the teachers, to discuss their experience rather than collect quantitative, specific data on the subject.

The data was collected with qualitative, semi-structured, focused interviews. Ruusuvoori and Tiittula (2005:11-12), Dufva (2011:133) and Tuomi and Sarajärvi (2011: 74-75) describe a focused interview as having similar themes and subjects, but allowing the specific wording and order of questions to change, thus making it possible for the interview to develop like a conversation, as suggested above. The order of the questions remained similar through all interviews, but the wording, examples and expansion of questions varied from interview to interview, mostly according to the answers of the interviewee in question. Ruusuvoori and Tiittula (2005: 44-45) speak of the neutral interviewer; in this study the follow-up questions on the interviewees' cues may have brought up somewhat different aspects in different interviews although the overall structure remained the same for all interviews. The interview was successfully piloted in February 2016, and the pilot interview is part of the data, as the questions remained very much the same. One background question was added to replace an

existing one as only one teacher at each school needed to be asked about the size of the school. In addition, after the pilot interview, the interviewer explained the topic and purpose of the study and how “writing” and “writing task” were defined in this study before the actual interview was recorded.

The interview questions were divided under four themes or categories; the framework for the interviews can be found in the Appendices. The interviews began with three or two background questions in order to find out about the experience of the teachers and to make both interviewee and interviewer feel more comfortable. Then the interview continued to the experience of using writing tasks in teaching, which included questions about general experience, specific writing tasks used and how the teacher regarded writing as a skill. This section had 14 questions. It was followed by a six question section on assessing writing and giving feedback and a five question section on motivation and writing. The questions had a strong connection with the theoretical framework of this study: especially the questions about specific kinds of writing tasks, such as creative writing and student-teacher correspondence, and feedback, such as students correcting their own texts and the use of peer feedback, were directly inspired by the literature in this study. Each interviewee was asked if they had something they would like to add at the end of the interview.

The interviews were conducted in February and March 2016, and eight teachers in total were interviewed from two Finnish cities. The criterion for the selection of interviewees was experienced English teachers who taught either secondary or upper secondary school; the chosen teachers had 13 to 27 years of teaching experience. Four teachers were chosen from Central Finland and four from Southern Finland, from three different schools; four teachers taught both secondary and upper secondary school, two taught secondary school and two upper secondary school. The interviews were done in Finnish, since it was the native language of every participant and the interviewer and as such was considered to be the most natural means of expression. The interviews lasted from 25 minutes to 67 minutes, were recorded electronically and each interviewee was made aware of the topic and themes of the questions via e-mail before the interviews took place; the four latter interviewees were sent the questions beforehand to allow more time to consider their answers. Tuomi and Sarajärvi (2011: 72-74) recommend this, as it is beneficial for the interviewee to know what the interview will be about and what will be asked before the actual interview, since the goal is to gather as much information as possible. However, there was no noticeable difference between the answers of the teachers who had seen the questions prior to the interview and who did not

know the question beforehand.

The eight interviewed teachers are presented below. Each interviewee has been given a pseudonym for this study.

“**Paula**” has been a teacher for over 20 years, and she teaches English to secondary and upper secondary school in Central Finland.

“**Laura**” has 13 years of teaching experience, and she too teaches secondary and upper secondary school in Central Finland. She teaches also French in addition to English.

“**Lotta**” has 18 years of teaching experience, and like Paula and Laura, she teaches English to secondary and upper secondary school in Central Finland.

“**Tuija**” has been a teacher for 16 years, and she too teaches English to secondary and upper secondary school in Central Finland.

“**Olavi**” has 22 years of teaching experience, and he teaches secondary school in Southern Finland. He teaches Swedish as well as English.

“**Maria**” has 26 years of teaching experience, and she teaches upper secondary school in Southern Finland. She teaches also French in addition to English.

“**Kaija**” has been a teacher for 27 years, and she teaches English to upper secondary school in Southern Finland. She is a qualified German teacher as well, although teaches only English at the moment.

“**Jouni**” has 23 years of teaching experience, and he teaches secondary school in Southern Finland. He teaches Swedish as well as English.

### **4.3 Methods of analysis**

The collected data was transcribed before analysis. Each interview was recorded and carefully transcribed shortly after the interview was conducted. The transcription focuses on what was said rather than how it was said and as such does not specifically describe the way each interviewee spoke, as Ruusuvuori, Nikander and Hyvärinen (2010: 424-245) suggest. Most interviews were conducted in quiet, peaceful surroundings, but two had to be recorded in a relatively quiet school corridor; one of which turned out to be neither quiet nor peaceful midway in the interview. This did not bother the interviewee and the recording could be transcribed accurately excluding a few slightly ambiguous parts. It is possible that those few individual words have been misunderstood due to background noise.

The method of analysis is a qualitative, thematic content analysis, as described by Tuomi and

Sarajärvi (2011; 91-94) and Dufva (2011:139). First the transcribed data was carefully read on several occasions, and then it was categorized into preliminary, relevant themes. The themes were chosen based on the research questions: 1) experience and thoughts of writing, 2) writing tasks and feedback and 3) motivation and writing. This helps make the results more easily comprehensible to a reader than, for example, simply presenting what the interviewees replied to each question. The first and third sections of the interview questions relating to the use of writing were specifically observed for data relating to teacher experience. The second part and the section on feedback were observed for writing tasks and assessment, and the final section and an overall sense were observed for the theme of motivation and writing. Each theme was divided interiorly into subsections when necessary: such as writing and motivation into the influences on teacher motivation and the memorable experiences that have affected motivation. The final phase of analysis after reporting the data under relevant themes was interpreting the data to see connections between themes and to conclude what the experiences of these teachers say about writing. The quotes from the teachers are in Finnish because this allows them to retain their voice, which is the very purpose of this thesis; the English translations can be found in Appendix II.

## **5. ENGLISH TEACHERS' EXPERIENCE OF WRITING TASKS**

In this section I will present the findings of the eight interviews and discuss them. The findings have been divided under three sections based on the research questions: first, experience of using writing, second, writing tasks and feedback and third, writing and motivation. Each section has subsections: first I will discuss the interviewed teachers' general experience and thoughts of using writing, how important they consider writing and what kind of a factor time seems to be in using writing tasks. In the second section I will discuss what kinds of writing tasks the teachers previously assigned and generally like to use and what have been their best and worst experiences of writing tasks; if they use creative writing and student-teacher correspondence, and how they say they correct and give feedback on student texts; if they use minimal marking and have students correct their own texts and if they use process writing and peer feedback. In the third section I will discuss how the teachers have found writing to affect student motivation, how it affects their own motivation and what kind of factors are influential in the relationship between writing and their motivation; I will also present the most memorable experiences the teachers recalled of writing and that have affected their motivation. I have included a summary of the findings of this study at the end of this chapter.

## 5.1 EXPERIENCE OF USING WRITING

This chapter reports the teacher's thoughts and ideas about writing and their ways of using writing. Writing tasks will be presented in chapter 5.2. I will begin by exploring what the teachers replied to questions about the importance of writing and if they saw themselves teaching writing as a skill. Second, I will discuss their more general thoughts about writing and how they tend to use writing, how much time writing requires from the teacher and the teachers' experiences of plagiarism. I will finish this chapter by reporting how the interviewed teachers divide using writing in class and at home and if and how student texts are presented in some way.

### 5.1.1 Views on writing and the importance of the skill

An important aspect to understanding how and why the interviewed teachers use writing is knowing what they think about writing: how important is writing to them? Do they teach it as a skill? Do they feel that writing reveals a student's skill level? Their view on the importance of writing is surely an important factor in explaining what their experience of writing is. It is perhaps worrying that Olavi and Laura were concerned about how the writing skills of students have generally worsened over time, starting with their mechanical handwriting. They are not the only teachers who have found students' skills to have decreased; Kaija, for example, feels that student comprehension and their ability to analyse have weakened, but this will be discussed in more detail in chapter 5.2.3. Kern (2000) suggests there is a strong link between writing and reading: since nowadays students write so little by hand and, as would be suggested by the news and the media, read much less than before, it would perhaps explain the decrease in writing and reading skills. The possible decrease in writing and reading skills, which could explain also the decrease in general comprehension and the ability to analyse, is definitely an interesting area for further research. Olavi feels that writing is important as part of the language skill, but says that nowadays students find it hard to write even in Finnish; he does not know how much students are assigned writing anymore.

*(1) "Niin, kyl se niin, et tavallaan osana, osana, mut ettei niinkun sillä tavalla, että jotenkin musta niinkun tuntuu, että monille on hyvin vaikee niinkun suomenkielelläkään nykyään. Mä en sit tiedä kuinka paljon sit niin kuin aineita, oikeesti aineita nykyään kirjoitetaan, että niistä harvoin ainakaan puhutaan tuolla mutta. Mutta tietysti varmaan että sen tekstin tuottamisen kannalta ja lauseen muodostamisen oppimisen kannalta niin se on niinku yks niinkun tärke, tärke osa, yhtä tärke osa tässä kuin kaikki muutkin." - Olavi*

Another reason for the possible decrease of the writing skill could be the national emphasis on oral language skills. There is a divide in the interviewed teachers on whether this emphasis is still as strong as it has been. Olavi, Lotta and Maria emphasized that oral skills are the most important in language learning, although they did not think that valuing oral skills would exclude valuing writing. Lotta describes what I believe to be a very common feeling among teachers and something suggested in teacher training as well: using lessons in school for writing steals time from speaking and oral communication, and the teacher perhaps should feel guilty for doing this. Olavi implied that he perhaps personally is not the writing type, but he thinks it is important to allow the students heading for upper secondary school enough practice in writing. Paula, Laura, Jouni and Kaija agreed that writing is an important skill, although – of course - not the only important skill. Kaija describes writing as being very important, essential and connected with every part of the language skill. Maria too seems to be an avid believer in the importance of writing: she says it is an essential part of the language skill, similar to Kaija, but also points out that writing is a way to improve the language skill. Oral skill is about communication: she will not correct someone's speech, but writing allows her and the students to develop accuracy as well.

*(2) "Musta se on olennainen osa kielen taitamista, ja, ja se on tietysti semmonen asia, jossa pääsee myös puuttumaan oikeakielisyyteen ja siihen kielitaitoon, niinkun selkeimmin. Koska jos puhutaan, niin emmä ainakaan rupea korjaamaan toisten virheitä, koska silloin on huomio muussa asiassa. Mut aineessa voi sit vielä katsoa, että missä kohdassa on, on vaikeuksia ja hankaluuksia, mitä pitää vielä opiskella, eli semmosta kielen tarkkuutta on helppo siinä korjata ja ohjata oikeaan suuntaan. Mitä joka tapauksessa niinkun et, et siinä tuotetaan omia ajatuksia, sehän kertoo ihan hirveesti opiskelijan kielitaidosta, kuinka hyvää tekstiä tuotetaan." - Maria*

Tuija ponders the issue of the emphasis on oral skills, and suggests a happy medium in the areas of the language skill. She says the reason she has had such an emphasis on the oral skill in the past is, at least partly due the strong, national emphasis on it, but as she has grown older, she has found that it is okay to write as well. She describes a newly-awaken appreciation and a memory of the importance of writing. She also has some very interesting and inspiring thoughts on the usefulness of writing, such as the variety it brings to the pair and group work and the constant noise. She continues by saying how writing allows students to calm down and focus on themselves; these thoughts are discussed in more detail in the other chapters. Tuija thinks that writing should receive more emphasis, but so should everything. Paula too referred to the lack of time, which will be explored in the following chapter. I asked the teachers if there was another area of the language skill they felt deserved more attention: Tuija highlighted oral comprehension and Kaija pronunciation as skills that need more focus.

I asked the interviewees also if they felt that they taught writing as a skill. It is curious that quite a few of them sounded insecure in their answers. They said that they did not know how to do it well enough, that they needed more expertise to do it well or even considered that they did not do it. However, their descriptions of their teaching and the tasks they used very strongly suggested that they do indeed teach students how to write, about different text types and what a good text is like. Paula, for example, says she would like more expertise in teaching her students about writing different kinds of texts and what a good text is like: her studies never exclusively taught this and writing an 8000-word academic article is a very different skill set than writing the 300 word matriculation examination essay. Paula describes writing as an important skill and one that has perhaps been incompletely taught in foreign languages, which she too thinks have focused on language instead of content: she emphasizes the skill of thinking in addition to language. I think it is sad that she expresses hesitance about how much the skill of thinking is allowed to affect the evaluation of texts: it is sad that foreign language teaching has focused so strongly on language and not the actual skill of writing and thinking. Should it not be a basic requirement in a language as prominent as English that the content, the organization and the fluency of the writing are as important as the vocabulary and the grammatical correctness of the text? Hopefully, it is or it will be soon. Below is the extract where Paula describes her thoughts on this matter:

*(3) "On se tärkeä, ja siin on myös sitte se, että siinä näkee aika monenlaisia asioita. Et kylhän siinä näkee sit sitä sanastonkäyttämistä ja sitten sitä semmosta, niinku sitä kielitaitoo, mut sit siinä näkyy myös sellanen, mitä mä oon joskus miettiny, et kuin paljon se nyt sais sit vaikuttaa tai pitäiskö sen vaikuttaa enemmänkin, niin semmosta ajattelun taitoo. Et niinku tavallaan miten ne rakentaa sen tekstinsä, miten looginen se on, miten johdonmukanen se on, miten paljon siinä on asiaa. Et jos se on vaan semmosta niinku mun äidinkielenopettaja lukiossa aikoinaan sano, et pelkkää kynäpyöritystä paperilla, et vaikka se ois kuinka kielipillisesti oikein ja fiiniä sanoja, mut jos se on ihan silkkoo sisältä, ni mites sitten. Ja kielissähän niillä yleensä on päässy aika hyvin pisteisiin, kun jotenkin tuntuu, että sitä katotaan vaan niinku sitä kielen rikkautta, ei sitä ajattelua." - Paula*

Maria thinks that they – teachers – all try to demonstrate to students the chapters and characteristics of a good piece of writing, and how the text should progress instead of repeating the same thing over and over again; what kind of vocabulary to use and to avoid repeating a single word, expression or phrase. She suggests teachers, at least in the school where she teaches, aim to guide student writing in terms of content, vocabulary and language. Lotta speaks of the different text types and how they are included in some of the courses in upper secondary school: this, she says, helps her to remember to include teaching them. She says there is a kind of a fence between secondary and upper secondary school when it comes to writing: there is no explicit teaching of text types and registers in secondary school, as, she

laughs, it is just good if the students can produce some kind of text in English. When they move on to upper secondary school, she begins teaching writing in a different way. I think it could be useful for the National core curriculum to review their approach to writing in secondary school, as it could be beneficial to allow students to get some sense of, for example, different text types and registers before upper secondary school. Including teaching writing as a skill in the National core curriculum might help the teachers who do not do so already to teach writing more thoroughly and with more certainty in their decision to do so.

Tuija thinks it is important to bring structure to the way one writes because the skill does not transfer automatically from Finnish to English. The writing skill does not arrive automatically either: even though students write a lot, for example in the form of homework, writing longer texts has to be systematically practiced as well, she says. This is something discussed by, for example, Weigle (2002), Hyland (2003) and Kern (2000): in addition to the skills of writing, such as drafting and editing, not necessarily transferring between a native language and a foreign language, there are also cultural conventions in writing that are not automatically clear to students. The upper secondary school where Kaija teaches has a course specifically for writing. She expresses enjoying teaching it very much and describes how the course teaches writing:

*(4) "No, itse asiassa tähän me pystytään paremmin vasta siellä mediassa käymään läpi. Et siel me käydään eri, eri tekstityyppjä lävitse, miten kirjoitetaan. Mut ohan se tietysti ihan kolmoskursseissakin ne kirjoittaa sen muodollisen kirjeen ja muuta sellasta. Tähän vois vielä enemmän mun mielestä nois peruskursseillaki kiinnittää huomiota. Luojan kiitos meillä on koulussa tämmönen vielä, tämmönen mediakurssi, mis on käydään- siis sehän on kokonaan vaan kirjoittamista ja sit siinä niinku analysoidaan myöskin eri tekstityyppjä ja, ja just sitä, että miten hyvä teksti kirjoitetaan, et se ei oo mitään semmosta kehäpäätelyä, et pyöritään se saman asian ympärillä, vaan loogisesti jatketaan asiasta toiseen luontevasti. Eli tää on tärkeä taito, ja sitä pitäis opettaa enemmän. Mut kun noilla peruskursseilla on aina kiire. Aina." - Kaija*

I asked the interviewed teachers also if they feel that a text reveals a student's language level. There seems to be a consensus among them that a text is a very good way to view a student's level, but that writing does not correlate with speaking. Lotta, for example, brought up dyslexia as one factor in the relationship between writing and speaking, where an excellent language skill might not transfer through writing because of this. Jouni describes some students as just not being either motivated or skilled at writing; that even though their language skill might be excellent in other terms, for some reason they cannot produce text. However, seven of the interviewed teachers agree that a student text shows them a lot about the student's writing skills and language level. Laura describes it as revealing how versatile the student's language skill is, how idiomatic the structures they use are and how quickly that

student can produce a text, a fluent one or the opposite. Maria says that a student text reveals the skill level very clearly; sometimes she feels that even a very short text does so, such as her students answering a few questions she has asked. Tuija, on the other hand, thinks that a text reveals something about a student's language skill, but that student's writing skill might present differently in different writing contexts, such as a carefully planned essay versus spontaneous language production:

*(5) "Se kertoo jotain kirjottamisen taitotasosta, mutta ei tokikaan kerro kaikista, kaikista taidoista lähellekään kaikkee. Et se kertoo jotain kirjottamisesta, ja sit tietysti riippuu, et minkälainen se kirjutustyö on, että itekin huomaa, et sit joku semmonen, joka on vaikka että arvioidaan joku essee, niin se saattaa olla hyvin, hyvin ansiokas ja tarkkaan mietitty ja selkeesti näkee, et sitä on todella niinku hiottu. Ja sitte taas semmonen kun näkee saman opiskelijan tekemän esimerkiks semmosen vapaamman kirjutushomman, niin, niin ymmärtää sen, että miten hirveän niinku suuri tavallaan sit se on ero siinä, kun ei käytetä välttämättä sitä sanakirjaa, ei tarkisteta kaikkee, vaan ihan tuotetaan sitä kieltä." - Tuija*

In conclusion, all the interviewed teachers seem to agree that writing is an important part of the language skill, with varying degrees of emphasis. The belief that oral language skills are so important that using lessons for writing would be a waste seems to still be present among teachers, but this belief is not as strong as I thought it might have been: the interviewed teachers use writing and most consider it at least almost as important a skill as speaking. Most of the teachers, I think, teach writing as a skill and do it well, but they lack faith in this, which could be due to a lack of instruction, support and education. Teachers are not taught how to teach writing as a skill and there is little that suggests that they should do this or instructs them how to do it. A majority of seven out of eight interviewees agree that a text shows them quite a lot of the student's language skill. What did not come up, most likely due to the phrasing of the interview questions and the tempo of the interview, is the importance of writing outside of school: in further studies and in working and personal life.

### **5.1.2 Teaching philosophies about writing**

In this chapter I will continue the discussion about the interviewed teachers' thoughts and teaching philosophies about writing. I began the interviews by asking them if there was something they would like to say about writing in general or how they tended to use writing. In addition to exploring their answers to this question I will discuss time as a factor in writing and the teacher's experience of plagiarism, which is something one has to consider when assigning writing.

Every one of the interviewed teachers uses writing tasks and, as concluded in the previous chapter, considers writing to be an important part of the language skill. The kind of writing done depends on the aims of the course, and all the teachers include writing as a part of their teaching in various ways. I would summarize, however, that it seems that in secondary school teachers tend to begin with shorter, informal, communicative texts and writing about oneself, and then gradually move towards more structured essays. This is in line with how writing is described in the National core curriculum for basic education (2014). The interviewees implied on several occasions, more or less seriously, that in secondary school the emphasis is not on writing and the teachers are quite satisfied if their students produce any text at all. Lotta, for example, describes quite of a leap between secondary and upper secondary school in the way she uses and teaches writing: students in upper secondary school write more and learn about writing in a different manner. For example, different text types, registers and different kinds of writing receive more attention in upper secondary school. This is exactly the difference in writing present in the National core curriculums for basic education (2014) and upper secondary school (2015). The teachers suggest that the first courses are a transition period from secondary to upper secondary school, similarly to starting soft on the seventh grade; Maria says she does not give a word limit on the first two courses, but simply tells her students what will be expected in the matriculation examination essay. Producing this particular essay is polished through the three years of upper secondary school.

The way Jouni employs writing in his teaching demonstrates well the summary presented above. He says he tends to begin writing with his seventh grade students through writing exercises in their books; there are exercises that are connected to the theme of the chapter, for example describing one's dream house, one's house in 50 years or one's family's home. They begin with small writing tasks, where the instructions vary from less than a hundred words to some students writing texts the length of the matriculation examination essay already in the seventh grade. Writing is included in exams as well, first as bonus tasks and gradually receiving more emphasis until the ninth grade. On the ninth grade Jouni teaches his students explicitly about writing essays: the length, the structure and careful planning. He allows his students to plan their essays in advance and bring in their planned structure, for example. His teaching method has been quite successful, as is demonstrated in chapter 5.3, and as such I think could be considered in secondary schools, as it would prepare the students better for upper secondary school and further studies.

(6) “(...) pääsääntöisesti mä semmosen oikein kunnan, kunnan aineen mä kirjoitan niillä ysillä, si-sillä lailla, että mä käyn läpi niinkun ainekirjotuksen perusteita niin laajasti kun mä nyt pystyn. Ja mä kehtaan

*tässä tunnustaa, että mä käytän kyllä hyvin pitkälti pohjana si-sitä, mitä mä ite muistan lukioajoilta, että mä käyn- siitä kirjotelman pituudesta me puhutaan ja, ja aineen rakenteesta ja, ja tota ne saa tehdä sen kirjotelmansa siten, että ne, itse asiassa niiden pitääkin valmistautuu siihen jonkun verran etukäteen. Et kun se on se eka kerta, ni mä annan niiden tota, mä annan niiden tulla sinne ainekirjotustilaisuuteen valmiin rungon kanssa, esimerkiks. Jos ne on nähneet vaivaa ja haluavat miettiä sitä aineen rakennetta jo kotona valmiiksi, niin se on minusta niinku ookoo siinä tilanteessa. Sitten ne tulevat vaan sinne ainekirjotustunnille ja kirjottavat sen kirjotelmansa ja minä sen sitten korjaan ja arvioin, numerona, numeroilla 4-10." – Jouni*

Laura describes her relatively fresh philosophy about the importance of the student's involvement in writing. She wants to allow her students room to put something of themselves in the task, to make choices or be creative. She has tried to consider her writing tasks from this perspective during the past winter because she found that the traditional course writing assignment leaves rather little room for real student input: he or she writes the text and the teacher grades it. She adds that not all students even read her feedback on these texts. So she thinks that she would like to include more writing tasks where the students are active participants in the production and the design of the task, in upper secondary school as well, and possibly through this have more versatile evaluation. I think this is an important thought to consider when assigning writing: students are likely to be more motivated when they have a real chance to express themselves and I claim that they will be more interested in their feedback as well when the task is something that they have been involved in.

*(7) "Nyt viimeaikoina mä oon alkanu miettiin enempi vielä sitä, että miten sais sen elementin mukaan, että oppilaat oikeasti valitsisivat siinä tehtävän yhteydessä jotain asioita, joita he tekevät. Et he itse niinku osallistuvat sen tehtävän luomiseen. Mun mielestä se olis aika mielekästä sen sijaan, että mä määrittelen ihan kaiken. Et se on aika hankalaakin silleen, jos miettii, että mä haluaisin arvioida tiettyjä asioita, et mun pitää tarjota se tietty rakenne siihen tai se tietty, et mitä heidän pitää tehdä, mutta että mä tarjoaisin heille mahdollisuuden valita siihen, miten he sen tekee tai millaisia elementtejä he käyttää, minkälaisen tarinan he luo siihen, siihen tehtävään." – Laura*

Writing is the most time-consuming part of a teacher's job outside of the course, Tuija says. Every interviewed teacher says that writing is extremely time-consuming; reading, reviewing, correcting and giving feedback on student texts takes hours and hours of teacher time, and there is rarely time to do this during school hours. The literature presented in this thesis says very little about this aspect of writing; Hedge (2005) acknowledges that writing is very time-consuming, but the brutal reality does not come across. Considering how significant a factor time is in using writing, I argue that there is a serious fault in the literature graduating teachers read. Since teachers can rarely work on student writing during school hours, it means that all those hours one writing assignment requires have to be taken from time outside of work. In addition, as Tuija points out, reading and evaluating the assignment should be done in a rather continuous time period, for example, over a weekend, for the sake of the reliability of the evaluation. Reading an essay here and there over a period of two weeks in various

circumstances and states of mind could mean compromising reliability. I am not surprised by the fact that writing is time-consuming, but I was not expecting it to take so much teacher time – no wonder considering how the literature gives one little warning. It is perfectly justified that teachers consider how many writing assignments they can assign, and how many of those can be evaluated and how many are writing practice, such as journals or informal discussion in a virtual learning environment. Even teachers who truly enjoy reading student texts, such as Maria, and think writing is an important skill, have to consider time as a factor. Teachers have an extremely stressful and demanding job, as, for example, Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) clearly state, thus, they absolutely need free time to balance the demands of their work. Paula's response to the question of how much time writing demands is presented below; her views on the importance of feedback are explored in chapter 5.2.5.

*(8) “Paljon. Isoilla kirjaimilla. Paljon. Kyl se vie aikaa. Ja sit varsinkin, jos sen yrittää tehdä sillain niinku, niinku mä nyt oon noitten ENA-ysiläisten kanssa yrittäny tehdä sillain, et ne saisi niinku mahdollisimman semmosta ohja- niinku eteenpäinohjaavaa palautetta myös. Et mä oon lukenu ne tekstit varmaan ainakin kolmeen kertaan ja, ja miettiny niitä korjauksia ja miettiny et, miten mä sanosin tän toisin ja sillain. Niin kyllä niihin menee aikaa. (...)” – Paula*

Since writing did not take enough time as it was, nowadays student writing is increasingly electronic and teachers are expected to read, correct and give feedback on these texts electronically, as well. I assume this decision has thoroughly considered reasons, such as the environment and the matriculation examination becoming electronic, hence the need to practice. It does make life much easier for students; there is no more fumbling with papers and printers that malfunction exactly when one needs them the most. However, I seriously wonder if anybody has considered the teacher in this transformation. Maria, Tuija and Kaija all report that working on student texts electronically takes several times longer than doing it manually, and Tuija has an unfortunate experience of a software glitch that made all of her work futile. It would seem these programs have not been designed thinking of the teacher who has to try and correct student texts with them. Where speed is essence, these programs seem to be slow and clumsy. The teachers, nonetheless, seem to have an optimistic attitude saying that it will get easier once they get used to it, and they have found ways to make the process somewhat faster already, but not enough. I think it is important to develop this direction of electronic environments and tasks further and consider the teacher while doing so. Writing is an important skill, especially for life after and outside of school, and it should not be made unreasonably difficult for the teachers.

Plagiarism is a possibility teachers have to consider when assigning writing, and I wanted to know especially how the interviewed teachers recognized a plagiarized text. It would seem all teachers have had experience with plagiarism, and a general consensus is that when the teacher knows the student's level, it is easy to recognize when the text presented is not their own: usually the language used or the style of the writing is very different. Laura and Olavi point out that the personal tasks they assign rarely allow students to copy something straight off the internet. Kaija recalls an instance where she asked a student she suspected of plagiarism to translate the brilliantly written text she had handed in, and even though the text was in front of the student, she could not say in Finnish what it was she had written. Kaija's and Maria's school has a program where the students return their written work, and the program checks the texts automatically for plagiarism; I think all schools should consider employing this, as it would teach students to avoid plagiarizing from early on and at the same time save teachers from doing pointless work or having to ponder if this brilliantly written piece of text is really by the student. Naturally, students can produce text that is untrue to their level through other means than plagiarism as well, but this is discussed in the following chapter.

Laura has an experience of plagiarism, which is perhaps a good reminder that plagiarism is not always the result of a student trying to avoid doing the work himself or herself, but can be a sign of student anxiety and stress. Her class had been studying the structure of a piece of news, and she asked her students to write one of their own, invent one, and she thought that the students would enjoy the task. However, the students had found the task to be very hard, and several had copied theirs straight off the internet, changing just a few words here and there. So she talked with these students and found out that they were very stressed about their studies, under immense pressure all the time; they had found the task very difficult. The incident made Laura think and decide that they could more in school: if the students had so much to do at home and were so stressed, they could do their projects in class instead. This leads us to the following chapter, which discusses the teachers' choices of dividing writing between home and the classroom.

*(9) "Mut siinä, siinä oli plagiointia ihan selkeesti. Ja ne oli yrittäny vähän muokata sitä jotkut sitä tekstiä - muutama teki, ei kaikki - ni vähän muokata sitä, et niinku oli jotain sanoja vaihdettu, mutta et tunnisti heti, et ei, tää ei oo omaa tekstiä. Ni se, siinä mä mietin sitä just, et mites tää tälleen meni. Sit mä aattelin, et ehkä parempi, ehkä jos niil on kauheesti, ja on kauheesti töitä niin, ehkä siirtäski enempi kouluun sitä työskentelyä. Et miks sen tarttee olla välttämättä kotityö, et kotonahan ne voi tehdä mieluummin vaikka niitä kirjan tehtäviä, niin tehtäskin se projekti tunnilla." - Laura*

### 5.1.3 Writing in class and writing at home

This chapter reports how the interviewed teachers divide writing between class and home. Interestingly enough, when asked about the divide of writing in class versus writing at home, both Paula and Tuija used the expression “fifty-sixty”. All interviewed teachers have their students write both in class and at home. As a rough summary based on their answers I could say that exam essays and other texts that are emphasized in the evaluation are written in school. Other kinds of writing, especially texts written on the culture course, more informal writing tasks or exercises that are not emphasized in the evaluation of the course are written at home. However, if there is time, most teachers like to at least begin writing the latter category in class as well. What is interesting about this divide are the reasons behind the decisions of the teachers. Below is a quote from Paula that demonstrates well my suggested summary above:

*(10) “Pitäskö vastata tälleen Matti Nykäsesti, että fifty-sixty tai sixty-fifty. Kyl mä yritän siihen, että jos, jos sillä kurssilla ei kirjojeta kun esimerkiks yks yo-ainetta vastaava aine, ni et se kirjojetaan koulussa. Et siihen tulee tavallaan se semmonen ajallinen tietty, tietty ajalliset raamit ja myös sitten niinku se, että nyt kirjojetaan tää ilman mitään apuneuvoja. Mutta sit esimerkiksi ne kulttuurikurssin tuotokset, niin ne on kyl kirjojettu kaikki kotona. Mut ne ei sitten saanu mitään muita läksyjä eikä muita sillain, ja niillä oli pitkästi aikaa ja ne ties, että nää on nyt tän kurssin niinku se suoritus. Niin et taas jälleen kerran, et se riippuu ihan siitä mitä tavoitetta varten kirjojetaan, minkälaista tekstityyppiä, mihin sillä pyritään, ni siitä ja vähän ajastakin, joskus. Joskus ei vaan, et jos kurssilla on 24 tuntii, siellä ei kauheen montaa ainetta pysty luokassa kirjottamaan.” – Paula*

There seem to be two main reasons for writing in school: helping the students to write and controlling the circumstances of the writing. Hedge (2005) emphasizes the teacher's role in writing in class, as being supporting and motivating and the one who can assist every student to get started. The literature in this thesis did not focus on the other reason that was described very clearly by the teachers: writing in class so that the teacher can have a real sense of the student's writing skill. Paula, Laura, Lotta, Olavi and Kaija point out that in class, the teacher can receive a text that is true to the student's skill level, whereas at home even a student whose language skill is at a lower level, can produce a brilliant essay using all the possible tools available, such as dictionaries, Google Translator, a sibling with more language proficiency or even plagiarism, which was discussed in the previous chapter. This is, obviously, not beneficial for evaluation. Laura gives an example of such a situation where a student surprises the teacher with a text that is not true to their actual level. She says this can obscure evaluation, and characterizes it as being futile work for both the student and the teacher. Writing in class, thus, allows the teacher to control how the writing is produced and how much help is had during the process, and this ensures truthful evaluation.

The other main reason for writing in class is supporting the students' writing. Naturally, writing in class is also a way to get students accustomed to writing with a time-limit and to give them experience of settings that they will face in, for example, examination. Jouni, Olavi, Kaija, Tuija and Laura brought up the opportunity to help students write when the writing is done in class, as was proposed by Hedge (2005). Laura says writing in class gives the students support from the group and the teacher and prevents the task from becoming an extra cause for distress; Laura has had an experience where she rather suddenly understood how stressed her students were about their school work, and now seems to aim to consider the workload of her students in her teaching. Olavi and Tuija have spoken of helping the students to write, and Tuija, Kaija and Jouni say starting writing in school allows them to at least make sure that everybody gets started; Tuija adds that she can also see what kind of difficulties her students are having and they have the opportunity to ask questions, so no one's progress is stuck because of not knowing what they should do. In secondary school, the 45 minute lesson is also not enough time for everyone to complete the task, and apparently quite a few students ask to finish it at home. In addition to the previous reasons, Jouni says that his students remember their writing tasks and can continue them better if they have started them in school:

*(11) "Tekevät sekä että, mutta yleensä oppitunnista en käytä hirveen paljon aikaa, varsinkaan jos ne on jotain tämmösiä oppikirjateemoja, kappaleisiin liittyviä tehtäviä. Me yleensä, mä huolehdin sen, että me alotetaan tunnilla, että jokainen pääsee kunnolla alkuun ja mä pyrin, pyrin kans katsoon, että ne, niillä on siel jotain, koska muuten ne unohtaa ne tai sitten niille jotenkin, jos ei se lähde ollenkaan se runosuoni sykkimään, niin se voi olla, et se jää kotona sit tekemättä. Mut sit niiden on helpompi muistaa se, että semmonen tehtävä tuli ja, ja että sitä jatkaa, jos on tunnilla sitä alottanu, mutta aikaahan siihen menee koulussa kovastikin, jos niitä täällä kirjottaa." – Jouni*

Tuija also speaks for some very interesting reasons for writing in school; these are referred to in other chapters as well. I think she is absolutely right and her thoughts are something to consider. She says that writing is excellent variety for many students; as nowadays there is so much pair and group work, writing allows the students to have a moment of quiet, to work alone and to focus on themselves:

*(12) "Koska mä oon huomannu, että monille se on hirveen hyvää vaihtelua. Täällä on aika paljon semmosta, nykyään varsinkin, niin suositaan aika paljon pari- ja ryhmätyöskentelyä. Toisaalta ne tykkää siitä, mut toisaalta monet on sit sellasia, et ne tykkää myöskin yksilötyöskentelystä. Jotenki se jotenkin se rauhoittaa sitä niinku päivää, kun saa keskittyä vaan siihen omaan, et kaikki ei oo sit- Ja sit se ääni myöskin, et ei oo se niinku tavallaan semmonen puheensorina koko ajan siellä, et tota. (...)" - Tuija*

The two main reasons for assigning writing tasks to be done at home, I would claim, are the lack of time in school and the abundance of time at home. Writing is extremely time-

consuming, both the physical act of writing and the process in general, as it includes planning and revising, and as reported in this thesis, teachers do not have time. It seems they have barely enough time to cover what they have to, and some seem to feel they never have enough time to do even that as well as they would like. All teachers have implied that time is a major factor in their teaching, and when asked about writing in school and at home, Tuija, Jouni, Maria and Paula refer specifically to the lack of time as a reason: Paula, for example, points out that if an upper secondary school course has only 24 lessons, there is not a lot of time for writing. Maria points out that she thinks the time available in school is better spent speaking, that is practicing skills one cannot do alone at home.

The other reason is the abundance of time – and resources – at home. It is not purposeful to do all writing tasks in school because of the strict time limit it sets: I think it just as useful to allow students to write in their own pace, to plan and ponder thoroughly, write as many drafts as they want and revise and edit without looking at the clock. I believe this is something Maria refers to when she says she thinks it is better to write at home. Hedge (2005) recommends writing at home as well. At home students usually have peace, quiet and privacy in addition to the possibility to write in their own pace. They also have the possibility to use dictionaries, books, music and other tools for help, which although perhaps problematic for the evaluation of the students' language skill, can be very useful for some tasks, such as writing cover letters and resumes, as Lotta suggests, where one needs specific phrases and structure.

Thus, the divide the teachers have made seems to be very sensible: they begin writing in school, so that the teacher can make sure everybody is able to accomplish the task and they write in school so that the students get experience of writing with a time-limit and so that the writing reflects the true level of the students for purposes of evaluation. Writing at home saves time in school for the other areas of language and allows the students to write without time-limits and in situations and settings best suited for their learning styles. Hence, it is logical to assign the less informal writing tasks, ones that require students to think, plan and become inspired and ones that practice writing skills without specific emphasis on grading to be done at home, as suggested by Hedge (2005). Below is the quote from Maria where she explains her thoughts on dividing writing between school and home:

*(13) "Kirjottaminen kyl tehään aika suurelta osin kotona. Meil koulussa tehään koeaineet ja semmoset ja alotellaan ehkä kirjojusta, mutta mä luulen, että se kotiympäristö voi olla parempi kun luokassa kirjottaminen. Abikursseilla kirjojetaan kyllä aineita luokassakin, semmoset missä niinkun nimenomaan*

*sitä ainekirjotusta harjoitellaan. Ja sit varmasti näillä media- ja tai mediakursseilla nimenomaan kirjoitetaan paljon koulussa. Mutta muilla kursseilla niin, niin joo, ehkä jotain lyhyempiä kirjoitelmia kirjoitetaan koulussa, mutta mun mielestä koulutunnit käytetään enemmänkin suulliseen esitykseen ja puhumiseen siis.” - Maria*

#### 5.1.4 The presentation of student texts

Harmer (2004) suggests that students present their written work to others, perhaps in order to motivate them and give them a sense of achievement and a real audience. I asked the interviewed teachers if they had their students present their work and how the students liked it. A few of them, including Tuija and Maria, used virtual learning environments for having their students write to the whole group through smaller, more informal tasks: such as introducing oneself in English to the group, which is what Tuija's students do, or commenting on films or books on the group's discussion board, which is what Maria's students do. All of the interviewees seem to have student texts or drafts read in pairs or small groups, and this is a means to do peer feedback on each other's texts as well. Laura says that sometimes she reads aloud student texts – with permission, of course – and Kaija ponders that perhaps they could read student texts in front of the class instead of just plays or other extracts. Jouni uses the document camera to present student texts, and he feels his students accept this medium, sometimes so well that even the whole class is eager to come and show their work. His students behave very well towards each other's work. Lotta too has found technology to aid sharing student texts, mentioning possibilities like Edmodo, Showbie and Dropbox for doing this. Olavi describes a variety of ways to have his students show their work to others:

*(14) “Joo, eli jos on näitä näitä tämmösiä niinku puhuin, et on tehty näitä tämmösiä julistetyyppisiä mainoksia ja tota tämmösiä esittelyjulisteita ja näin pois päin, niin niitä on sitten tuolla yleensä aina laitetaan esille tonne taululle. Ja sit on, jos on tämmönen lyhyt, lyhyt kirjoitustehtävä, niin aika usein sitte tota me sitten luetaan niitä pienessä ryhmässä toisille, pareittain tai pienessä ryhmässä että joskus saattaa olla, että niitä ei niinku sitten tarkemmin käydä läpikään eli mä en niinku tarkasta niitä tai korjaa vaan et se on se viestin, viestin tuottaminen, tekstin tuottaminen on niinku se tärkeempi siinä hommassa.” - Olavi*

There is a variety of student texts that are often presented on the classroom walls. Poems and other creative texts are something that Kaija, Maria and Lotta like to have presented, either read or put up on classroom or school walls. Kaija and Maria's school also has an annual publication that publishes the best of student texts, often especially poems. Kaija's classroom also has a “Newsroom” wall, where one of her school-specific courses writes pieces of news in English, and Olavi and Jouni mention their students doing advertisements that can be presented. Presentation through posters and projects seem to be a common, accepted medium of sharing student work. Quite often projects are presented orally and then they are discussed

in groups or the written versions are presented on the walls of the classroom – or on the school walls, as in Tuija's case. She describes her students sometimes presenting their projects on the school walls as a gallery, and she makes an effective task of this by requiring students to answer questions about the work they are seeing:

*(15) “(...) Yks [posterin] purkumuoto ja välttämättä niitä ei aina esitellä suullisesti, vaan yks purkukeino tietyksi on semmonen, mitä mä oon käyttäny paljon, tällönen niinkun näyttelytyyppinen, et laitetaan seinille niitä, vaikka käytäville. Ja sitten niihin saattaa olla liitetty myöskin kysymyksiä, jotta tavallaan mä pystyn varmistamaan, että on oikeesti tapahtunu jotain aivotoimintaa siellä, kun kierrellään käytävillä niin, niin tota, ne projektitöiden kirjottajat on myöskin sitten kirjottanu jotain kysymyksiä siitä sisällöstä. Sitten niinku niitä luetaan ja vastataan kysymyksiin ja tavallaan sitä kautta tutustutaan niihin toisten, toisten töihin, ja nimenomaan sisällön näkökulmasta, et mä aattelen, et se on kuitenkin opettajan työ ensisijaisesti sitä kieltä pohtia, että opettaja on kielen ammattilainen ja oppilaat sitten antaa muun kielistä palautetta toisilleen.” - Tuija*

Four out of eight of the interviewed teachers have implied that their students do not enjoy sharing their work with others nor do they enjoy peer feedback, perhaps for the same reason of having to show their texts to others; peer feedback is discussed in more detail in chapter 5.2.5.2. Paula, Maria, Kaija and Laura have said that they feel that their students do not want to show their work to others, which is an interesting contrast to Harmer's (2004) suggestion and Jouni's experience of having even an entire class eager to present their texts in front of the whole group. Lotta has also described her students' anxiety in relation to other students seeing their work, or the possible mistakes they have made, in particular. Kaija has tried to have her students comment each other's work in their virtual learning environment, but the students have not been excited by it, and sometimes Maria has her students study and comment each other's work, but she feels they do not want to do it. Paula too says that not nearly everyone is into reading each other's work, but then again she has found some students to do this spontaneously, for example, a pair of girls exchanging essays voluntarily.

It is unclear whether this reluctance stems from indifference towards each other's work or the desire to avoid doing extra work or if it is about students feeling insecure and anxious about, perhaps, the quality of their work. I think the latter, and Laura seems to support this opinion: she describes her students as being timid to show their work and becoming anxious, some even panicked, about the thought of others seeing their texts. Curiously, even though Harmer (2004) suggests that students would be motivated by the presentation of their work, Finnish students seem to be horrified of it. Laura and I wondered during the interview if some of the literature's suggestions about writing would suit American students better, as Laura supposes they might generally be more extroverted. It is definitely an interesting question for further research why Finnish students are so unwilling and anxious about showing others what they

have done. This discussion is continued in chapter 5.2.5. Below is the quote from Laura where she discusses her students' response to presenting their work:

*(16) "Ne on aika arkoja laittaa mihinkään esille. (...) Mut siinä täytyy miettiä, et miten sen tekee, et jos siel on oppilaita, jotka on hirmu arkoja, jotka ei oikeen niinku, ihan paniikissa pelkäävät sitä, että se tuotos näytetään jollekin. Ethän sä vaan, niinku, lue sitä ääneen tai ethän sä, et eihän tätä lue kukaan. Ja lukiolaisissa sama, kun ne palauttaa showbiehin, niin aika monet, että eihän nää näy sitten muille. S-se niinkun tavallaan se näkymä. Juu, ei näy. (naurua) (...) Et oisko amerikkalaiset vähän ulospäinsuuntuneempia. Et en tiä, se on vähän vaikee siihen niinku muutosta silleen äkkiseltään saaha aikaseks enkä mä tiä tarviikokaan. Et kenenkään ei tarvi miettii, että tää nyt oli surkee ja toi on ihan hyvä, ja se on ihan liikaa semmosta. Mutta et toisaalta tehään silleen, kun tuntuu hyvältä. Mun mielestä se on parempi." - Laura*

## 5.2 WRITING TASKS AND FEEDBACK

The interviewed teachers were asked about the different types of writing tasks they use, their best and worst experiences with writing tasks and what kinds of feedback they use: how they correct student texts, if they have students correct their own texts, if they use process writing or peer feedback. This chapter discusses these themes and the teachers' thoughts and experiences of them.

### 5.2.1 Writing tasks

This chapter will discuss the different kinds of writing tasks the interviewed teachers report they tend to use. The most important factor in choosing writing tasks would seem to be the aim of the course and what kind of a "multiliteracy" the course tries to develop. Paula illustrates this point well. On the culture course or course 5 of upper secondary school she usually assigns tasks for students to learn about culture individually; they are allowed to choose the kinds of tasks that suit them best, such as film reviews, poems, a biography for a musician or a presentation on something that relates to culture, for example a certain style, a pop star or, say, skateboarding. The culture course has a very wide selection of possible writing tasks. Paula continues to say that on course 3, which focuses on studying and work, students usually write a resume and a cover letter, and on courses 1 and 2, the first courses of upper secondary school, students usually write shorter, communicative pieces, such as an e-mail to a restaurant, to either praise or criticize the place.

All the interviewed teachers use essays or compositions and writing assignments in exams or as evaluated tasks. As was discussed in, for example, chapter 5.1, writing is considered to be

an excellent way to be able to see a student's writing skill and at least part of a language skill level as well. The previous writing task Paula assigned was a practice matriculation examination essay on a course that prepares students for the matriculation examination. Tuija describes her students writing these essays as well and practicing the length of these essays because the matriculation examination tends to be so important for upper secondary school students. Lotta illustrates how she tends to use writing assignments in her course exams. The previous one offered a couple of options relating to the course's themes, such as media: how do the students use media and how does their way of using it differ from their parents'. She prefers to have a writing assignment in the course exam because she does not want to test merely the students' capacity to memorize, but to also produce the language.

*(17) "No aika usein mä, niinku mä sanoin, niin mä teetän niinku kurssikokeen yhteydessä pienen kirjoitelman, koska perustelen sitä sillä, että, että tota, eähm, pitäis niinku jatkuvasti testata oppilaitten semmosta omaa tuottamistaitoo. Niin ollen, kun mä pidän ison kokeen, jossa on sanastoo ja kielioppia, niin mä en haluu, että se on pelkästään sellanen, että ulkoo opetellaan jotain juttuja ja niitä testataan, vaan että aina niinku isossa kokeessa on pieni joku semmonen kirjoitustehtävä. Niin, niin tota ihan eniten mä käytän niitä, että, että mulla on siinä just semmonen joku, se voi olla otsikko vaan, keksi siitä ja kirjota tai sitten että, että kuvaile näitä tapahtumia tai kerro mielipiteitäsi tähän asiaan. Ja sitten on muutama semmonen niinku vinkki tai apukysymys esimerkiks siellä, että voit kuvailla esimerkiks näitä asioita, mutta yleensä niin, että ne liittyy just niihin niinku kurssin asiasisältöihin, että sitten ois vähän niinku tukee siitä sanastosta, mitä on luku, just kirjan kappaleista, tai mitä on harjoitettu sanakokeisiin tai sitä koetta varten. Et harvemmin teetän semmosta ihan vapaita kirjoitelmia, niinku sem-semmosta luovaa tarinankerrontaa ihan mistä tahansa aiheesta koko ryhmällä." – Lotta*

Vocabulary tests have become an opportunity for innovative, imaginative and fun writing tasks. Laura and Tuija describe examples of such tests. Laura asked her students in upper secondary school to study the verbs of a new vocabulary and then use ten of them in a blog text or a diary extract of a day at a sport training camp. She evaluated the use of the chosen verbs: had the students understood the words and could they use them fluently in sentences. The students were allowed to build the story of the task: what happened on that day, what sport was it and decide what kind of a text they wanted to write. Laura felt the task was a success, and that her students produced very good texts, which showed very clearly who could actually use the new vocabulary both correctly and fluently. However, she feels the course had to be taught in a hurry, and that perhaps she did not have enough time to revise the vocabulary, so that perhaps the students who knew how to use the verbs knew that before the course as well; for example a student using the verb award in the meaning of the verb admit, as they had the same Finnish translation in the vocabulary, would have needed more practice.

Tuija has used "sound scripts" as vocabulary tests, a kind of open book exam, where students learn the new vocabulary and are allowed to have their books while they write down a script

that they will then record orally. The written script is not evaluated, but the task would be quite impossible to do without it. Laura has assigned her secondary school students a more unusual vocabulary test as well. Her students had to choose a photograph, invent a future for the person in it and write his or her story using a specified vocabulary:

*(18) “(...) Jos mä vielä toisen esimerkin kerron, yläkoulussa niin tota mulla oli semmonen viimeks, että mä annoin niille, niillä oli tää työelämä aiheena, työhaastatteluja tehdään tällä hetkellä, niin mä tulostin semmosia kaikkia kuvia kaikista lapsista ja nuorista ja teini-ikäisistä, ja sitten he sai ensin valita vaan sieltä mieleisensä kuvan. Ja sitten siihen kuvan ympärille heiän piti kappaleen sanastoa hyödyntäen kirjottaa semmonen, ää semmonen, semmonen et luotiin tulevaisuus sille hahmolle, ja ne sai kirjottaa siitä hahmosta ja keksiä sille. Ja sit siinäkin oli, et pitää käyttää tiettyä sanastoa. Et se oli se sanastotesti. Et tää on nyt ihan selkeesti mulla tää sanastotestijuttu.” – Laura*

In general, there is a very wide and a very fun variety of different kinds of writing tasks used. As illustrated in this chapter, writing can fulfill very versatile functions, everything from testing to informal communication and even freewriting. Laura, who enjoys using writing tasks as innovative vocabulary tests, also uses writing for quick tasks to practice what has been learnt, such as a new language structure. She says such tasks can be easily used as tests as well. Lotta describes the previous task she assigned as a fictional travel story about India. Her students had been getting to know India through listening, reading and watching a video about the country, and then they had to write a fictional description of their journey. She also says she uses writing tasks as fun way of differentiation for quicker or skilled students: she can ask these students to write stories by, for example, throwing them a few words. Maria presents an impressive, imaginative variety of tasks she has assigned recently, such as a text of differing opinions, with a bit of a twist, a task about the image of the American school presented through television, and she introduced an artist to her students:

*(19) “Mä tänään annoin tehtäväksi, ne ei oo nyt vielä kirjottaneet sitä, mutta tämmösen Doctor Jekyll and Mr Hyde, eli kirjasta tehtävän, tota, eriävät mielipiteet, plusmiinus, pros and cons, jostaki asiasta. Ja edellinen oli varmaankin samalle ryhmälle tämmönen pieni kirjutustehtävä amerikkalaisesta koulusta, minkälainen kuva siitä välittyi telkkarin välityksellä, minkälainen on amerikkalainen koulu. (...) mitä kirjutetaan niin, niin tota hyvin monenlaista tekstiä ja yks mistä mä oon tykänny paljon on se, et me ollaan kuunneltu, et meil ei oo mitään... Se ei ollu mikään oppilaan oma tuotos, vaan ollaan kuunneltu tai katsottu videopätkä, esimerkiks tehtiin Georgia O’Keeffestä tällainen, eli kolme pätkää katsottiin hänestä ja ihan tuntematon taiteilija opiskelijoille, ja näiden pätkien perusteella piti sit kirjottaa juttu, kuka on Georgia O’Keeffe, mitä hän on tehnyt.” – Maria*

All upper secondary school teachers use more extensive projects and presentations, as they are often included in specific courses. Maria, for example, lists course 5 as including reading a novel, course 6 as including a scientific survey and course 7 as including giving presentations. The previous task Tuija assigned was a part of the culture course in upper secondary school, an 800-1000 word, extensive, written presentation on something relating to

culture, which is presented orally as well. She demanded her students to choose their topics and to present text quite soon after assigning the task to prevent the trend of leaving all or at least the majority of the work to the last night before the deadline. This ensured the process beginning in time, and based on how students handed in assignments longer than the set limit, the task had most likely sparked student interest. Kaija, who teaches writing-themed, school-specific courses uses more extensive projects as well. She also describes using source materials as the basis for writing, such as TED-talks, articles and BBC-podcasts. She is quite thrilled about the materials sparking student motivation. The previous task she did with the writing course was to write presentations about the U.S election the group has been following, and their next topic is whether cars have a future. The other school-specific course is writing pieces of news.

*(20) "No nyt me ollaan käyty Yhdysvaltain vaaleja siellä mediakurssilla lävitse, ja ne on tehny niinkun esitelmiä noista presidenttiehdokkaista. Ja tänään meille tuli uus tehtävä, ja siinä me käsitellään sitten sitä, että onko autoilla tulevaisuutta. Ja useimmiten mä niinku pohjustan näitä näis kurseissa niin, et me katotaan esimerkiks joku TED-talk, ja sit mä annan jonkun artikkelin, eli niillä on lähdemateriaalia, mihin ne tukeutuu, kun ne kirjottaa niit juttuja. Ja sitten siinä ENA12:ssa (...) me ollaan käsitelty semmosia autenttisia news in brief -juttuja, josta ne on sitten löytäneet niinku pohjaa sille, että ne on ite kirjottanu joistain annetuista aiheista pikku uutisia. Ja useimmiten mä oon antanu ne sillä tavalla, että why, what, when, where, elikkä ne on ja voinu antaa otsikoitakin, jotka on ihan kuvitteellisia. (...) Mä tykkään ite hirveesti just siitä, et on paljon sitä lähdemateriaalia ja useimmat on vielä niin innostunu onneks niistä TED-talkeista, et ne kattoo ne kotona viel uudestaan ja se on mun mielestä niinku jes! Mä en kehtaa oikein tuulettaa siellä, mut mä voin täs jes tuulettaa, että jotkut on niin innostunu niitä, et me ollaan käytetty niitä siellä ENA12:ssa, et ne on voinu kattoo kaikista muistakin niinku niitä ihan ylppärikuunteluja silmällä pitäen." – Kaija*

Kern (2000) presents a continuum of writing tasks from most focus on form to most focus on content, and implies that the content-focused end will be the most motivating; for example letters, diaries, creative writing and freewriting were placed in this end. It is, therefore, pleasing to find that the content-focused end of the continuum is actively used by the interviewed teachers. There are several mentions of letters, journals and especially creative writing, which will be discussed in chapter 5.2.4; Maria also describes freewriting as her favourite type of writing, since the student is allowed to use his or her imagination and write anything at all. She considers this to be the most fun to read. Tuija reports using more informal writing tasks where language accuracy is not the focus, but the goal is communicating with the language; these tasks are not necessarily evaluated either. Such tasks represent well the extensive writing Hedge (2005) suggests is a strategy for improving writing skills. Below is the quote from Tuija:

*(21) "(...) sitä semmosta vapaampaa kirjottamista mitä nyt ei välttämättä arvioida. Niin varsinkin, kun on nyt nää oppimisympäristöt sähköisty... Niin mulla on nyt tällönen kun edmodo-oppimisympäristö käytössä lukiorhmiien kanssa. Niin tota, kun he pystyy ite julkasemaan sinne mitä vaan niin esimerkiks*

*saattaa olla joku, jotakin semmosia vaikka elokuva-aiheiseen liittyvä, et heidän pitää ettiä joku traileri jostakin tietyistä genrestä ja sitten perustella siitä, niinku kertoo aika vapaasti, ja sitä ei niinku, siinä ei oo niinku päähuomio siinä, että, et onks siellä virheitä vai eiks oo. Vaan että niinku oikeesti viestitään nyt toistemme kanssa, vaan et se on vähän niinku, en tiä onks se sulle tuttu, mut semmonen niinku facebook oppimis- no, koulumaailman facebook. Ja tota, et, et se niinku oikeesti se kieli on myöskin se kommunikoinnin väline, kirjottaminenkin tässä tapauksessa.” – Tuija*

Olavi and Jouni would characterize the writing done in secondary school as mainly shorter, narrated and usually fictional or communicative texts, which is in line with the National core curriculum for basic education (2014). Olavi says the task usually depends on the grade and the topic; his seventh grade students, for example, have written about their pets, hobbies and the holiday they had last summer, whereas the ninth grade students write perhaps more essay-like compositions. He does quite a bit of work with posters, and says that he tends to assign rather few compositions, perhaps two on the ninth grade. Jouni supposes that the writing done is perhaps a bit monotonous, as it tends to the narrated, somewhat fictional pieces mentioned above, for example, the previous writing task his seventh grade students did was to write about their dream house. He feels they do not use a very wide variety of different text types; he says they make, for example, advertisements, but he would not call them writing tasks, per se. Jouni begins the use of writing tasks with his seventh grades through smaller exercises and bonus tasks in exams, and then he teaches his ninth grade students how to write essays, which was discussed more extensively in chapter 5.1.2.

In conclusion it would seem that in secondary school writing is mostly shorter, communicative texts and perhaps even more often, students writing about matters close to them, themselves, their home and family, their hobbies and things they like or would like, such as a dream house. In the last year of secondary school students start to do compositions and more structured writing. In upper secondary school there is a very wide and very innovative variety of different types of writing, and even though the matriculation examination is present, in for example dictating the length of the text, which at least according to Paula is not enough to allow the writer to really say much, it does not dominate writing the way I had feared that it would, which is a very positive discovery. Teachers use writing as practice and for purposes of real communication without the pressures of grammatical correctness instead of just as graded essays. There are extensive projects and often a broad selection of different kinds of tasks for the students to choose from, even freedom to write what and about whatever they want. Such a variety hopefully nurtures and maintains student motivation, which is directly linked to teacher motivation, as argued by, for example, Dörnyei (2001) and Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011).

### 5.2.2 The best experiences of writing tasks

This chapter explores the interviewed teachers' experiences of what they would consider the best or most memorable writing tasks they have assigned. Three of the interviewed teachers chose an instance of poetry when asked about the best writing task they had assigned. Kaija has had a very positive experience having her students write haiku, which is something they have done on the culture course in upper secondary school. She has shown her students what English haiku are like and they have looked at the ways of describing nature, and Kaija reports having received poems of such caliber that she has wanted them to be presented in the school's annual publication. She also emphasizes that these haiku were written by boys. She says that even though students tend to resist in the beginning, questioning what possible kind of use could writing poetry ever be to them, they do usually get excited by it in the end. Paula, too, recalls that the most amusing task that comes to her mind was a real Shakespearean sonnet, in the authentic rhyme scheme, which got some interesting responses from her students:

*(22) “Emmä osaa sellasta, mut semmonen mikä on ollut musta itestäni hauska, nii kulttuurikurssilla mä oon pistänyt ne kirjottamaan tota nii Shakespearen innostamana ihan siis oikeaa sonettia sillä ababcdcdeeff-kaavalla. Ni sitä on ollu sillain hauska kattoo, kun osa on niinku sillain että et voi olla tosissas ja sit taas osa on niinku sillain että aijaa, miten me saadaan nää riimit. Ja sitte joillekin mä oon heittäny vielä senkin, että siellä pitää olla niinku kymmenen tavua joka rivillä, nii se, se on ollut niinku siinä, siinä semmosessa erilaisuudessaan...” – Paula*

It would seem that there is a general resistance from the student population when assigned poetry. Yet, several of the interviewed teachers have found the most memorable, positive experiences of writing to be exactly that, poetry. It would also seem that despite initial resistance, students do get inspired and excited by expressing themselves in this way. Lotta remembers an impressive instance with poetry as well. She feels poetry is something that is difficult to actually teach, especially in a foreign language, but has received a rather magnificent creation on the culture course:

*(23) “(...) Ja just runojakin esimerkiksi, mitä on mun mun mielestä vaikee niinku opettamalla opettaa. Se on musta hankalaa, niinku varsinkin vieraalla kielellä, koska niitä on aika hankala lukea äidinkielelläki, ja opetella esimerkiks tulkitsemaan tai sitte just kirjottaakin. Niin, niin sit samaisella kulttuurikurssilla on niin, on muutamia aika mahtavia tuotoksia tullu ja sitte samaten siellä lukion vitoskursilla, niin, et tota, yks poika, joka suoritti itsenäisesti sen, niin oli aivan mahtavia runoja. Siis olisin voinu pistää millek tahansa yliopiston runoanalyysikurssille (nauru) niinku sinne analysoitavaksi. Että tosi syvällinen.” – Lotta*

Another, very formidable teacher favourite among student writing is fiction. Stories, fairytales, thrillers and other prose that demonstrates student talent and creativity has been

very influential for Paula, Lotta and Maria; these texts colour also their thoughts on teacher motivation. Maria has been very impressed by examples of student creativity and she has found it very motivating when a student is truly excited about writing and writes breath-taking stories, where the enjoyment, inspiration and motivation shine through the text. Her students have done tasks, where, for example, they write drawing inspiration from pictures, such as *The Girl With A Pearl Earring* by Johannes Vermeer; Maria says these stories that are connected with something have been most interesting reads. Lotta, too, has found student fiction to be the most memorable of writing tasks. When she taught primary school, the characters in the text book, apparently aliens of some sort or other, were a source of great inspiration and imagination for her pupils:

*(24) "Kyllä ne, niinku ehkä parhaat tuotokset, mitä on sitten lukenu, ni on ihan pieniltä oppilailta sillon, kun mä opetin alakoulussa vielä, niin jotain nelkkiluokkalaisia, kun ne on oppinu jo vähän englanniks sanastoa. Niin niiltähän tulee ihan huikeita tarinoita, esimerkiks, silloessa oppikirjassa oli niinku semmonen, vähän niinku semmonen fiktiivinen, fiktiivisiä avaruushenkilöitä, niin ne jotenkin tuntu ruokkivan tarinankerrontaa aika hyvin, että sitten kaikki tarinat melkein, mitä pojat varsinkin kirjotti, niin siellä siekkaili, tota ni, aliens ja ufoja ja mentiin Marsiin ja avaruusaluksilla ja tuli örkkejä ja (naurua) tapettiinkin ehkä hiukan. Et ne on varmaan motivoinu kaikista eniten." - Lotta*

Paula has been very impressed by her students writing fiction as well as Maria. These texts have been very influential for her motivation, and reflect student excitement as well, as she has suggested a 400-500 word limit on these texts written on the culture course, but has received stories of 1500 words instead. She has enjoyed reading these stories, and feels one can tell that the writers have really put a lot of effort into the text and praises some of them as being really very good. Although she has read some marvelous stories, there is one that Paula highlights as being quite stunning. One of her students decided to write a story completely excluding a very common letter of the alphabet – and succeeded.

*(25) "Semmonen huimin mitä mä oon nähnyt, ni oli, yks tyttö halus kirjottaa sit jonkun tarinan sillain, että hän ei halunnu käyttää yhtään, mikähän kirjain sillä nyt oli pannassa, se oli joku siis hyvin keskeinen, a tai e, mut et siis se, et se joutu korvaamaan sitte artikkelitkin niinku jotenkin sillain, et ei käyttäny... Että sieltä ei löytynyt sit yhtään sellaista kirjainta. Kaikki, kaikki sanat oli etitty sillain, että... Ja se oli sellanen ainakin semmonen 400-500 sanaa pitkä juttu. Se- se oli niinku vähän niinku sillain, että ei hyvää päivää, miten pystyy." - Paula*

Jouni, Laura, Olavi and Tuija all emphasize the effect of student input, effort, excitement and motivation. None could choose a particular task as being the best they would have assigned, but rather stressed the importance and influence of student motivation. This is quite perfectly in line with the literature presented in this thesis, such as Dörnyei (2001) and Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011). Jouni, who teaches his ninth grades how to write essays, has found the best experience of writing to be with these students. He says most of these writers are going to

upper secondary school and have understood that they need the skills to write, and thus one can see how hard they work and how motivated they are. The essays have also been an interesting read for the teacher. Olavi highlights tasks that show student motivation and that interest students so that they are able to produce good texts. Laura stresses the importance of actual student involvement and leaving room for students to participate in the task instead of merely following strict rules and instructions set by the teacher. It would seem it is important to leave room for student creativity and student autonomy, making students active participants in their writing, having them do more than just writing a text. Tuija agrees with student excitement and motivation being a very important motivational factor for her as well; she likes it when students are involved, when they have a desire to use and produce with language and their motivation is at least partly internal, resulting in, for example, an interior inspiration or passion for the topic; see, for example, Dörnyei (2001). She also feels that grammatical correctness is not the most important criterion, and enjoys different kinds of project work; she feels the spark for student motivation often show through a free selection of topic. She prefers tasks that are connected with numerous skills:

*(26) "Mä ehkä tykkään sellasista tehtävistä, jotka on tietyllä tavalla kuitenkin semmosia niinku moniin taitoihin sidoksissa, että se ei painotu pelkästään siihen, että me tehään nyt tekstiä siinä pelossa, että tota ne kaikki virheet bongataan. Toki niillä on omat puolensa niillä, mut mä jotenkin tykkään siitä, että niinku niitä eri taitoja ja osa-alueita yhdistellään, ja ehkä, ehkä semmonen kaikkein mieluisin juttu on, on... Emmä osaa sanoa mitään yksittäistä juttua, mutta noin niinku kirjoitustyypinä semmonen, et kun näkee, että oppilas ite innostuu siitä." – Tuija*

In conclusion one can summarize that the writing that is most memorable, most motivating and most influential for the teachers is the kind that demonstrates student creativity and passion. Every one of the interviewed teachers has been impressed by student motivation in one form or another, and most by students' creative writing. Such a conclusion would suggest that even just for the sake of teacher motivation, it could be a good idea to assign writing tasks that inspire and interest students and perhaps encourage them to write stories, poems and other examples of creativity. Creative writing is something that, for example, Harmer (2004) and Kern (2000) recommend as well.

### **5.2.3 The worst experiences of writing tasks**

There is no universally unsuccessful writing task. This is why Maria cannot pinpoint a single writing task that would not work. One can claim that the success of the task is very strongly linked to the students in question, as they are all individuals. Some students like writing and some do not, but sometimes even students who claim to hate writing can be motivated by it,

for example, by the right kind of topic, as Jouni illustrates by suggesting that a boy who is normally not excited by writing tasks, could be thoroughly motivated if their writing assignment was to write about a video game they enjoyed. Students can also be interested in writing, but feel like they lack the capacity and can be demotivated. They might also feel they can do only some type of writing, for example non-fiction texts, such as some of Laura's students who consider themselves utterly lacking in creative thinking, so they categorically refuse to write creative texts.

Jouni thinks that there could be writing tasks that are unmotivating because of the topic or the type of writing, such as an environmental theme or having to write how to -instructions, but the main thing, he says, seems to be that generally there are students who like to write and students who do not, no matter the task. This does seem to be the case, as for example Olavi and Laura have assigned a nearly identical writing task of having students invent a story for a character in a picture: Olavi felt it was a task that did not work, whereas Laura was quite happy with its success. Students would seem to be the major variable.

*(27) "(...) semmonen, jossa ei ollu niin kauheen tarkkaan niinkun ohjeistettu, et se oli sellanen mul oli niinkun moniste, jossa mulla oli kuvia hyvin erinäköisistä ihmisistä, joista ehkä pystyi kuvistakin päätteleen, että niillon erilaisia taustoja ja erivärisiä ja sit mä- tehtävän anto oli vaan sellainen että valitse yksi näistä henkilöitä ja kirjoita sen henkilön niinkun taustatarina, että mitä se henkilö on kokenut ja mahdollisesti elämässään, millainen elämä sillä on ollut. Tää ei sillä kertaa ainakaan toiminut, et. Oppilaat eivät vaan niinku päässeet siitä oikein eteenpäin. Tai sitten ne oli jotenkin ihan, ihan niinkun päättömiä ne tarinat et mentiin niinku, et siel oli hyvin paljon alkoholismia tämmöstä. Pojat varsinkin et ne tuntu et ne siihen aikaan ei osannu niinku, osannu ajatella siitä mitään muuta." – Olavi*

One important factor in the success of a writing task is the clarity of the instructions. Laura and Tuija both chose examples where they felt the instructions for the task or the construction of the task had not been successful. Laura has found that a writing task cannot have too many different elements crammed into it: the teacher might really want the students to use certain grammatical structures and specific vocabulary, but there cannot be too many different elements. The text can become too forced. The awkwardness of the writing situation can, of course, be taken into consideration in the evaluation, but one can conclude that it is better to leave room for the students. Laura says that the skilled students can take even poor elements and turn them into very good ones, but a dysfunctional task will be very difficult for the students whose language skill level is lower. Tuija emphasizes knowing one's students, as the success of the task depends quite heavily on what the students are like and, what they can accomplish and how skilled they are at using the language. Knowing the students will allow individualizing tasks, for example, by giving more of a free rein to a student who truly enjoys it and is able to perform and express himself or herself versatily in writing. Tuija considers a

task to be unsuccessful if the instructions have not been clear enough or the task has been too demanding for the group, as for example, they do not all have the ability to accomplish a very autonomous task:

(28) “(...) missä mä opettajana koen, että en oo ehkä niin onnistunu, on sillon, jos tavallaan se mun ohjeistus on ollu sellanen niinkun sanotaanko koko oppilasryhmää ajatellen liian vaativa. Että, että kaikilla välttämättä se itseohjautuvuus ei riitä siihen, että pystyy toteuttamaan vaikka kuinka niinkun opettaja innostus siitä, että saa vapaasti valita ja muuta. Että esimerkiksi niinkun peruskoulun puolella niin enemmän tyydytystä antaa sitten semmonen, että kun onnistuu antamaan semmoset ohjeet, että siitä tulee jotakin niinkun semmosta runkoo ja selkärankaa siihen kirjottamiseen, et se ei kuitenkaan kaikille peruskoululaisille oo mikään itsestäänselvä, tietenkään, taito, kun sitä ei oo niin paljon vielä harjoteltu.”  
- Tuija

Paula and Lotta have found writing resumes and cover letters to be their least favourite kind of writing task; these tend to be written, for example, on the third course in upper secondary school. The rigidity and set structures leave very little room for student creativity or for students to show off their language skills. Such tasks are placed on the form-focused end of Kern's (2000) continuum of categorizing writing tasks, and Kern, too, seems to favour the other end, at least in terms of motivation. Both teachers agree that such writing tasks do have to be practiced as well and that they have their uses. However, Lotta characterized them as quite dull to read, probably since apparently most of them are copied and pasted from a model cover letter in the internet, just with a different name for the applicant and the company. She says the task type works well for students who have experience or a profession they know that they are interested in, but for most students it is merely a distant part of the future. Paula would also call some matriculation examination essay titles utterly foolish.

Kaija has noticed that students seem to become more and more inept at analysing texts, at looking beyond the concrete level. She says that student skill level at analysis decreases year by year and that they require, one could say, ironclad instructions for almost any kind of writing tasks to produce what the teacher is looking for. She is very worried about the fact that the culture course, where, for example, they do literary analysis, is moved to the third year of upper secondary school from its current place in the second year.

(29) “Vuosi vuodelta oppilaille on yhä vaikeempaa analysoida tekstiä, elikkä kun on niitä novellianalyseja. Niin jotkut ei kertakaikkiaan enää niinku saa niistä irti, et ne, ne vaan hirveen konkreettisella tasolla pystyy käsitteleen niitä, ja sama on tapahtunu niissä, kun me luetutetaan se romaani siinä vitoskursissa ja sit siit tehdään se evaluointi, eli pitää olla tosi konkreettiset kysymykset mulla, mitkä johdattelee oppilaita vastaamaan, et ei, ei tuu enää semmost muuten mitään analyysia, vaan tulee pelkkiä juoniselostuksia. Eli se on heikentyny ihan hirveesti, ja nyt sitten, kun se siirretään koko tää kulttuurikurssi tulevassa opsissa sinne kolmoseen ni mä, mä en tiedä mitä tulee tapahtumaan. Koska ykköset nyt on vielä konkreettisemmalla tasolla. En tiä mihin mahtaa mennä. Jännittävää, muttei ehkä hyvässä mielessä.” – Kaija

Based on the interviewed teachers' thoughts and experiences of dysfunctional, unsuccessful writing tasks, one can conclude that there is no universal task that works or does not. Student talents and preferences are such a major variable that even identical tasks can be received very differently by different student groups. There seems to be also an increasing need for very clear, almost ironclad instructions, which judging by Kaija's experience, is extremely worrying. I hope that student capacity for autonomy is not decreasing, as it is quite an essential skill in life. Perhaps it could be improved by actively training students for it and for different types of writing tasks already in secondary school. The most influential factor for teacher experience of both successful and unsuccessful writing tasks seem to be the presence of student creativity and motivation.

#### **5.2.4 The use of creative writing and student-teacher correspondence**

This chapter will explore the interviewed teachers' experience of using creative writing tasks, namely fiction and poetry, and whether they have had students write letters or diaries to them or have kept up correspondence with their students, to better the student-teacher relationship, as suggested by Harmer (2004). This chapter also reports the interviewees' answers to whether they have assigned writing tasks without a strict word limit, which, I think, could dampen student inspiration in creative writing. It would seem that in secondary school most writing could be considered fictional, something made up:

*(30) "(...) suurin osa mitä kirjoitetaan ni on niinku fiktiota et ne ite niinku keksii näitä tarinoita, että on tyliin niinku matka- matkakertomusia Afrikasta tai postikortteja Aasiasta tai tällaisia. (...)” – Olavi*

Jouni agrees and supposes that one of the reasons for using fictional writing tasks is the hope that the use of imagination will motivate students to write. He says, perhaps slightly ironically, that the function is to get the subject of the course or lesson to sink into the students' heads and to have them revise it by producing text. It would seem that there is little free, creative writing in the form of prose, despite teachers referring to the writing tasks as stories.

In upper secondary school most of the fictional and creative writing is focused on the culture course, both in upper secondary and secondary school. It seems to be the favourite among the interviewed teachers, five of whom have reported creative student texts to be their absolute favourites, even teachers who do not prefer to do a lot of creative writing. The five teachers have also implied that these fictional student texts have also been a major, positive factor in

their motivation; this will be discussed more extensively in chapter 5.3. Most of the memorable writing tasks and memories that have come up in the interviews have been connected with creative writing. Paula and Maria, for example, keep referring to the stories students write. Maria has assigned a lot of fictional tasks, which are included in the culture course, as well as poetry. Lotta describes the types of creative writing tasks she tends to use, including using writing stories as an extra task for quicker students:

(31) “(...) ysiluokalla on viimeinen kurssi kulttuurikurssi, niin siellä sitten mä annan yleensä niinku lopputyöks, ööm, sellasen, että jokasen on tehtävä kolmesta viiteen jotain kulttuuriin liittyvää tehtävää ja ne voi olla kyl suullisiakin esityksiä vaikka, joku laulun tekstien kirjottaminen ja sen esittäminen ja nauhottaminen tai jotain muuta, mutta aika moni kirjottaa siellä sitten tarinoita myöskin. Tai just vaikka laulun sanoja tai runoja tai muuta. Ja sitte ehkä ne millon mä muullon käytän semmosta vapaata kirjottamista ni on sitten ihan semmosina niinku lisätehtävinä tai eriyttävinä tehtävinä joillekin nopeille tai näppärille, hyville oppilaille. Et, että heille antaa vaikka viis sanaa kappaleesta tai, tai jostain aiheesta ja sitten kirjota ton ympärille tarina. Se on hirveen nopee semmonen eriyttämisen keino.” – Lotta

Poetry seems to divide opinions and experiences. Paula mentioned writing a real, Shakespearean sonnet as the best or at least one of the most interesting writing tasks she has done, and Kaija, similarly, selected the writing of haiku-poems as the best task she has done; both are presented in the previous chapter. Kaija and Lotta have had some wonderful experiences with poetry and finding student talent through it. Kaija seems to be quite passionate about using poetry and uses very imaginative methods to allow her students to become inspired:

(32) “Juu, kyllä, kyllä. Se on niinkun mä tykkään ite sellasesta niin, ja nyt me ollaan tehty tänä vuonna mä oon tehny runon niin, että mä niinkun ohjasin sen tavallaan. Että mä niinkun pyysin katsomaan ulos ikkunasta, kuuntelemaan ääniä ja niin pois päin. Ja sit lopuks ne teki siitä semmosen vapaan runon sitte. Ja se onnistu mun mielestä kans aika hyvin, että otin sieltä pari talteen ihan, ja totta kai pyysin luvan, että jos tarvitaan, tarvitaan meidän koulun kuvastoon jotakin niin sieltä sitten näitä loistavia runoja saa käyttää.” – Kaija

Tuija too uses poetry on the culture course, though mostly as Valentine's Day -type aphorisms, and reports that her students are not very excited by it, that having students write poetry requires quite a bit of motivating on the teacher's part. Jouni and Laura do not use poetry, and Laura says that this is because she does not feel like she is the right kind of person for it: she does not really read poetry, she does not feel like she understands it and thus would not know how to teach it either. Tuija and Maria both report using song lyrics as a possible writing task on the culture course, and Tuija even has a very memorable, motivational experience of such a task, which will be presented in the chapter discussing motivation. Olavi reports not using poetry as such, but he does have his students write rap lyrics:

(33) *“Ja sit tietysti, no runoja, runoja on varmaan vähä vähempi, mut sit räppejä on jonkun verran kirjoitettu, mikä on tätä nykyaikaa. Et siellä taitaa olla jossain oppikirjassa semmosii tehtävänantojakin, että kirjoita räppi jostain tietystä aiheesta, tän tyylisiä mut et runoja ei.” – Olavi*

Laura supposes that the writing tasks closest to fiction that she does, would be, for example, her students thinking of a life story for a character, innovating from an image – something Maria prefers as a task type as well – or writing a fictional script for an iMovie. Tuija too thinks it important to acknowledge all kinds of different text types, fiction and non-fiction, prose and dialogue, the use of the language in versatile ways:

(34) *“(...) monipuolisesti erilaiset tekstityypit huomioitua. Lähtien sit tosiaan, et onks se fiktiivistä tai ei-fiktiivistä myöskin sitten se, että, et niinku onks se, onks se jotain niinku tarinamuotoo vai sitten, et niinku, onks se niinku dialogia, jolloin se mahdollistaa taas sen semmosen niinku viestinnällisyyden painottamisen siinä ja mahdollisestaa sen toteuttamisen käytännössä suullisesti.” – Tuija*

Harmer (2004) and Hedge (2005) describe an interesting idea of being in correspondence with one's students or offering to read student diaries to develop the teacher-student relationship. Probably due to being intrigued by the story of the *Freedom Writers Diary*, the story of a truly inspiring teacher where student diaries are a key method, I felt inclined to involve this teaching method as a point of enquiry in the interviews. Only a few of the interviewed teachers have had students write specifically to them, although diaries or blog texts and letters as such seem to be a rather popular, imaginative text type used in foreign language teaching. Paula and Lotta have asked students to write a letter to them at the beginning of a course; in the letters students introduce themselves, so that the teachers can get to know them better. Lotta has also had her students write letters to themselves, from the seventh grade to the ninth grade, and she has allowed her students to write letters to their headmaster as well, though these had a specific purpose in conveying student wishes on what their new school should be like. Tuija has done a similar task as Paula and Lotta, as she has written a letter to her seventh graders and asked them to reply to it.

(35) *“(...) sitä kautta just mä lähen hakemaan tietysti tuntumaa heihin niinku uusina oppilaina, äää niinku ihmisinä ja että sitä sisältöö. Ja sitten myöskin mä nään aika kätevästi siinä jo vähän sitä kielenhallintaa ja niitä mahdollisia ongelmia, että mihinkä sit täytyy sit tarjota tukee. Niin, niin tota ihan tämmösessä mielessä säännöllisesti sitä.” – Tuija*

Tuija has also used student diaries as a writing task, though, I suspect, as a one-time writing assignment as opposed to the continuous correspondence-like activity described in, for example, Harmer (2004). Tuija feels that not all students were thrilled about the task and the quantity of the text produced varied; she also allowed students to choose the language they wrote in.

(36) *“Tosin, mulla oli myöskin se vaihtoehto siellä, että saa kirjoittaa suomeks, että siinä nyt ei ollu pääpaino siinä kielessä. (...) Itseasiassa nyt kun mä sitten niitä luin tossa niin aika monet oli valinnu englannin kielen, ja ne nautti siitä, että ne sai just vapaasti kirjoittaa, tietää, et joku lukee, et se ei oo niinku täysin sitä niinku heille itselleen pelkästään, ja, ja aika pitkiä juttuja kirjotti sit suhteessa siihen, että... Että tota, kun mitään semmosta niinku kauheen sellasta rankkaa sanamäärävaatimusta ollu, niin sielt saatto tulla sivutolkulla sitä tekstiä, vaikka niinku yks A4 ois periaatteessa riittäny. (...) tää päiväkirjatouhu, niin semmosta numeerisesti arvioitavaa, vaan enempi just sitä semmosta vapaata kirjottamista, osa kurssiarviointia sillä tavalla, et se pitää olla hyväksytysti niinku hoidettu se homma, mutta, mut että ei niin, että siitä tulis numeroo. Varsinkaan niin, että mä bongaisin sieltä virheitä. Vaan tämmöstä niinku viestintävälineenä.” – Tuija*

Maria said that course feedback from her students resembles a letter to the teacher, and that her students tend to communicate to her in English when sending e-mails, which is something she very much enjoys:

(37) *“(...) Kirjeitä mulle, joo, siis kurssipalautteet on tavallaan kirjeitä, kyllä ja kirjoitetaan englanniksi. Ja, ja sit tota, musta on kauhean kiva, kun useat opiskelijat kirjoittaa mulle sähköpostia englanniksi. Et se on niinku se ihan luonteva kieli, mitä käytetään. Että, et tota, sitä kieltä käytetään, mitä, mikä niinku kuuluu asiaankin.” – Maria*

Laura has not used this type of exercise and feels that she is not the right kind of person for it. She says that the success of this kind of a task probably depends on the teacher, which is very likely, since the teacher is such a major motivational factor, as stated by, for example, Dörnyei (2001) and Turunen (2014), and such a long-standing project as continuous correspondence with the group would demand constant motivating from the teacher's part to keep the students interested, which is what Harmer (2004) emphasizes as well. If the teacher did not feel comfortable or motivated by the task himself or herself, it would be unlikely to succeed. Success would require the teacher to truly think the task important. Laura also feels that if she asked her students to write specifically to her, her students would feel anxious and perhaps instead of enjoying the task, stress about the correctness of their grammar and spelling, which could defeat the purpose of building better rapport and a deeper relationship with the students. During the interview we found that perhaps there are cultural differences between the literature read and the reality of a Finnish classroom. It is likely that, for example, American students respond to tasks and teaching methods presented in this thesis very differently than Finnish ones. Perhaps this, the differences between the literature and the reality, is the reason why the interviewed teachers have not used the kind of student-teacher correspondence suggested by Harmer (2004).

All the interviewed teachers teach courses where they do not set a restriction for the length of the text or where they allow exceeding the suggested maximum length. I think this can be

beneficial for student inspiration in creative writing: it would be hard to force a story into a 250 word limit, and I think giving students occasional freedom of expression is a good way of motivating them to write. Several teachers implied that it is more common to have to set a minimum requirement, which could be why Jouni makes sure to take note of students who have been inspired to write and reward them somehow. Laura, on the other hand, speaks of an opposite view where she finds that some of her students seem to think that length of text equals quality. It seems to be a common belief outside of the school environment as well, but as Laura too points out, the best texts for an upper secondary school writing task she assigned were shorter ones. Those texts had managed to summarize their message effectively, and the extra length in others added little value to the evaluation.

Lotta, Maria and Kaija remembered instances of having received longer, inspired student texts:

(38) *“Varmaan parhaimpia on semmonen tosi pienellä käsialalla kirjoitettu 24 ruutuvihon sivua oleva tarina – ilman kappalejakoja, joka oli aika tiivistä luettavaa (naurua).” – Lotta*

(39) *“(…) Varsinkin nää tämmöset luovat tehtävät on ollu... On tullu pitkiä, on tullu huikean pitkiä tehtäviä vastaan (naurua). Että jotkut ovat nauttineet kirjottamisesta ihan hirveästi. Sekä siellä yläkoulun puolella että lukiossa, niin on tullut valtavan hienoja juttuja ja, ja tota... Tarinaa on aina vielä jatkettukin, että siitä on nähty monta versiota siitä ja jatkoakin niille, että se on kauhean kiva.” – Maria*

(40) *“Mulla kerran yks oppilas toi romaanin. Mä kyllä luin sen. Mut sen jälkeen mä oon sanonu, et mä en kyllä enää haluu lukee kenenkään science fiction -romaneja. Että. Mutta sillon mä nyt sitten suostuin, suostuin lukemaan sen, kun mä olin nuori ja tyhmä.” – Kaija*

Tuija says that she accepts texts of any length and that she values students who have a desire and a need to express themselves in writing, to write down, for example, their thoughts and create their own fiction and short stories. However, she has had to restrict the amount of text she receives for the sake of her own wellbeing. Students have a chance to express themselves more freely on courses with extensive, written works. Tuija also points out how students have to be able to produce the matriculation examination essay, in the required length. Maria does not give a word limit on the first and second courses of upper secondary school, as students have just arrived from secondary school where writing is usually used quite differently, but she tells her students what the required length is for the matriculation examination. Kaija has had an unfortunate experience with a student who wrote a 450-word matriculation examination essay, despite being told repeatedly that exceeding the word limit would simply not do. Thus, upper secondary school teachers have to prepare their students for the matriculation examination, but ideally also allow their students freedom to express themselves and their creativity. Paula emphasized that she does not feel that the 300 or so -word limit of

the matriculation examination essays really leaves room for real content. It would seem that most teachers truly enjoy student creativity and expression, but the reason for requiring to summarize it stems from the lack of time and resources, as writing is so very time-consuming for the teacher.

### 5.2.5 Feedback

In this chapter I will explore how the interviewed teachers report using feedback, how they correct student texts and what kind of thoughts they have about feedback. The kind of feedback given and the level of detail in correcting student errors depend on the function and the purpose of the writing assignment; Tuija says, for example, if they have been discussing the structure of a certain text type, she looks for the application of said structure and she assesses content and language accuracy or if she is evaluating the “sound scripts” she describes in preceding chapters, her emphasis is on the use of the vocabulary. Paula and Lotta, too, emphasize the function of the writing. Lotta has taught a lot of courses that prepare students for the matriculation examination, outside of school as well, and she has found that these students want very detailed feedback and error correction, an emphasis on the grammatical correctness and how idiomatic the language is. Lotta says her approach is very different on, for example, the culture course: the purpose of, for example, creative writing is not to focus on language accuracy. Lotta especially does not want to mark all student errors on work that will be displayed to others, such as a poster on the classroom wall, as she feels students can be very insecure and timid about their writing.

*(41) “(...) no esimerkiksi siellä kulttuurikurssilla jotain niitä runoja ja muita, niin ei se mun mielestä siellä oo tarkoituksenmukasta sieltä nyt välttämättä joka kielioppiasiaa korjata. Kuka muuten sanoo missä muodossa runossa pitää joku verbi olla (naurua). Tai sitten jos tehään sellasia kirjoituksia, vaikka esitelmiä, jossa pääpaino on siinä sisällössä, vaikka nyt maantuntemus, maantuntemukseen liittyvä joku poster, niin en mä halua, että siellä seinällä on semmonen työ, jossa on hirveesti punakynää, niin et kaikki vaan kattoo, että yäh, toi ei osaa mitään tai mä en osaa mitään, tietenkin se oppilas eniten, että sitten on pääasia siinä sisällössä vaan. Et ei joka juttua korjata.” – Lotta*

All interviewed teachers use both error correction and written feedback. They correct language mistakes and the detail of the correction depends on the function of the text, as was suggested above. The teachers also set writing tasks that emphasize communication and content instead of language accuracy and tasks that are not graded, but receive, for example, a “good” or a “very good” instead, as suggested by Olavi and Maria. Hedge (2005) recommends tasks like this as well to support the development of the writing skill. Such tasks are not necessarily corrected by the teachers; the teachers also employ peer feedback in

working on student texts. All teachers use error correction to varying degrees of detail, and Maria says she tends to correct all student mistakes in a text as she feels it allows the student to have a better overview of what kind of things they should be paying attention to. Lotta describes her way of giving feedback on secondary school texts as the “hamburger feedback”. She corrects errors in the notebooks and tries to give written feedback as well, a summary of the areas the student should work on, such as verb tenses or articles, and comments on content, which is where she usually encourages the student.

(42) “(...) *Hampurilaispalaute (naurua). Ensin jotain hyvää ja sitte kauheesti korjattavaa, ja sit vielä, että ymmärsin kuitenkin kaiken mitä olit halunnut sanoa. Hauskaa luettavaa. Keep up the good work.*” – Lotta

Tuija stresses the importance of giving written feedback in addition to grades and correction. She says it can be much more effective than just a grade, at least to some people. I agree with her that in developing the writing skill and teaching students to write in English more effectively it is important to give students detailed feedback. I think the feedback should be specifically about the content of the text, which is emphasized by Kaija as well, and help students develop their argumentation, their clarity, cohesion and coherence, their ability to capture a reader and to engage their reader to the end. This is an issue that should receive more attention, as demonstrated by, for example, the study by Konttinen (2009), where an alarming majority of teacher comments focused on language.

(43) “*Eli pyrin antamaan sanallista palautetta, koska mun mielestä esimerkiksi kirjottamisessa niin se, se kertoo hirveen paljon enemmän ehkä joillekin ihmisille kuin se pelkkä numero. Vaikka nuorille tuntuu se numero olevan tosi tärkeä asia. Eli pyrin antamaan sekä numeerista, että sitten tällasta sanallista palautetta, ja et se niinku ohjais eteenpäin jollakin tasolla. Välillä aika vaatimattomasti, mutta yritys hyvä kymmenen (naurua).*” – Tuija

The importance of feedback is emphasized also by, for example, Paula and Laura. Laura feels she cannot give feedback the way she would like because of the lack of time and the massive workload. Paula also expresses her frustration on how feedback in language teaching seems to be mainly error correction. I can fully share her frustration based on my own experience of Finnish foreign language teaching, and I believe shifting English teaching more towards second language teaching could help develop the feedback given. Paula believes in the power of feedback and thinks writing should be more than a means of showing language skills:

(44) “*Nii mä uskon siihen palautteen voimaan sillain niinku oikeesti, että sillä palauteella pystys, pystys sillain... Että mua harmittaa ihan äärettömästi, että minkä takia kieltenopetuksen puolella ni palaute on niinku jotenkin typistetty pelkästään tämmöseks error correctioniks. (...) Et siin ei kauheen paljoo sitten anneta muuta palautetta, ku korjataan virheitä. Ni tota, et kai sillä kirjottamisella täytyy olla joku muukin funktio ku et se on pelkästään sen kirjoitetun kielen semmonen... Niinku sen kielitaidon osoittamisen*”

*semmonen alusta. Et kai sillä tekstillä pitäs ainaki, ku aattelee kielitaitoa tämmösenä viestinnällisenä taitona, niin kai sillä pitäs olla jotain viestinnällisiäkin arvoja tai jopa esteettisiä arvoja eikä pelkästään sitten niinku se kielen oikeudellisuuden kuljetusalusta. (...) Nii et se, et musta, et mä niinku toivosin, että me kiinnitetäs vähän enemmän huomiota johonkin muuhunki ku siihen, että hei, sulta puuttuu tästä yksikön kolmannen persoonan ässä tai tässä pitäisi olla artikkeli. Jota olen tehnyt suurimman osan urastani." – Paula*

Feed forward is a thought presented by Paula and Tuija in this study, where the teacher can help the student develop through the feedback. Paula speaks of being inspired by John Hattie, an author writing of student assessment and feedback, and how using feed forward has improved her motivation: her work feels more meaningful. She describes her method of using feed forward as giving more concrete suggestions for students to improve their writing, how they could, for example, receive a higher score on the matriculation examination essay:

*(45) "(...) et se palaute ei keskittys pelkästään siihen; jos tässä tää paperi on nyt se essee, et mä en pelkästään niinku ruodi sitä, että niinku tässä se on kirjottanu näin ja tässä sulla on tämmönen kielioppivirhe ja mä annan tästä sulle 82 pistettä, koska tää on sellanen. Vaan et sen, sen tän hetkisen suorituksen ruotimisen lisäksi mä antasin jonkinlaisia niinku neuvoja eteenpäin, että jos – jos opiskelija haluaa esimerkiks kirjottaa 90 pisteen aineen, että miksi se jää vajaaks, mitä siinä pitäs olla vielä, sitten niinku, minkäläisten muutosten avulla se ehkä sitten olis se 90 pisteen aine. Et tota, et yritän antaa niinku sitä sellasta palautetta siitä jo tehdystä suorituksesta, mutta antaa myös sitä feed forwardia, et miten tästä eteenpäin." – Paula*

Hyland (2003) and Kern (2000) recommended face-to-face conferencing as a method of giving students feedback, and Laura has done this with her students. However, it is so time-consuming that it is rarely possible. Laura seems to consider oral feedback to be most effective because the teacher and the student are face to face and can look at the text together, the teacher can draw the student's attention to repetitive issues with his or her texts and make sure that the student really receives and understands the feedback. Hyland (2003) and Kern (2000) emphasize similar benefits. Laura can never be sure if students read the written feedback on their assignments, or if they see it at all: several upper secondary school students never collect their course exams, thus, they never see the feedback received on their writing. There seems to be a structural issue with the way upper secondary school students are given their exams and essays back.

Hedge (2005) and Hyland (2003) described the fine line between praise and criticism in giving feedback, as criticism can easily crush the fragile confidence of insecure ESL or EFL writers, too much praise can lose its meaning or make learners complacent and ambiguous feedback is the worst one of all. Kaija prefers giving her students personal feedback, but sometimes she feels it is more like treading on eggshells: she says students can be very sensitive about their writing, which along with the issues described by Hedge and Hyland, can make giving feedback a difficult balancing act.

(46) ”Niin se, se on kans sellanen, että, että tota noin se palautteen antaminen oppilaille, ku mä haluun antaa sit henkilökohtasta palautetta, ni se on välillä niinku vähän munankuorien päällä kävelemistä. Ku toiset on ihan uskomattoman herkkiä, ja mä varmaan sitten joskus onnistun niinku pahottamaan jonkun mielen, vaikka mä en... Haluan vaan niinku parantaa hänen kirjottamistaan. Mutku ne on kuitenkin niin jotenki niin, kun ne on niitten oma teksti, oma vauva (...). Mut sit mä kuitenkin haluan antaa sitä henkilökohtastaki palautetta, mutta eihän se aina onnistu, mut sillon kun on aikaa siihen ja pystyy, niin sillon.” – Kaija

One issue with the work teachers do on student essays and writing tasks is that quite often it feels useless, for example, if students barely look at their feedback or never come to collect their texts at all. The effect of this problem will be discussed in more detail in the chapter 5.3. The main issue, it seems, with any kind of teaching is the lack of time. Teaching seems to be a constant act of prioritizing, condensing and not being able to teach in ways that the teacher might feel would be better. For example, giving feedback orally and individually, face to face, as suggested by Hyland (2003) and Kern (2000), could be preferred, as it could ensure the student receiving the feedback and the teacher having the possibility to make sure that the student has also understood the feedback. There would also be a chance to enter into a discussion. However, finding the time to do this seems to be almost impossible, when there is so much work to be done.

It is not surprising that in the studies of teacher job satisfaction by Leppänen (2011), Mäenpää (2005) and Kaski (2009) they found the overwhelming workload to be quite a significant factor. Jouni, among others, has found that a majority of students do not care to look at anything except for what they scored on a task. However, if a student should be even a little bit interested in their text, he is willing to review his or her task more thoroughly, and perhaps to give feedback on the structure of the text as well.

(47) “(...) kuka haluaa yhtäänkään, että, että ne on tarkemmin vielä katottu, niin mä voin oikein yrittää ne katsoo tarkkaan, et jos otatte niistä opiksenne. Mutta se on vaan valitettava tosiasia, että, että kun ne huitasee jonkun oman tekstin niin niistä 70%, 80% ei vilkasekaan muuta kun sen pistemäärän (...) Mut sitte mitä, mitä niinku huomaa ite niinku vaka- enempi vakavissaan ne on ja, ja mä tiedän, että, että ne on kiinnostuneita kirjottamiskyvyistään niin, niin mä pyrin ne korjaan ihan varsin tarkkaan. Saatan antaa palautetta toki myös sen kirjoituksen rakenteesta, mutta pitkälti se on sitä oikeeikielisyyttä sieltä (...)” – Jouni

Some teachers have decided to ask their students what kind of feedback they would like, as was suggested by Harmer (2004) and Hyland (2003), which has had a rather positive effect for the teacher. This will be explored more extensively in the following chapter. Teachers can perhaps manage their workload, their motivation and the time to use writing slightly better if they can focus their effort where it is needed and wanted. They can also assign writing tasks which are not graded or where the emphasis is not on grammatical accuracy but on the

fluency of communication or where students receive peer feedback instead of the teacher's. Peer feedback will be discussed in more detail in chapter 5.2.5.2.

It would also seem that perhaps a general shift of focus in English teaching from error-correction to feedback on content, the quality of the text as a whole piece of communication and on feed forward could be beneficial. Foreign language teaching has had a notorious reputation for focusing merely on the language instead of the content, as for example Paula points out, but I strongly feel that English is more than a foreign language in Finland and thus, students could be taught writing on a more extensive level: how to write a good text and an effective argument and what kind of conventions go with each text type - to take writing beyond grammatical and idiomatic accuracy. Feed forward could be a useful tool for improving student writing in all aspects. Sadly, teachers seem to barely have time to assess writing tasks as it is.

#### **5.2.5.1 Students correcting their own writing tasks and the use of process writing**

This chapter will discuss the teachers replies to using minimal marking and asking students to correct their own texts and the teachers' use of process writing. Hyland (2003) suggests minimal marking as a method, and I believe that it could be a way of making sure that students go over their texts and feedback, which some of them tend not to do if left to their own devices. I also thought it interesting to ask about process writing, since most of the literature in this thesis seems to discuss teaching writing as specifically process writing with several drafts. For example Hedge (2005) and Harmer (2004) emphasize the process of writing – that is, planning, drafting, revising and editing - as a crucial part of the writing ability, so it is interesting to see if the drafting process is practiced on English lessons.

Having students correct their own mistakes after the teacher has marked them in their texts or the use of process writing does not seem to be very common in secondary school among the interviewed teachers. Olavi has not used either and neither has Jouni. Jouni does, however, sometimes use minimal marking for student texts, but has not asked students to correct them themselves. He thinks that perhaps he should, if he wants them to regard their texts more seriously and to improve their writing. He has not used process writing either, but says it could be a useful exercise for the ninth grade. Tuija too reports that she does not tend to use process writing in secondary school, and that it is quite lovely to have them return anything – especially if the assignment is written on paper, it is always lost somewhere.

Lotta says that her students have had very different reactions to correcting their own texts. It has worked very well for some students, usually the ones who also hope and ask for detailed correction and are ready to work on the process of writing. Lotta has found that some students could not care less and cannot be bothered to go through their texts again; she says it is similar to students asking why they have to listen to the chapter of their text books again, since, after all, they have heard it already. Kaija has had her first year upper secondary students correct their own texts and claims that the popularity of the exercise is not great, that the students do not want to correct their texts.

*(48) "Ei ne halua korjata niitä. Mut kyl mä oon tehny sitä, ja varsinki sitte kun on semmosia heikompia oppilaita, joilla toistuu ja toistuu ne virheet, niin mä pistän kyllä kirjottaa uudestaan ja ne on alleviivattu ne. Mut ehkä tää on ekan luokan juttuja enemmän. Nyt kun rupee miittimään. Ja varsinkin tukukurssilla tehään sitä sitten. (...)" – Kaija*

It seems that having students correct their texts themselves is most commonly used during the last year of upper secondary school, and specifically on the course that prepares students for the matriculation examination. Maria uses this technique especially on that particular course and thinks it alerts students to take notice of the mistakes they make and it saves her from doing pointless, unappreciated work. She feels that her students accept this way of working, but the correction has to happen soon after the students have their texts back. They usually recognize the mistakes they make after they have been shown to the students. Tuija too tends to have her students correct their own mistakes in the last year of upper secondary school, as the students' understanding of language is on a more developed level. However, she has first year students look at the most common mistakes made, such as verb tenses, articles, prepositions and congruence, in groups of four and they review the anonymous examples together, but rarely have time to go through whole texts.

Paula has focused students correcting their own texts to upper secondary school as well, but she has decided to ask the students how they want to receive their feedback, as not everybody learns the same way. She does not believe that one size fits all. Thus, she asks her students what kind of feedback they want, written or oral, if they would like their mistakes corrected or just marked, so that they have to work on them themselves and how well they would like to do, what point score they aim for:

*(49) "(...) Mä oon lukiossa aika useinkin tehny sillain, et mä oon vaan niinku harrastanu siis tätä indirect corrective feedbackia, et mä oon vaan merkannu ne, ja se ei kauheesti hyödytä kaikkia. Mut et mä oon jotenki aikoinaan ollu sitä mieltä, että se ois niinku tehokkainta, että ne joutus ite miittimään sitten, että*

*mikä tässä oli väärin ja miten tää pitäis sanoa. Mutkun se ei toimi niin. Ni, ja sitten taas toisaalta osalle ei toimi sit se direct feedback, et se menee niillä ihan hukkaan, että niitä ei sitten kiinnosta se, että se on jo valmiiks korjattu, että ne kaipaa sen älyllisen haasteen. Niin niinpä nykyisin varsinkin siis tässä päättövaiheessa noitten abien kanssa, niin mä oon tehny sillain, et kun ne on nyt kirjottanu mulle ne aineet, niin ne on ensin kirjottanu siihen, että mikä on niiden se tavote, mihin ne pyrkii. Sitten miten ne haluaa sen palautteen, haluaaks ne suullisesti vai kirjallisesti ja haluaaks ne virheet merkittyinä vai virheet korjattuina. Ja sit mä oon korjannu sen mukaan. Ja suosittelen lämpimästi. (...) Eri opiskelijat on erilaisia, niillä on erilaisia oppimistylejä, mut niillä on myös erilaisia tarpeita ja erilaisia toiveita, ni se, mä en usko siihen, että niinku one size fits all tai yhdellä keinolla niinku pystytään antaa se palaute parhaalla mahdollisella tavalla kaikille. Nii... Niin sen takia mä oon niinku, ku ne antaa ihan samoja perusteluja sillain, että joku saattaa sanoa, että mä haluan, että sä merkkaaat ne virheet etkä korjaa niitä valmiiks, koska sillain, et mä joudun ite miettimään sitä, ni mä opin parhaiten. Sit toinen taas saattaa sanoa, et mä haluan, että sä korjaat ne valmiiks, koska sit kun mä katon sitä korjattua muotoo ja sitä mun virheellistä muotoo, niin mä opin sillain kaikkein parhaiten.” – Paula*

Laura has found that her students are interested in their texts: that they come and ask about their assignments if she has simply marked their errors, which is a positive observation for teachers. The sense of doing pointless, time-consuming work, for example, giving feedback on student essays seems to be something that inflicts most teachers, so knowing that they do care, is surely motivating. Laura describes her secondary school students as having a short attention span and says that they do not seem to be interested in returning to work with something they have been graded for already. She suggests that a possible solution could be having students review their texts either before grading them or before showing the grades to the students. The lack of time seems to be the main issue for her. Most of the time she just has to give the assignments back to the students and then move on to the next topic on the following lesson.

Maria has used process writing and peer feedback together, so that students have given feedback to each other and afterwards have had the chance to rewrite their text based on the feedback before handing them in. She feels that perhaps the most significant reason for not using process writing more is the lack of time, similar to Laura. Maria suggests that there should be a course that is tailored for focusing on writing and the writing process and where the students are willing to keep with it, that all of them would be involved in the process and support and help each other as well. Lotta too finds the time-consuming nature of process writing to be an issue, as well as the text and task becoming outdated, if the students cannot continue working on the text very quickly. However, she has found that instead of teacher feedback on drafts, peer feedback can be used, which is what Maria does as well.

*(50) “Ja tää on kyl huono tekosyy, mut se on vähän aikaavievää kanssa (naurua). Että sitten taas jo, jo monesti se kirjotelmia on niinku yhestä aihepiiristä ja sitten mennään jo seuraavaan. Että, että se on vähän sellasta, et jos sulla on 25 oppilaan ryhmä ja sitten et jos ajatuksena on se, että, että mä vaikka siinä välissä kommentoin ne, ne tekstit, ja sitten oppilas jatkaa uudestaan siitä. Niin. Pitää vaan tehdä hirveen paljon ja nopeesti töitä, mut eihän siinä tarvii aina opettaja olla välissä. Että oon käyttäny myös sitä, että, että tota, just että esim neljän hengen ryhmässä ne ysiluokkalaiset tai ne lukiolaiset niin*

*luetuttaa tekstisä toisilla ja sitte antavat palautetta ja kommentteja. Että se on musta kyl myös aika hyvä keino.“ – Lotta*

Kaija has used process writing on the writing-themed course she teaches, but she reports that it was not popular. Apparently the students were not excited. Paula reports that she has been using process writing for approximately two decades, and she too says that students tend not to be very motivated by it. She says that they seem to often feel that the text they have produced is the final version and that there is little reason for continuing to work on it, even if having received feedback on it.

*(51) “(...) Oppilaat ei vaan tai opiskelijat ei välttämättä aina siitä hirveesti tykkää. Et musta tuntuu, että meillä on kauheen usein sellanen olo, et minkä kirjoitin, sen kirjoitin ja se on jo sitten valmis. Niinku mitä sitä nyt enää tässä sitten niinku prosessoimaan. Et aika, aika harva tekee hirveen paljon sitten muutoksia, vaikka ne sais siellä välillä välipalautetta ja vaikka siellä olis niinku jotain semmosta, mutta oishan se tietysti. Mä en oikein usko siihen, että yksikään teksti on niinku ensimmäisenä versiona se kaikkein paras. (...)” – Paula*

Laura comments on the learning process in general and the benefits of it for the students, a way of teaching where there is something more than just one final exam which determines the students' success and leaves little room for a student to show improvement:

*(52) “Ja siinä itseasiassa varmaan se on tavallaan se prosessi ihan kurssillakin, että jos vaikka harjotellaan kielioppia ja sit tuotetaan jotain tekstiä sitä käyttäen, niin että sitä tulis myös siinä myöhemmin sitten uudestaan sitä testausta. Ettei se oo vaan se yks kerta. Ni se ois aika hyvä. Ja myöskin uuden opsin mukainen ajattelutapa, että ei oo vaan yks loppukoe, jossa testataan hetkessä se tuotos. Et tää on nyt tässä, ja sit se oppilas ei saa tilaisuutta parantaa ja näyttää. Se ois oikeesti hyvä.” – Laura*

Concluding from the interviews students are interested in their texts, just as suggested by Hyland (2003), though perhaps a little bit worryingly seem to be mostly focused on what kind of and how many mistakes they made. If a teacher marks their texts without correction or makes no kinds of markings at all, which is something Kaija has experienced, a student might be likely to come and ask about it, or in the case of the latter, suspect the teacher has not read his or her text at all because apparently the student feels that they must have made some mistakes. The sense I have got from personal experience of the Finnish school system and these interviews is that Finnish students have perhaps an unhealthy fixation on mistakes – despite their teachers - which could divert their energy and effort away from more constructive learning.

The students seem to have a relatively short attention span, particularly in secondary school, but there is an attitude in both secondary and upper secondary school of “what is done is done.” That there is little point in reviewing a text once it is written and even obstinate

resistance in accepting feedback and rewriting or editing the text based on it, which differs from Hyland's (2003) suggestions of students trying to use most of the feedback they receive. Resisting process writing and ignoring feedback is, obviously, not beneficial for the process of writing, described by Harmer (2004) and Hedge (2005), the process being planning, drafting, revising and editing, in continuous, circular manner of repeating different stages throughout the writing process. One reason for the attitude could be students' inexperience with process writing, not being accustomed to thinking of their work as something that can be thought of as a draft.

Paula, Lotta and Maria have found that they can ask the students what kind of feedback they would like, what kind of feedback is most effective to their learning. The main issue in any kind of writing seems to be the lack of time because of the crammed curricula and how time-consuming reviewing student texts is for the teacher. This is clearly linked to teacher motivation, which is discussed in detail in its own chapter. One factor that can demotivate teachers is feeling that the work they do is for nothing, that the students do not see or appreciate the work the teacher has done. A way to overcome this is to ask the students who actually wants the kind of feedback that takes so much time and effort – Maria, for example, found that only eight out of 34 students actually wanted to have their texts corrected thoroughly and to receive detailed feedback. The same phenomenon was repeated with two different groups. One could conclude that teachers perhaps should consider consulting their students in how they would like to receive feedback, as was suggested by Harmer (2004) and Hyland (2003), and they could improve their own motivation at the same time.

### **5.2.5.2 Peer feedback**

Harmer (2004) and Hedge (2005) recommend peer feedback: they say it offers students another audience beside the teacher, perhaps helps them to view feedback as suggestions rather than commands and helps students to edit their own writing as well. Therefore, I think it is interesting to ask the interviewee's for their experience of peer feedback: if such benefits apply to the reality of the Finnish classroom as well.

The most popular kind of peer feedback among the students of the interviewed teachers seem to be students doing peer feedback in pairs they have chosen themselves. Kaija reports that her students agree to do this when they have a familiar, safe partner they have been allowed to pick, but that she has not been able to get her students to comment on each other's texts in

their virtual learning environment. Paula too says that her students seem to feel safer when working in pairs. One could conclude, based on for example how reluctant Finnish students seem to be to present their texts to others, that Finnish students feel insecure about their writing and or language skills and perhaps could even feel ashamed letting others see what they have produced. Hedge (2005) and Harmer (2004) do say that second or foreign language writers tend to be insecure about their abilities, but I think Finnish students are alarmingly so. Could they be so fixated on their possible mistakes that it would cause them to feel like that? Tuija described writing, even fictional texts, as a very personal product, a way for her to have a sense of the student's persona, even. It could be also be possible that the strict code of privacy in the Finnish culture would cause students to be reluctant to let others glimpse into their mind. This would most definitely be an interesting area for further research.

There seems to be a consensus among the interviewed teachers that students in upper secondary school are better suited for peer feedback than the students in secondary school; Lotta proposes that one of the reasons for this could be that upper secondary school students practice peer feedback also in other subjects. Hedge (2005), Harmer (2004) and Hyland (2003) also emphasize the importance of training students for peer feedback. The above-mentioned consensus could be why Olavi and Jouni, who teach secondary school English, do not assign peer feedback. However, their students do read each other's texts and possibly provide oral feedback while doing so. Jouni also praises his students for behaving so smartly towards each other's work, for example in recognizing mistakes in other's texts, but never ridiculing each other for it. Lotta says that secondary school students do not always see the point of peer feedback, and it can be assumed that they would need clear instructions for such an activity to avoid the issues described by Lotta and Tuija:

(53) “(...) sitten se palaute on sellasta niinku “ihan kiva” ja, ja tietysti sitten on ehkä eroja siinäki, että jos on niinku hyvä kirjottaja ja samassa ryhmässä sitten vähän heikompi kielitaito niin on se palaute ihan erilaista. Toinen kans korjaa tarkalleen toisen virheet ja sitte taas toinen ei pystykään puuttumaan niihin, tai niihin oikeakielisyyjuttuihin siellä, että. Et sitten pitää miettiä, että onks se palaute sellasta niinku sisältöön liittyvää tai vaikka niinku jäsentelyyn, että tähän voisit laittaa ton asian ja ton tuonne vasta loppuun tai jotain muuta tai, että onks se niinku ihan yksityiskohtasta sanastoon ja rakenteeseen liittyvää.” – Lotta

(54) “(...) ehkä just lukiossa eniten pystyy sit, no peruskoulussakin on, on oppilaita, jotka pystyy antamaan sitä palautetta ja olemaan asiallisia, mut sit kaikilla ei oo sitä kykyä samal tavalla, että siinä sitten käy sillä tavalla, että osa saa tosi, tosi hyvin sitä palautetta ja sitte osalla se jää hyvin sille et ihan kiva -tasolle. Niin, niin tota ihan sen käytännön toteuttamisen kannalta niin oon kokenu sen vähän silleen peruskoulussa vaikeaksi, ainaki sillä tavalla, että jos se niinku ajatellaan, että sitä pitäis sitä prosessia jatkaa sitten sen jälkeen niin sen palautteen perusteella mitä saa niin, niin tota...(...)” – Tuija

Specific, clear instructions and practice in giving each other feedback could improve the

chances of implying peer feedback successfully in secondary school as well. Significant gaps in student skill levels could still be an issue, though, as Lotta and Tuija point out. There might be a feeling of unfairness if some receive detailed feedback on the structure and content of their texts, advanced suggestions on grammar and vocabulary, but other students are unable to provide any other kind of suggestions than saying “it's nice”. Maria and Tuija describe how they have used peer feedback in upper secondary school. Maria has students read each other's texts and usually they give oral feedback on them; sometimes they have also had the chance to correct possible mistakes and improve their essays after the feedback before handing them in to be evaluated. This would support the process of writing emphasized by, for example, Hedge (2005). Tuija too gives students a chance to receive peer feedback on drafts and work on them based on the feedback received. She instructs peer feedback to focus on content and organization rather than the language.

*(55) “Et tokihan ne, niinku sanoin, et jos on tollanen projektityö ollu tämmösenä niinku näyttelykappaleena niin, et kyllähän ne on lukenu niitä juttuja ja sit me on voitu tehdä niin, että joskus on ollu vaikka just seinillä on ollu niitä projektitöitä, niin siin on ollu semmonen palautelappu sitten, että siihen on saanu kirjottaa semmosta palautetta, mut se nyt on aika silleen, silleen vaatimatonta, et ehkä tuolla lukiossa tosiaan taas jälleen kerran se on ollu semmosta vähän tehokkaampaa se ja tällä lukion kulttuurikurssilla niin siellä aika paljonki sitä just, että esiteltiin niitä omia ensimmäisiä versioita ja luettiin sieltä pätkiä kavereille ja, ja kaverit anto palautetta siitä, et onks tää selkeetä vai ei ja näin pois päin... Mut nimenomaan siihen, että sillon kun kaverit antaa palautetta niin se palaute ei keskity kieleen niinkään, vaan ehkä ensisijaisesti just siihen sisältöön, rakenteeseen ja semmoseen niinku fiilis, filishommaan myöskin.” – Tuija*

Harmer (2004) presents also the possible negative sides of peer feedback, such as students not seeing peer feedback as valuable as teacher feedback and even resenting peers'. Laura has not encountered such reactions, but can report that students might even find each others' feedback more interesting than the teacher's. She seems to also have a positive feeling towards using peer review in secondary school and a positive view of her students' ability to perform the task:

*(56) “Mutta oon pyytäny heitä antamaan toisilleen palautetta, eli joku vaikka vertaisarviointilomake tai sanallinen arvo tai palaute. Ja ne niitä kyllä kiinnostaa ehkä enempi ne toistensa palautteet kun minun palautteet välillä (naurua), et se on ihan kiva. Ja ne on aika hyviä arvioimaan toistensa töitä, myös. Kun vaan ohjeistaa sen palautuksen silleen niinku järkevästi. Niin sieltä tulee oikeesti hyviä havaintoja.” – Laura*

### 5.3 WRITING AND MOTIVATION

Motivation is a very powerful thing, as is stated throughout this thesis, and it is also a very interesting aspect of writing. This chapter will discuss student motivation, teacher motivation and how students affect it and explore what kind of writing-related experiences teachers can

recall that have affected their motivation.

What has become apparently clear from the interviewed teachers' answers is that every student is different. There is no universal writing task that would work or that would not, as even the same task can be received in very different ways. When asked about matters relating to students, the answer tends to be that students are different. Some students like writing and some do not, and it affects, for example, how they view it, what kind of tasks they like to do and how excitable they are. The students who like writing in English perhaps enjoy it in other subjects as well, skilled writers are skilled even with bad elements and the ones who do not like the activity – or perhaps find it hard – tend not to be motivated no matter what the task, although there are exceptions to every generalization, as described by, for example, Jouni in a previous chapter. Tuija demonstrates this by describing how her students regard the extensive culture course project, presented in a previous chapter: some enjoy the chance to begin straight away and the opportunity of a process and some do not.

It is said that some students are almost scared of writing. Hedge (2005), Harmer (2004) and Weigle (2002) also suggest that some become very anxious about writing and have very low confidence as writers. Paula, Jouni and Laura all speak to this effect. Some of the interviewed teachers also suggest that generally writing skills have decreased, even the physical handwriting. A reason behind some students' claim of not enjoying writing or opposing writing tasks can be found in their anxieties about it and their lack of belief in their abilities as writers. Laura, for example, suggests that some students find writing very hard and need a lot of support from the teacher; as Hedge (2005) emphasizes, writing in class is a way to support these kinds of students, to develop their skills as writers and even as autonomous learners by supplying them with strategies for accomplishing the task. Laura describes student motivation relating to writing as depending on the students in question:

*(57) "Than hyvin. Ne jotenkin mieltää sen niin selkeesti osana koulutyötä, et ne ei ees osaa kyseenalaistaa sitä. (nauraa) Mut joillekin se on kauhee paikka, kun jos on vaikeeta ja hankalaa ja ei oikein osaa, niin semmosille oppilaille se on, se on tietysti tosi hankalaa. Ja jos on vaikka yläkoululainen, jonk-jolle se viiden lauseen tuottaminen on oikeesti tuskaa, niin se on heille vaikeeta, et sit pitää tosi paljon kiertää siinä ja auttaa, ja huomaatko tossa kohtaa ja hyvin menee. Ja tälleen. Mut varsinkin ne sujuvat kirjottajat, niin ne on kyllä aika... Ne vaan tekee. Ei siinä, monesti. Kyllä ne monesti kysyy tarkentavia kysymyksiä, just et miten pitkä ja mitä tässä halutaan, ja se on hyvä." – Laura*

Several of the interviewed teachers feel that anything that requires effort from the students is usually not considered very motivating, especially in secondary school. This is a trait of human nature, and perhaps quite understandable of students who have serious difficulties in

expressing themselves in writing. Jouni too stresses the individuality of students and their preferences and supposes that by practising writing more – as suggested by Hedge (2005) as well - even the students who appear to be terrified by writing could find it easier:

*(58) “Kyllä se niitä ahistaa vähän, et se on sellanen että “emmä osaa, emmä osaa”. Se riippuu, se vaihtelee hirveen paljon luokittain. Mulla on tällä hetkellä semmoset, jotka niinku lähes pyörtyy ja tippuu jakkaraltaan, kun ne kuulee, että pitää alkaa itse kirjottaa jotain, tekemään. Ja he ei mitään osaa ja ei saa tehtyä. Sit on niitä, jotka “joo”, innoissaan, “joo, kiva, kivaa, voiks tätä jatkaa kotona?” Ja sitten ne tuo niitä pitkiä stooreja. Et se tosiaan vaihtelee, vaihtelee tota hyvin paljon. Mut sekin on varmaan asia, jossa pystyy niitä sitten kouluttamaan, että kun ne tottuu ja, tottuu siihen niin ainahan se tietenkin helpommaksi käy. Mut kaikki, mikä aiheuttaa vaivaa, mikä vaatii keskittymistä, miettimistä, pohtimista, ni kaikkihan se on monille vastenmielistä. Olis kiva pelata pelejä ja täyttää niit lyhyitä työkirjatehtäviä ja, ja keskustella ja tehdä kaikkee semmosta, että, että samahan pätee vaikka käänöslauseisiin. Et ne ei oo kivoja, kun niissä joutuu kovasti miettimään ja säätämään.” – Jouni*

Lotta has found this to be true as well. She describes her students reactions to writing tasks in exams as varying: on one hand, some find writing as something requiring perhaps too much effort and some, on the other hand, as a way to demonstrate their language skills, when they cannot, perhaps, demonstrate it on the other content of the exam. One could suppose that not being able to demonstrate their skill could be from the unwillingness to put in the effort to learn, for example, the new vocabulary.

*(59) “(...) kyllähän osa, tota, mieluummin haluais, että on sellasia, niinku, mekaanisempia tehtäviä esimerkiksi, mitkä vaikuttaa arviointiin, että kun niistä on helpompi saada täydet pisteet, että, että tota... Siinä kohin usein kun on kokeessa se aine, niin tulee vähän sellanen, yäääh, mä en jaksa. Mut että sitten taas sellaset oppilaat, jotka ei välttämättä just jaksa niitä, niitä kurssin asioita, olkoon nyt kielioppia tai sanastoa niin kauheesti treenata, tyliin eivät tee läksyjä niin hyvin. Niin sitten he monesti tykkäävät, että onkin kirjoitustehtävä ja sitten saa niinku näyttää, että mä oikeesti osaan kieltä, vaikka mä en osakaan näitä kappaleen kuusi sanoja.” - Lotta*

Writing can, of course, be thought of as something positive as well, as suggested by, for example Maria and Tuija. Students tend to have mostly positive reactions and can think writing a composition as fun, Maria says, which is most definitely true, at least if the teacher has considered the students in assigning the task, ensuring that there are options and topics that interest students. Harmer (2004), for example, emphasizes this particular aspect in choosing writing tasks. Tuija speaks of the variation of writing, how it can be a welcome change from pair discussions; as was presented in a previous chapter, she feels that writing in class can allow students to have a moment of silence in the midst of the school day, to focus on themselves and work alone for a change. Tuija also stresses that if a student has a clearly negative reaction to a school task, it is usually not about the task but about something else going on in the student's life, such as family matters, lack of sleep or other issues outside of school.

Several of the interviewed teachers feel that most students simply accept writing as part of schoolwork: it is something that is done in school. Kaija says that students know that if they do not do the required work, it will either affect their grade or prevent them from passing the course. Tuija, for example, always lets her students know in the beginning of a course that it involves writing tasks. Laura warns teachers not to fall in love with their own tasks: often teachers are so focused on what wonderful tasks they have designed for the students that they might forget who they are making the tasks for and why. No matter how brilliantly innovative and imaginative the writing task is, it is still just another piece of schoolwork for the students. Remembering that might protect teacher motivation from unnecessary disappointment. Despite this, Laura says, teaching as a profession has that special something.

*(60) “(...) Tosta motivaatiosta tuli vaan mieleen se, että siinä on myöskin semmonen pieni riski, et ihastuu niihin omiin tehtäväksantoihinsa, väsää niitä iltaisin siellä ja on kauheen tyytyväinen, ja just että sitten ehkä se pieni narsismi sieltä pukka esille joskus. Että pitää myös muistaa kenelle näitä tekee ja miksi. Et näkee joskus sen oman työnsä niin kauheen arvokkaana, siis sen tuoksen, tavallaan, et vitsit mä tein hyvän, ja sitte ihmettelee, että ei nää oppilaat innostunu tästä yhtään, että nehän näkee sen vaan koulutyönä. Mut sit taas joskus kun huomaa, että oikeesti onnistuu tekemään sellasen, että oppilaat innostuu. Niin se on kauheen palkitsevaa. Mut kai tässä ammatissa joku homma on, et miksi sitä illalla niin innoissaan tekee niitä, sen sijaan, että tekis jotain muuta. Kyl siinä joku on. Silleen. Jos tiedät, mitä tarkoitan.” – Laura*

### 5.3.1 Influences on teacher motivation

This thesis has established that teacher motivation is very important for both teacher job satisfaction and for student motivation. The present chapter will discuss the interviewed teachers' thoughts on the relationship between writing and their motivation. If, for example, the way students respond to the tasks teachers assign or to the feedback they are given affects the teachers' motivation and if they feel their work, the time and effort they put into it, is appreciated. All interviewed teachers have expressed that student excitement and effort motivate them as well, which is exactly what Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) suggested. All teachers have said that it is more motivating to read student texts that have been written with excitement and where the students have been involved. It is also very common for the interviewed teachers to take student feedback into consideration, for example, to change the task if the response is very negative, and if it is, to perhaps be inspired to improve. Paula asks if the students learn anything by doing something very reluctantly. Kaija describes being motivated by student excitement and students being proud of their work, and Lotta says seeing students get clearly thrilled, their imaginations soaring, makes her feel like she cannot wait to get to read their texts. Tuija adds that she has found that students tend to be more interested and involved in the feedback they receive as well, when they are motivated by the

task.

(61) *“Se on ihan niinkun avainasemassa oikeestaan silleen, et just mitenkä sitte ite saa sitä, sitä inspistä siitä aiheesta. Totta kai jos mä nään, että oppilaat ite on niinku innostuneita ja motivoituneena, nii se tavallaan niinku, tavallaan tuo semmosen olon et mun työllä on jotain merkitystä (naurua).” – Tuija*

The way teachers feel about reviewing student texts, correcting and giving feedback on them, varies. Maria says it is important work, and that she likes it, and Laura expresses similar sentiment. Maria describes it as motivating work, especially since one can see the student's language skill very clearly through their writing and get a good sense of what he or she knows well and where they might need more support. Tuija too says that working on student texts has a positive effect on her motivation and that student texts, even fictional ones, give her a sense of the student's persona as well:

(62) *“No siis motivaatioon niinku toimia kieltenopettajana niin sillä tavalla vaikuttaa positiivisesti, että kuitenkin sitä kautta mä saan paitsi tietoo siitä kielen osaamisesta tietyiltä osin, mä pääsen myöskin aika syvälle ehkä sit sinne niinku oppilaan ajatusmaailmaan kiinni, semmoseenkin ajatusmaailmaan, mikä ei näy tunneilla välttämättä, et mä koen, et se on hyvin sellanen henkilökohtanen, vaikka se olis fiktiivinen juttu, ni mä pääsen jotenkin siihen niinku oppilaan, opiskelijan persoonaan jotenki sillä tavalla käsiksi, että se on mun mielestä hirveän tärkeä näkökulma sen lisäksi, että siinä on se ite kieli ja se kirjottamisen taito.” – Tuija*

Paula, Tuija, Kaija and Lotta speak of the amount of work and time correction and giving feedback takes. Kaija says that correcting student texts is extremely lot of work, at least if you do more than just underline errors; the teacher has to also consider what is good about the text instead of focusing on what is not, and she has to teach students to write well, so that they do not keep repeating the same thing over and over again, but move forward and make conclusions in their writing. Lotta says that she likes to assign and read student texts, that they are usually quite fun, but that correcting them is something she tends to procrastinate for a couple of days: carry the essays in her back bag back and forth for a couple of days before getting to work. Tuija describes herself as the kind of person who is not made to sit down and be still for long periods of time, and that it is the sitting down and correcting that she finds boring, not the student texts, which can be very good. Paula too admits that she has disliked correcting student texts, but that she has found a way to motivate herself, to make the work feel more meaningful, through the John Hattie inspired feed forward: she tries to help students improve, beyond grammatical correctness:

(63) *“Mun täytyy myöntää, että mä oon tän noin 20 vuotisen urani aikana, ni mä oon inhonnu aineiden korjaamista. Että se on musta jotenkin tylsää ja työlästä. Mut nyt sitte, kun mä sain tän Hattie-herätyksen, ni sitten mä ehkä niinku, nyt mä koen, että mä teen jollainlailla merkityksellisempää työtä sekä niille opiskelijoille että itselleni. Et siin on niinku enemmän, enemmän niinku jotenkin sellanen, että teet työtä,*

*jolla on joku merkitys, koska aikasemmin monta kertaa kävi sillain, että oli korjannu ne aineet ja kirjottanu sinne jotain kommenttia ja pistäny ne pistemäärät ja sit sillain aha (ryttää paperia) ja suoraan roskeihin. Et ne katto vaan ne pisteet. Et näistäkinhän on paljon tutkimustuloksia, et niitä korjaamisia ei ni, et ne ei paljon vaikuta. Mut ehkä nyt sitten, kun ne on ite saanu valita sen, et miten ne ottaa sen palautteen, nii ne myös on jollain lailla vähän ite kiinnostuneempia, vähän enemmän sitoutuneita sit siihen palautteeseen (...) Mut se on ollut musta itestäni jotenkin älyllisesti mielenkiintoisempaa yrittää miettiä myös sit se feed forward, et aika rutiinillahan ne nyt tulee, et tästä puuttuu artikkeli, tuolta puttuu yksikön kolmannen persoonan ässä, sun on epäsuorasta kysymyslauseesta puuttuu whether tai if – jotain tämmöistä, mutta että niinku sitten se, se että miten auttaa sitten muuta kuin sanomalla, että korjaa kielioppivirheet. Ni eteenpäin, se, se on ollut musta oikeestaan ihan mielenkiintosta.” – Paula*

Teachers have opposing views of students appreciating the time and effort teachers put into their work, though I am reasonably sure that the interviewed teachers saying their work goes unappreciated are not being entirely serious. Maria supposes that her students appreciate her work and that they understand the value of feedback; not everybody, of course, but she thinks most see her work contributing to their learning. Laura too thinks that most of her students value her work, they ask for feedback and are interested in it and their texts. Laura has also found a way to motivate herself, whether or not her students care about, for example, their feedback: she wants to do a good job and she has to be able to argue for her decisions. Tuija supposes that some students do appreciate the work and some could not care less, they throw away their papers without examining their feedback; however, she wants to give everyone an opportunity to have the feedback. It is up to them whether they take notice of it. Jouni, Kaija and Olavi all say – or laugh – that students, probably, have no idea what the teacher does and how much effort it takes and that they probably assume that the teacher lives at school. It is also common that students do not understand how much time it takes for a teacher to review essays or tests, which is something Lotta has found as well: she laughs that students most definitely do not understand what and how much teachers do.

*(64) “Ei varmaan. Ei takuulla (naurua). Just tää, että, että tota, osa kattoo sen numeron ja sitten ne niinku, vaikka se ois hyväkin se numero, niin ne ruttaa vaan sen konseptipaperin sinne jonneki paperinkeräysroskikseen ja sillä selvä. Että, että tota. Joskus mä oon kysynyki ihan suoraan oppilailta, lukiolaisilta, että ketkä teistä haluaa sillälailla niinku yksityiskohtasta palautetta ja kelle riittää numero. Että sitten niinku, tavallaan, käyttäny aikaa niiden oppilaiden palautteen antamiseen, jotka oikeesti on sen halunnu. Että tota, sillain. Mutta en usko kyllä, että kaikki, kaikki peruskoululaiset esimerkiks niin, jos niillä vähän pidemmän kirjotelman teettää, niin en usko, että kyllä ymmärtävät esimerkiks, et kuinka paljon siinä kuluu aikaa, jos sen kunnolla ajatuksella niinku lukee ja korjaa ja arvioi. Sen näkee siitäki, et ne odottaa aina, että ne on samantien tarkistettu. Niinku ehkä jo sillain, että, et jos saa kokeen valmiiksi puolelta ja tunti loppuu varttia vaille, ni eks sä oo jo tarkistanu niitä meidän aineita. Jo (naurua). Kakskytviis 15 minuutissa. No en.” – Lotta*

Generally the amount of work related to writing affects teachers' ability and willingness to assign writing tasks. I argue that most teachers have to limit the amount of writing they do because of the constant hurry and pressure of the curriculum and because of the time and resources it takes the teachers personally. If a teacher is unwilling to assign writing for other reasons, I think a major one could be feeling that the work is pointless, unappreciated and thus

demotivating. Jouni, Olavi and Tuija all refer to their workload as a reason why the amount of writing has to be limited:

(65) *“(...) kylhän täs tietysti ku on paljon tunteja niin joutuu niinku miettimään sitä omaa jaksamistakin, et jotenki tuntuu että, että kun on pitkä, pitkä päivä niin, et ei siin ehdi, ehdi tota noin mitään muuta tekeen, kun vaihtaa tunnista toiseen, et kyl se varmaan niinku sillä tavalla, et just joutuu niinku, just joutuu niinku miettii sitä määrää, et kuinka paljon niinku ja millaisia, minkä tyyppisiä tehtäviä, kirjotustehtäviä tehdään ja onko ne semmosii, jotka mä korjaan kaikki ja. Et sit osittain varmaan tehdään osin sen takia, et jos on ihan ylitsepääsemätön urakka korjata niitä, niin aika paljon tehdään semmosia, et tuotetaan sitä tekstiä, mut ei välttämättä niinku joka kohtaa korjata sieltä.” – Olavi*

Tuija, who has emphasized the benefits of writing, says she has had to reduce the amount for the sake of her own wellbeing. Leppänen (2011), Kaski (2009) and Mäenpää (2005) suggest that teachers have difficulties in separating their work from their free time. The interviewed teachers also suggested that a teacher always has a bad conscience: that he or she never has enough time to teach how they would like. It is, thus, likely that a conscientious, passionate teacher, such as the ones in this study, might have the urge to keep on working, even around the clock. It is obviously not an option if one wishes to remain able to work or has a family or something besides work in their life. A few teachers kept calling themselves selfish or questioning their work morale, when they would limit the amount of work they do outside of school. Hopefully they were joking, as it would be alarming if teachers whose work is so time-consuming and demanding already, would seriously blame themselves for giving themselves time for a life outside of work. Tuija points out that the level of English in upper secondary school is so advanced that often the teacher has to check things herself or himself as well and that takes even more time. Another reason for her to limit the amount of writing done is to focus on quality rather than quantity: she wants to do her job well, similar to the other interviewed teachers.

The interviewed teachers have found ways to both limit the amount of work associated with writing and to maintain their motivation. Paula, Lotta and Maria, for example, have decided to ask their students which of them want the detailed feedback or how they would like to receive their feedback, which was something suggested by Harmer (2004) and Hyland (2003) as well. As it is the feedback that makes writing so time-consuming for the teacher, this is a way to make it more efficient for both teacher and students; Maria for example had asked two groups of 34 students which of them wanted very detailed feedback and only eight did, in both groups. This will allow teachers to focus their effort more beneficially and avoid doing work that will feel useless, as it is quite common for students to throw away their essays without examining them. This, of course, is not always a sign of indifference, but perhaps a student's

emotional reaction, disappointment for not doing as well as they hoped, for example, as Laura suggests, and that should not be taken personally, even though it might feel frustrating. Maria proposes having students correct their own texts in order to avoid the feeling of useless work and to ensure that even the students who normally pay no attention to their feedback actually go through their texts. Teachers can also assign writing that is not graded and writing where the teacher does not necessarily need to be the one giving all the feedback, but peer feedback can be used; Olavi, Kaija and Tuija, for example, have done this. Kaija says it does not matter how thrilled she is about reviewing student texts as it has to be done, but she uses different kinds of writing that do not always require her to grade them, as the amount of writing done, for example on the school-specific course she teaches, is quite impressive:

*(66) ”No, joka kurssissa pitää nyt ainaki tulla yks pitkä kirjoitustehtävä, et vaikuttaakoon mun intoon ihan mil tavalla vaan, mut se on niinku tehtävä. Mut nyt sitte kun joku mediakurssi, niin se pitää ottaa sillä tavalla vähän eri tavalla, että koska ne tuottaa niitä tekstejä niin paljon, etten mä aina kiinnitä huomiota niihin kieliooppivirheisiin. Joskus mä en ees korjaa niitä kieliooppivirheitä, ne luetaan vaan ne tekstit ja analysoidaan niinku sitä asiasisältöä siinä ja niitten mielipiteitä, et ei, ku mä mietin noita mitä portfolioita, 25 tekstiä kirjoitettu viime vuonna ni en rupee jokaikistä korjaamaan. Varsinki kun mullakin on nyt liki 30 oppilasta siellä, niin ei, ei onnistu. Mä en oo yli-ihminen. Mut se onki vähän erilainen kurssi. Mut kyllä oppilaat haluaa noilla 1-6 kurseilla, jos mä antasin aineen, jota mä en oo korjannu, kyllä ne tulis pyytämään ”eiks tässä muka ollu virheitä?” Kyllä ne vaatiikin sen korjaamisen. Ei ne niinku tajuais sitä ollenkaan, että, et vois niinku antaa takasin arvosanan silti. Onkohan se edes lukenu tätä.” – Kaija*

### 5.3.2 Memorable experiences of writing

The interviewed teachers were asked if they could recall writing-related experiences that had somehow affected their motivation. Laura describes an unsuccessful task, which was discussed in more detail in chapter 5.1.2, where she asked her students to write pieces of news thinking they would enjoy the task. She was, however, surprised by the response of heavy plagiarism; how those students had found the task overwhelmingly difficult and how stressed they were about their schoolwork. Laura says the experience made her feel bad and got her to think about what it was that went wrong with the task, and eventually had a positive effect on her motivation: she was inspired to think about her tasks more thoroughly. She emphasizes the importance of a teacher's motivation: if a teacher becomes demotivated, the work becomes monotonous and it will show to the students as well. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011), for example, support a conclusion of teacher motivation being directly and strongly linked to student motivation.

Tuija and Maria both speak of the impact in motivation when students cannot complete the task how the teacher has hoped. Maria has faced disappointment in, for example, students not

understanding the assignment of creativity: instead of letting their imaginations soar they have reported a memory, for example a description of a vacation. Tuija has emphasized her desire to assign and instruct tasks that her students will be able to do, which has been discussed in a previous chapter; how she has understood that her bringing structure and tools to support writing can make a big difference to a student who normally might struggle. An aspect of teaching is not always being able to see the development of a student or the impact of one's work, Tuija says, and it might make maintaining teacher motivation difficult, not knowing if one's work has any meaning. Therefore helping a student succeed and seeing the result almost immediately, for example, a student now being able to write, will have a positive impact on teacher motivation.

It is curious that the most memorable, motivating, writing-related experiences that Paula, Maria, Lotta and Tuija could recall are all about student creativity, students writing fiction, in particular. It is, thus, not surprising that the culture course seems to be an absolute favourite among the teachers, as was suggested earlier as well. This theme has carried throughout the interviews: it would seem that creative writing is not very common as a writing task, most often used on the culture course, both in secondary and upper secondary school, and yet it would seem to be the most motivating for the teachers, the writing task that they will remember and that inspires them. The reason for teachers not assigning more writing, let alone creative writing, is surely the lack of time and the constant hurry. I say this because in my experience of the Finnish school system there is very little time and very much content and creative writing has not been a priority. This is a terrible shame, since it would seem that creative writing could be hugely beneficial for both student and teacher motivation.

Maria has admired student creativity and especially student-written fiction throughout her interview and speaks of it as the most memorable experience as well: how the inspiration of students being able to freely express themselves and their creativity has inspired Maria to keep giving them that chance. Lotta too has been impressed by student creativity: she speaks of quiet students who in no way have brought themselves forward on lessons or in other tasks, but suddenly amaze her through their creativity. Paula keeps referring to student creativity and student-written fiction throughout her interview as well, and describes how brilliantly good some of the texts she gets to read are:

*(67) "Joo. Niit kulttuurikursseilla, kun mä teetäin nyt niitä, niitä niitten, et ne kirjotti myös niitä fiktiivisii tarinoita. Ni kyl siel on paljon sellasii, sellasii tarinoita, että vaikka mulla meni ihan sairaasti aikaa siihen, kun mä luin niitä noin viissataa, kun ne kirjotti kaks vähintään sellasia kurssilla, että noin 500*

*sanaa, kertaa 30. Kertaa kaks. Ni. Ni olihan, menihän, siihen meni ihan hirveesti aikaa. Mutta tota, siellä oli muutamia oikeesti sellasia, että mä niinku joko itkin niitä lukiessa, että niin surullisia tarinoita tai sitten niin, niin jotenkin semmosia hauskoja juttuja, että sitä niinku nauro siellä. Ja hueskeli niitä miehelleni ääneen, että kuuntele ku tää kirjottaa tälleen. Et ne oli, ne oli kyllä ihan. Siis se, että kun näkee sen, et minkälainen luovuus niissä oikeesti on. Et mitä niistä irtooo, kun niille vaan antaa vähän vapautta. Niin ne on ollut sellasia, mitkä on motivoinu.” – Paula*

Kaija and Tuija both also praise student effort and excitement. Kaija describes a longer, more extensive project her students did on the school-specific, writing-themed course she teaches. They studied diseases, for example how they were viewed in the Middle Ages and moved on to the present day; the extensive project allowed students to do different kinds of work best suited for their skill level and, for example, gather lists of vocabulary for support. Kaija was so impressed by the students' work that she hoped that there was someone to show the projects to, like that the amazing effort was almost wasted when there was no other audience but the teacher. She hopes the students got a great experience out of it as well. Tuija shares a very impressive instance of student effort, excitement and creativity, as well: at a time when the upper secondary school culture course was still done as a portfolio, one student took the project above and beyond:

*(68) “(...) Ehkä semmosia huippuhetkiä elämässä on justiin joskus, siitä on tosi, tosi kauan aikaa, kulttuurikurssilla, joka toteutettiin silloin tommosena portfoliona, et siellä ei ollu paljon semmosia perinteisiä testejä minkäänlaisia, jossa kuitenkin tavallaan sitten niissä miten erilaisia projektitöitä toteutti ni sitten piti huomioida siinä niinku erilaiset taitoalueet, niin kyl semmosia huippukokemuksia tulee vieläki kylmät väreet on niinku kirjottamisen suhteen se, kun yks tyttö teki niinku oman laulun, sävelsi sen, esitti, äänitti, ja sit se pakkas ne kaikki ne omat projektityönsä semmoseen laatikkoon, ja sieltä löyty kaikennäköstä, ne sanat oli tehty semmoseks niinku, laitettu semmoseen käättöön ja sit semmonen silkkinauha siihen päälle. Et niinku missä niinku todellaki siis niinku sokeeki huomaa sen, et niinku on näkyne se kiinnostus, motivaatio, sitä niinku omaa työtä kohtaan. Nimenomaan sen kautta, et saa ihan vapaasti toteuttaa itseään, juuri sellaisena kun on, ja jos sattuu olemaan tommosia lahjoja ihmisellä, että, et pystyy vieraalla kielellä tekemään omia kappaleitaan ni se nyt on yks tämmönen huippuesimerkki, niit on paljon kyl semmosia positiivisia asioita, mutta tos on niinku muutama maistainen.” – Tuija*

Jouni speaks of an experience which made him feel that the work he does has meaning, similar to Tuija. Jouni teaches his ninth grades how to write essays: he gives them the structure and tools they need to be successful at it, which is precisely what Tuija emphasizes as well. I can fully support this method, as the change between secondary and upper secondary school, even just in terms of writing, is quite immense. It would seem that there is not very much writing in secondary school; quite a few teachers in this study alone implied that in secondary school the focus is on oral skills and that they are just satisfied if their secondary school students write something. For a student like this the difference in being in upper secondary school and being expected to learn to write essays fit for the matriculation examination can be difficult, even terrifying. Jouni shares a story where he received a thank you from a previous student, saying that it was his teaching that had made a difference for that

student:

(69) *“Se oli tossa vuos sitten suurin piirtein, ku oppilaillahan ei niitä kännyköitä pitäis juuri olla siinä oppitunnilla, mutta se nyt vaan on niin, että kyllä niillä niitä siinä, siinä tota pöydällä silloin tällön näky, ja tietysti me siitä niiden käytöstä kielletään, mut sitten oli tämmönen ysiluokan tunti. En muista oliko meillä ollu vielä mitään ainekirjotusjuttuja niiden kanssa siinä vaiheessa vuotta, mutta sit siinä oli yks oppilas, sit- ne teki jotain hiljasta työtä, niin kesken kaiken se sano, et nii että, että, että [entiseltä oppilaalta] terveisiä. Ja mä, että jaa kiitos, hui, mitä häh, jaa että sekö, joka meni lukioon, ei tossa nimee tarvi mainita sen kummemmin. Joo se, ja sit mä sanoin, et onks sulla kännykkä, joo. No sit se, oli hiljasta vähän aikaa. Nii että se sano, että, että niin se on sen koko lukion, lukion ekan vuoden pärjänny niillä ainekirjotusopeilla, mitä te täällä kävitte. Että, että ei se siellä oppinu niitä, että ne on näillä yläkoulun eväillä se oli sit pärjänny näissä kirjoituksissa. Ja se oli ihan kiva tilanne, siinä oli se koko luokka kuulolla, ja se oli vielä semmonen sakki, joka ei kai kaikin puolin ollu aina niin hirveen motivoitunu kirjoitustehtäviinkään. Niin se oli ihan hauska, aika niinkun suora palaute siinä. Se siitä, että jotain oli tarttunu jolleki korvan taakse ja siellä oli sit semmonen hiljasuus laskeutu taas. Ja sitten en tiedä mitä ne mieltivät, mutta ihan, ihan mukava hetki. Et siinä ei ollu se kirjottamisen opettaminen täysin hukkaan mennyt, että jotain hyötyä siitä oli jollekin. Semmoset on aika kivoja. Oli ihan vilpittömän tuntunen episodi.” – Jouni*

## 6. CONCLUSION

In this section I will discuss the features of this study that might affect its reliability, validity and generalizability and the implications of this study; I will also present a conclusion of this study. First of all, no generalizations can be made based on eight interviewed teachers, and as a qualitative study focused on hearing the personal experiences of said teachers, this study does not aim to generalize or to conclude universal truths. However, I believe in the importance of the topic and think a study like this could be recreated with a larger number of participants. Such a study would allow drawing conclusions about the use of writing in Finnish English language teaching and it could offer teachers valuable information on how to teach writing, what kind of writing tasks to use and how to motivate themselves and their students. I think this is especially important, since there is so very little instruction on how to actually teach writing. The teachers in this study implied that they do not feel confident or even qualified to teach writing as a skill, and I argue that a reason for this is the lack of training and the lack of support. The National core curricula, which guide teaching in Finland, offer very little instruction on how to actually teach writing.

Although there can be no universal conclusions or generalizations drawn from a study of this quantity, there are numerous important and interesting patterns that arise from the data. I believe these patterns deserve further studies in order to better understand how to improve writing in English, how to help build the confidence of student writers and to keep the teachers motivated. There were also several underlying hypotheses in this study, and I will also address these in this section.

I was correct in assuming that teachers cannot give general answers in concerning students as they all individuals. This is why, of course, the study aimed to focus mainly on the teachers and their perspective. I also assumed, based on the literature on motivation, for example Dörnyei (2001) and Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011), that there would be a very strong correlation between student and teacher motivation, and based on this study that is most definitely accurate: when students are excited and enthusiastic about writing, it has a very clear, positive effect on the teacher's motivation. It would seem student enthusiasm makes the teacher both enthusiastic and motivated to work harder and more conscientiously.

I had also hypothesized that the matriculation examination would dominate writing in upper secondary school. I also assumed that even though writing would be more about content than it perhaps has been in the past, teachers would not explicitly teach writing as a skill. I am very pleased to be proven wrong. The teachers use a very wide, a very innovative and imaginative variety of writing tasks in both secondary and upper secondary school. Their writing tasks feature, for example, different kinds of writing, genres, varying audiences and registers and different degrees of formality. There are several occasions of writing tasks that are just about writing, practicing different kinds of writing and allowing students to be motivated by the act of writing, instead of the emphasis on evaluation. Creative writing plays a very important role as well. The matriculation examination essay is present in upper secondary school writing, but it is just one type of writing. I argue that the interviewed teachers do teach writing, even though they do not perhaps dare to see themselves as doing so, as was discussed in the previous section. Thus, one suggestion for further study would be to study how teachers could build their confidence in teaching writing and where they could find the tools to build their own expertise in doing so.

I believe the most important implication of this study is the significance of creative writing. It is a theme that arose time and time again in analyzing the data, and it dominates the interviewees' answers about the best writing tasks they have done and the memorable, motivating experiences they have of writing. Five out of eight interviewed teachers brought up either student fiction or poetry as having affected them very positively. The other three emphasized student motivation and enthusiasm. Thus, it would seem that motivating and exciting students and allowing them opportunities for creative writing can improve teacher motivation as well.

Another pattern that is visible in the data is the insecurity and anxiety in how Finnish students regard their writing and abilities. How confident are students in reality about their language skill and writing ability? There was a sense that students do not want to present their work, some were even panicked about the thought of others seeing their work, and I believe this is the reason why they appear reluctant to do peer feedback as well. What does this reluctance stem from? I suggested that perhaps the strict code of privacy in the Finnish culture could deter students from sharing writing, which according to a teacher, is always a description of the writer's persona. However, I believe that the more likely reason is that foreign languages have traditionally emphasized language accuracy in writing and the dominating method of feedback has seemed to be error correction. I suppose it is only logical that students will fixate on their mistakes as well if that is what their education emphasizes as the most important thing in writing. This is definitely an important area for further research. How can we build students confidence in their skills and how can we shift the emphasis in writing away from errors?

I suppose one possible solution would be to teach writing as a skill already before students entering upper secondary school. As Hedge (2005) argues, it is practice that develops the writing ability and the writer's confidence. Of course, change is difficult to achieve if teachers have such an immense workload that there simply is no time to focus on writing and if there are no clear instructions on how to actually teach writing. For example, the National core curricula offer very little on the subject of writing in secondary school, and I believe it could be beneficial to educate students in writing from a younger age. The interviewees report students being reluctant to do process writing and unwilling to revise their texts even when given feedback to support doing so. The teachers report of a general attitude of "what is done is done", which I feel is a widespread phenomena in the Finnish culture. Could educating students in writing help deter such an attitude? If students viewed writing as the kind of skill that includes the process of writing discussed in this thesis, perhaps they could be motivated to try and improve their writing through drafting and revising based on the feedback they receive. I also think it is worth further research to see if students would benefit from some kind of writing instruction in all subjects that use writing texts as a medium: writing conventions do not differ only between cultures, but there are different conventions for writing even in school subjects. It would be interesting to study what the transition between secondary and upper secondary school is like as well: do students who have been taught writing fare better than those who have little tools to do the kind of essay writing expected in upper secondary school, let alone further studies.

I think it would also be important to study how teachers manage the fragile line between their work and their freetime. How do teachers feel about their free time? Are feelings of guilt common? I argue that it is a real possibility for passionate, motivated and conscientious teachers to feel guilty about time spent not working, and such a teacher could end up exhausting himself or herself by working around the clock, unable to separate work from their free time. Writing especially is such a time-consuming area of language that it requires extensive, immense amounts of time from the teacher, and as argued in this thesis, that time tends to be taken from time outside of school. How will a teacher who considers writing to be important and wants to help his or her students become better writers manage the already daunting workload? I wonder what kind of a view the people in charge of what has to be taught and in what kind of a time period have of the teacher's profession. Makes one ponder if education would be more effective if there was time to teach and time to learn.

In conclusion, this study set out to hear the experiences and thoughts of English teachers about writing and its affect to their motivation. The research questions aimed to see 1) what teachers thought about writing, 2) in the teachers' perspective, what kind of writing tasks they used and how they taught writing, and 3) what kind of an effect the teachers felt writing had on their motivation. Thus, the theoretical framework for this study explored literature on second language writing, as I argued that English language teaching in Finland could be considered to be like second language teaching, literacy and writing as a skill, evaluating writing, motivation and guides for using writing. The study was conducted by interviewing eight secondary or upper secondary school English teachers in Central and Southern Finland, and several of the interview questions were inspired by suggestions in the literature. I wanted to know what experienced teachers thought about these suggestions and methods for using writing: whether these ideas were used in reality.

The data gathered from these interviews was analysed qualitatively using content analysis, as the purpose of this study was to hear the thoughts and experiences of these teachers. The results of this study found that the interviewed teachers all consider writing to be an important part of the language skill, and that the most important consideration in using writing tasks is time, more specifically, the lack of it. They all use a wide, innovative variety of writing tasks in both secondary and upper secondary school, even though writing receives clearly more emphasis in upper secondary school. However, this emphasis is exactly what the National core curricula for both basic education (2014) and upper secondary school (2015) instructs.

The interviewed teachers use written feedback on student writing, and although error correction seems to be the most commonly used method, the teachers brought up the importance of verbal feedback. The teachers do emphasize the content and quality of the writing instead of mere language accuracy, which is a very positive discovery. Again, the reason for teachers not being able to give the kind of feedback they would think best is the lack of time. The most significant factors in writing-related teacher motivation are student enthusiasm and motivation, exactly as the literature suggested, and quite surprisingly, the use of creative writing. Five out of eight teachers emphasized the role of student-written fiction or poetry as having a very positive effect on their motivation.

As was already suggested, no true generalizations can be made based on only eight teachers, but there are patterns arising even in this data that suggest further research is needed. Such patterns would be, for example, the role of creative writing in both student and teacher motivation and its effect on learning, and Finnish students' perceptions of their writing skills. It is definitely worth studying if writing in English places too much emphasis on error correction and language accuracy, and if this leads to students becoming increasingly more insecure about their writing. I think it would be also worth further research to see if teaching writing, that is writing as the kind of skill discussed in this thesis, more prominently in secondary school would improve students writing skills and their confidence in their abilities. The key to becoming a good writer, as for example Hedge (2005) stated, is practice. I believe it would be beneficial to allow Finnish students opportunities to practice the process of writing and understanding writing as a skill already before upper secondary school.

## 7. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alaste J. (2008). *The English language teacher as a motivator*. Unpublished Proseminar thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of languages.  
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/18902>
- Asunmaa I. (2015). *Writing tasks in EFL teaching: Analysis of the writing tasks in Finnish schoolbooks*. Unpublished Proseminar thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of languages.  
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/46069>
- Bandura A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: the exercise of control*. New York: Freeman cop.
- Bennett H. (2005). *The ultimate teachers' handbook*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Bitchener J., Young S., Cameron D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing, *Journal of Second Language Writing* 14, 191-205.
- Dufva H. (2011). Ei kysyvä tieltä eksy: kuinka tutkia kielten oppimista ja opettamista haastattelun avulla in P. Kalaja, R. Alanen and H. Dufva (eds.), *Kieltä tutkimassa: tutkielman laatijan opas*. Tampere: Tammerprint, 131-145.
- Durr T., Chang M. and Carson R. (2014). Curbing teacher burnout: the transactional factors of teacher efficacy and emotion management. In P. Richardson, S. Karabenick and H. Watt (eds.), *Teacher motivation: theory and practice*. New York: Routledge, 198-213.
- Dörnyei Z. (2001). *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei Z., Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Motivation* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Harlow: Longman.
- Elinkeinoelämän keskusliitto. (2014). *Kielten opiskelu vastaa heikosti työelämän tarpeisiin*. <http://ek.fi/ajankohtaista/tiedotteet/2014/05/08/kielten-opiskelu-vastaa-heikosti-tyoelaman-tarpeisiin/> (18 May, 2016).
- Ferris D. (2007). Preparing teachers to respond to student writing, *Journal of Second Language Writing* 16, 165-193.
- Gardner R. (2010). *Motivation and second language acquisition: the socio-educational model*. New York: Peter Lang cop.
- Gemeda F., Tynjälä P. (2015). *Exploring teachers' motivation for teaching and professional development in Ethiopia: voices from the field*. *Journal of Studies of Education*, 5 (2), 169-186.
- Harmer J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hedge T. (2005). *Writing* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hietala J. (2015). *Finnish upper secondary school EFL teacher's satisfaction with current textbooks*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of languages.  
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/45950>

- Hyland K. (2003). *Second language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaski-Akhawan H. (2013). *Teaching and learning oral skills in Finnish upper secondary school: a study of students' and teachers' views on oral skills education*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of languages.  
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/41259>
- Kaski H. (2009). *English language teachers' job satisfaction in upper secondary schools in Finland*. Unpublished Proseminar thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of languages.  
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/20323>
- Karjalainen R. (2016). *“Write in English on your notebook”: analysis of creative writing exercises in a Finnish EFL workbook*. Unpublished Proseminar thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of languages.  
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/49226>
- Kern R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klassen R., Durksen T. and Tze V. (2014). Teacher's self-efficacy beliefs: ready to move from theory to practice? In P. Richardson, S. Karabenick and H. Watt (eds.), *Teacher motivation: theory and practice*. New York: Routledge, 100-113.
- Konttinen M. (2009). *The reality of teacher written feedback: a quantitative study*. Unpublished Proseminar thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of languages.  
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/20117>
- Kunter M. and Holzberger D. (2014). Loving teaching: research on teachers' intrinsic orientations. In P. Richardson, S. Karabenick and H. Watt (eds.), *Teacher motivation: theory and practice*. New York: Routledge, 83-99.
- Leppänen J. (2011). *The job satisfaction of English teachers in Finnish elementary, middle and upper secondary schools*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of languages.  
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/27153>
- Lukion opetussuunnitelman perusteet 2015*. Finnish National Board of Education [online].  
[http://www.oph.fi/download/172124\\_lukion\\_opetussuunnitelman\\_perusteet\\_2015.pdf](http://www.oph.fi/download/172124_lukion_opetussuunnitelman_perusteet_2015.pdf). (28 April, 2016).
- Länsikallio R. and Ilves V. (2016). *Opetusalan työolobarometri*. Opetusalan ammattijärjestö [online].  
<http://www.oaj.fi/cs/oaj/OAJn%20tyoolobarometri%20> (18 May, 2016).
- Manousou A. (2015). *L2 writing and L2 written feedback in upper secondary school as experienced by teachers*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of languages.  
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/47995>
- Mäenpää M. (2005). *Teachers of English in Finnish upper secondary general school and their job satisfaction*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of languages.  
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/7391>
- Niemelä M. (2012). *“I'll believe it when I see it”: a study of English and German teachers' beliefs about and use of motivational strategies*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of languages.  
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/38296>
- Nikander P., Hyvärinen, M., Ruusuvoori, J. (2010). *Haastattelun analyysi*. Tampere:

Vastapaino.

*Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet 2014*. Finnish National Board of Education [online].  
[http://www.oph.fi/download/163777\\_perusopetuksen\\_opetussuunnitelman\\_perusteet\\_2014.pdf](http://www.oph.fi/download/163777_perusopetuksen_opetussuunnitelman_perusteet_2014.pdf). (28 April, 2016).

Polio C., Williams J. (2011). Teaching and testing writing. In Long, M., Doughty, C. (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Teaching*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 486-517.

Reid, G. (2007). *Motivating learners in the classroom: ideas and strategies*. London: Paul Chapman Pub.

Ruusuvuori J., Tiittula, L., Aaltonen, T. (2005). *Haastattelu: tutkimus, tilanteet ja vuorovaikutus*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Tileston Walker D. (2011). *10 Best teaching practices: how brain research and learning styles define teaching competencies* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin cop.

*Toisen kotimaisen ja vieraiden kielten kokeiden määräykset 2011*.

Ylioppilastutkintolautakunta [online].

[https://www.ylioppilastutkinto.fi/images/sivuston\\_tiedostot/Ohjeet/Koekohtaiset/fi\\_maaraykset\\_kielikokeet.pdf](https://www.ylioppilastutkinto.fi/images/sivuston_tiedostot/Ohjeet/Koekohtaiset/fi_maaraykset_kielikokeet.pdf). (28 April, 2016)

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

Turunen J. (2014). *An English teacher's ways of motivating students in Dangerous Minds and Dead Poets Society*. Unpublished Proseminar thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of languages.

<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/46512>

Urduan T. (2014). Concluding commentary: understanding teacher motivation: what is known and what is there to learn. In P. Richardson, S. Karabenick and H. Watt (eds.), *Teacher motivation: theory and practice*. New York: Routledge, 227-245.

Weigle Cushing S. (2002). *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## APPENDIX I: Framework for interviews

### Taustakysymykset

- Kauanko olet ollut opettajana? Mitä asteita tai kursseja opetat nyt?
- Minkä kokoinen koulu on? Tiedätkö oppilas- ja opettajamääriä?
- Onko sinulla suosikkiastetta tai kurssia mitä opettaa?

### Kirjoittamisen käyttö opetuksessa

- Yleisesti millaisia kokemuksia ja ajatuksia sinulla on tekstien kirjoittamisesta oppilailla?
- Millaisia tekstejä oppilaasi viimeksi kirjoittivat?
- Millaisia kirjoitustehtäviä olet yleensä käyttänyt ja tulet käyttämään? Miksi?
- Mikä on paras teettämäsi kirjoitustehtävä? *Muista kysyä perusteluja*
- Oletko kokenut jonkin kirjoitustehtävän epäonnistuneen?
- Oletteko kirjoittaneet fiktiota, runoja tai muita luovemman kategorian tuotoksia?
- Oletko laittanut oppilaat kirjoittamaan päiväkirjaa tai kirjeitä opettajalle?
- Oletko antanut tehtäviä ilman maksimipituutta?
- Onko tullut vastaan plagioituja tekstejä? Jos on, miten olet tunnistanut ne?
- Kirjoitutatko oppilailla luokassa? Kuinka paljon he kirjoittavat kotona?
- Esittelevätkö oppilaat tekstejään toisilleen tai laittavat niitä näyttille kurssin sivuille tai luokkaan?
- Kuinka tärkeää tekstien kirjoittaminen sinusta on?
- Pitäisikö mielestäsi tekstin kirjoittamiseen kiinnittää enemmän huomiota yleisesti opetuksessa? Entä johonkin muuhun kielen osa-alueeseen?
- Koetko opettavasi kirjoittamista taitona, esimerkiksi miten kirjoitetaan hyvä teksti?

### Palaute

- Miten korjaat kirjoitustehtävät ja millaista palautetta annat? Mihin asioihin kiinnität huomiota ja miksi?
- Laitatko oppilaita korjaamaan omia tekstejään? Moniko oppilas haluaa korjata itse?
- Oletko käyttänyt prosessikirjoitusta?
- Oletko laittanut oppilaat lukemaan tai antamaan palautetta toistensa tekstejä?
- Kertooko teksti oppilaan taitotason?
- Paljonko aikaa ja työtä tekstien korjaaminen ja palautteen antaminen vaatii?

### Motivaatio

- Miten olet kokenut yleisesti oppilaiden suhtautuvan kirjoittamiseen?
- Miten kirjoittaminen vaikuttaa omaan motivaatioosi ja jaksamiseesi?
- Miten oppilaiden suhtautuminen vaikuttaa omaan motivaatioosi?
- Koetko oppilaiden arvostavan käyttämäsi aikaa ja tekemääsi työtä?
- Onko sinulla mieleenpainuvia kokemuksia kirjoittamiseen liittyvistä tilanteista, jotka ovat vaikuttaneet motivaatioosi?
- Onko jotain, mitä haluaisit lisätä tai sanoa?

## APPENDIX II: English translations of the interview quotes

(1) *“Niin, kyl se niin, et tavallaan osana, osana, mut ettei niinkun sillä tavalla, että jotenkin musta niinkun tuntuu, että monille on hyvin vaikee niinkun suomenkielelläkään nykyään. Mä en sit tiedä kuinka paljon sit niin kuin aineita, oikeesti aineita nykyään kirjetetaan, että niistä harvoin ainakaan puhutaan tuolla mutta. Mutta tietysti varmaan että sen tekstin tuottamisen kannalta ja lauseen muodostamisen oppimisen kannalta niin se on niinku yks niinkun tärkee, tärkee osa, yhtä tärkee osa tässä kuin kaikki muutkin.” - Olavi*

(1) "Yeah, it is, kind of as part, part of it, but not so that, that I kind of feel that it is very difficult for many even in Finnish nowadays. I don't know how many, like, essays, actual essays are written nowadays, at least they are rarely spoken of over there but. But of course for the sake of producing text and learning to form sentences it is like, like one important, important part, as important a part of this as everything else." - Olavi

(2) *“Musta se on olennainen osa kielen taitamista, ja, ja se on tietysti semmonen asia, jossa pääsee myös puuttumaan oikeakielisyyteen ja siihen kielitaitoon, niinkun selkeimmin. Koska jos puhutaan, niin emmä ainakaan rupea korjaamaan toisten virheitä, koska silloin on huomio muussa asiassa. Mut aineessa voi sit vielä katsoa, että missä kohdassa on, on vaikeuksia ja hankaluuksia, mitä pitää vielä opiskella, eli semmosta kielen tarkkuutta on helppo siinä korjata ja ohjata oikeaan suuntaan. Mitä joka tapauksessa niinkun et, et siinä tuotetaan omia ajatuksia, sehän kertoo ihan hirveesti opiskelijan kielitaidosta, kuinka hyvää tekstiä tuotetaan.” - Maria*

(2) "I think it's an essential part of language skills, and, and it's of course something through which you can draw attention to the language accuracy and the language skill most clearly. Because if we're speaking, I'm not going to go correcting other people's mistakes because that's when your attention is on other things. But in the essay you can check where the difficulties and challenges are, what still needs to be studied, so the accuracy of the language can be easily corrected and guided in the right direction. In any case it's like that, that you produce your own thoughts, and it says an awfully lot about a student's language skill, how good the produced text is." – Maria

(3) *“On se tärkee, ja siin on myös sitte se, että siinä näkee aika monenlaisia asioita. Et kylhän siinä näkee sit sitä sanastonkäyttämistä ja sitten sitä semmosta, niinku sitä kielitaitoo, mut sit siinä näkyy myös sellanen, mitä mä oon joskus miettiny, et kuin paljon se nyt sais sit vaikuttaa tai pitäiskö sen vaikuttaa enemmänkin, niin semmosta ajattelun taitoo. Et niinku tavallaan miten ne rakentaa sen tekstinsä, miten looginen se on, miten johdonmukanen se on, miten paljon siinä on asiaa. Et jos se on vaan semmosta niinku mun äidinkielenopettaja lukiossa aikoinaan sano, et pelkkää kynäpyörytystä paperilla, et vaikka se ois kuinka kieliopillisesti oikein ja fiiniä sanoja, mut jos se on ihan silkkoo sisältä, ni mites sitten. Ja kielissähän niillä yleensä on päässy aika hyviin pisteisiin, kun jotenkin tuntuu, että sitä katotaan vaan niinku sitä kielen rikkautta, ei sitä ajattelua.” - Paula*

(3) "It is important, and there's that too, that you can see a lot of things from it. Like you can see how the vocabulary is used and then like the language skill, but it also shows that, what I've thought about sometimes, that how much it should affect or if it should affect more, the art of thinking. Like how they structure their texts, how logical it is, how coherent it is, how much content does it have. If it's just, like what my Finnish teacher in upper secondary school used to say, rolling the pen around on the paper, no matter how grammatically correct it is and how fancy the vocabulary is, if there is no content, what then. And in languages you've usually been able to get good scores with just that because somehow it feels that only the richness of the language is looked at, not the thinking." - Paula

(4) *“No, itse asiassa tähän me pystytään paremmin vasta siellä mediassa käymään läpi. Et siel me käydään eri, eri tekstityyppejä lävitse, miten kirjetetaan. Mut ohan se tietysti ihan kolmoskurssissakin ne kirjottaa sen muodollisen kirjeen ja muuta sellasta. Tähän vois vielä enemmän mun mielestä nois peruskursseillaki kiinnittää huomiota. Luojan kiitos meillä on koulussa tämmönen vielä, tämmönen mediakurssi, mis on käydään- siis sehän on kokonaan vaan kirjottamista ja sit siinä niinku analysoidaan myöskin eri tekstityyppejä ja, ja just sitä, että miten hyvä teksti kirjetetaan, et se ei oo mitään semmosta kehäpäättelyä, et pyöritään se saman asian ympärillä, vaan loogisesti jatketaan asiasta toiseen luontevasti. Eli tää on tärkee taito, ja sitä pitäis opettaa enemmän. Mut kun noilla peruskursseilla on aina kiire. Aina.” – Kaija*

(4) “Well, actually we can't go over this better until the media course. There we go over different text types, how to write. But of course they write the formal letter and such on the third course. I think this could get more attention on the basic courses. Thank god we still have this kind, this kind of a media course where we go over- I mean it's all about writing and then there's like the analysis of different text types and, and precisely how to write a good text, so that it's not just circular deduction, repeating the same thing, but logically moving on from

one thing to another fluently. So this is an important skill and it should be taught more. But there's always the need to hurry on the basic courses. Always." - Kaija

(5) *"Se kertoo jotain kirjottamisen taitotasosta, mutta ei tokikaan kerro kaikista, kaikista taidoista lähellekään kaikkee. Et se kertoo jotain kirjottamisesta, ja sit tietysti riippuu, et minkälainen se kirjoitustyö on, että itekin huomaa, et sit joku semmonen, joka on vaikka että arvioidaan joku essee, niin se saattaa olla hyvin, hyvin ansiokas ja tarkkaan mietitty ja selkeesti näkee, et sitä on todella niinku hiottu. Ja sitte taas semmonen kun näkee saman opiskelijan tekemän esimerkiks semmosen vapaamman kirjoitushomman, niin, niin ymmärtää sen, että miten hirveän niinku suuri tavallaan sit se on ero siinä, kun ei käytetä välttämättä sitä sanakirjaa, ei tarkisteta kaikkee, vaan ihan tuotetaan sitä kieltä."* - Tuija

(5) "It says something about the skill level of writing, but of course not nearly everything about all, all skills. So it says something about writing and of course it depends on the type of the writing task, like I notice myself that like something, like evaluating an essay, it might be very, very good and well thought-of and you can clearly see that it is polished. And then seeing a like a more informal writing thing by the same student, you can understand that there's like a very big difference in it when they don't necessarily use a dictionary, not check everything, but just produce the language." - Tuija

(6) *"(...) pääsääntöisesti mä semmosen oikein kunnan, kunnan aineen mä kirjoitutan niillä ysillä, si-sillä lailla, että mä käyn läpi niinkun ainekirjotuksen perusteita niin laajasti kun mä nyt pystyn. Ja mä kehtaan tässä tunnustaa, että mä käytän kyllä hyvin pitkälti pohjana si-sitä, mitä mä ite muistan lukioajoilta, että mä käyn-siitä kirjoitelman pituudesta me puhutaan ja, ja aineen rakenteesta ja, ja tota ne saa tehdä sen kirjoitelmansa siten, että ne, itse asiassa niiden pitääkin valmistautuu siihen jonkun verran etukäteen. Et kun se on se eka kerta, ni mä annan niiden tota, mä annan niiden tulla sinne ainekirjotustilaisuuteen valmiin rungon kanssa, esimerkiks. Jos ne on nähneet vaivaa ja haluavat miettiä sitä aineen rakennetta jo kotona valmiiksi, niin se on minusta niinku oookoo siinä tilanteessa. Sitten ne tulevat vaan sinne ainekirjotustunnille ja kirjottavat sen kirjoitelmansa ja minä sen sitten korjaan ja arvioin, numerona, numeroilla 4-10."* - Jouni

(6) "(...) mainly I have them write a proper, proper essay on the ninth grade, li-like that I go over like the basics of essay writing as extensively as I can. And I dare to admit here that I mainly use as a basis what I can remember from my time in upper secondary school, like we talk about the length of the text and, and the structure of the essay and, and well they can write their essay so that they, actually they're supposed to do some preparation in advance. So that when it's the first time, I let them, well, I let them come to the writing situation with a ready structure, for example. If they've gone through the trouble and want to finish the structure of their essay already at home, I think it's like okay in that situation. Then they come to the writing class and write their essay and I correct it and evaluate it with a grade, grades 4-10." - Jouni

(7) *"Nyt viimeaikoina mä oon alkanu miettiin enempi vielä sitä, että miten sais sen elementin mukaan, että oppilaat oikeasti valitsisivat siinä tehtävän yhteydessä jotain asioita, joita he tekevät. Et he itse niinku osallistuvat sen tehtävän luomiseen. Mun mielestä se olis aika mielekästä sen sijaan, että mä määrittelen ihan kaiken. Et se on aika hankalaakin silleen, jos miettii, että mä haluaisin arvioida tiettyjä asioita, et mun pitää tarjota se tietty rakenne siihen tai se tietty, et mitä heidän pitää tehdä, mutta että mä tarjoaisin heille mahdollisuuden valita siihen, miten he sen tekee tai millaisia elementtejä he käyttää, minkälaisen tarinan he luo siihen, siihen tehtävään."* - Laura

(7) "Now lately I've started thinking even more about how to include the element of students actually choosing some things they do in the task. So that they participate in creating the task themselves. I think it is better than me defining everything. So it's kind of difficult like if you consider that I'd want to evaluate certain things, like I have to offer that specific structure for it or that specific, like what they have to do, but that I'd offer them the opportunity to choose how they do it or what kind of elements they use, what kind of a story they create for the, the task." - Laura

(8) *"Paljon. Isoilla kirjaimilla. Paljon. Kyl se vie aikaa. Ja sit varsinkin, jos sen yrittää tehdä sillain niinku, niinku mä nyt oon noitten ENA-ysiläisten kanssa yrittäny tehdä sillain, et ne sais niinku mahdollisimman semmosta ohja- niinku eteenpäinohjaavaa palautetta myös. Et mä oon lukenu ne tekstit varmaan ainakin kolmeen kertaan ja, ja miettiny niitä korjauksia ja miettiny et, miten mä sanosin tän toisin ja sillain. Niin kyllä niihin menee aikaa. (...)"* - Paula

(8) "A lot. In capital letters. A lot. It takes time. And especially if you try to do like, like I've tried to with the ENA9- students, so that they'd get like feedback that guides like them forward as well as possible. So I've read the texts like at least three times and thought about the corrections and thought that how I'd say this thing in another way and so on. So yes, they take time. (...)" - Paula

(9) *“Mut siinä, siinä oli plagiointia ihan selkeesti. Ja ne oli yrittäny vähän muokata sitä jotkut sitä tekstiä - muutama teki, ei kaikki - ni vähän muokata sitä, et niinku oli jotain sanoja vaihdettu, mutta et tunnisti heti, et ei, tää ei oo omaa tekstiä. Ni se, siinä mä mietin sitä just, et mites tää tälleen meni. Sit mä aattelin, et ehkä parempi, ehkä jos niil on kauheesti, ja on kauheesti töitä niin, ehkä siirtäski enempi kouluun sitä työskentelyä. Et miks sen tarttee olla välttämättä kotityö, et kotonahan ne voi tehdä mieluummin vaikka niitä kirjan tehtäviä, niin tehtäskin se projekti tunnilla.” - Laura*

(9) *“But that, that was plagiarism very clearly. And some of them had tried to modify the text – a few did, not all – modify it a little bit, like a few words had been changed, but that you could see instantly that no, this isn’t produced by them. Like that, there I was just thinking precisely that, how did it go this way. Then I thought that maybe it’s better that if they have an awfully, awfully lot of work to do that maybe we can do more in school. Like why does it necessarily have to be homework, like they could rather do like the exercises in the book at home, and we could do the project in class.” - Laura*

(10) *“Pitäskö vastata tälleen Matti Nykäsesti, että fifty-sixty tai sixty-fifty. Kyl mä yritän siihen, että jos, jos sillä kurssilla ei kirjojeta kun esimerkiks yks yo-ainetta vastaava aine, ni et se kirjojetaan koulussa. Et siihen tulee tavallaan se semmonen ajallinen tietty, tietty ajalliset raamit ja myös sitten niinku se, että nyt kirjojetaan tää ilman mitään apuneuvoja. Mutta sit esimerkiksi ne kulttuurikurssin tuokset, niin ne on kyl kirjojettu kaikki kotona. Mut ne ei sitten saanu mitään muita läksyjä eikä muita sillain, ja niillä oli pitkästi aikaa ja ne ties, että nää on nyt tän kurssin niinku se suoritus. Niin et taas jälleen kerran, et se riippuu ihan siitä mitä tavotetta varten kirjojetaan, minkälaista tekstityyppiä, mihin sillä pyritään, ni siitä ja vähän ajastakin, joskus. Joskus ei vaan, et jos kurssilla on 24 tuntii, siellä ei kauheen montaa ainetta pysty luokassa kirjottamaan.” - Paula*

(10) *“Maybe I should answer like Matti Nykänen that fifty-sixty or sixty-fifty. Like I aim for that, that if, if we don’t write more than one essay that is like the matriculation examination essay, that we write it in school. So that it has the kind of, kind of limit of time, and there’s also like that now we’re writing without any aids. But then of course the products of the culture course, those have all been written at home. But they didn’t get any other homework or other such things, and they had a lot of time and they knew that these are the things required for the course. So that once again, it just depends on the aim of the writing, what kind of a text type, what’s the goal of it, so that and on time a bit too, sometimes. Sometimes it’s just, that if the course has 24 lessons, you can’t write that many essays in class.” - Paula*

(11) *“Tekevät sekä että, mutta yleensä oppitunnista en käytä hirveen paljon aikaa, varsinkaan jos ne on jotain tämmösiä oppikirjateemoja, kappaleisiin liittyviä tehtäviä. Me yleensä, mä huolehdin sen, että me alotetaan tunnilla, että jokainen pääsee kunnolla alkuun ja mä pyrin, pyrin kans katsoon, että ne, niillä on siel jotain, koska muuten ne unohtaa ne tai sitten niille jotenkin, jos ei se lähde ollenkaan se runosuoni sykkimään, niin se voi olla, et se jää kotona sit tekemättä. Mut sit niiden on helpompi muistaa se, että semmonen tehtävä tuli ja, ja että sitä jatkaa, jos on tunnilla sitä alottanu, mutta aikaahan siihen menee koulussa kovastikin, jos niitä täällä kirjottaa.” - Jouni*

(11) *“They do both, but usually I don’t use a lot of time from the lesson, especially if they’re some textbook themes, exercises connected to the chapters. Usually we, I make sure that we begin in class, so that everyone gets started properly and I aim, aim to see that they, they have something there, since otherwise they forget it or then some of them can’t get their inspiration flowing, somehow, so it might be that at home they won’t get the task done. But then it’s easier for them to remember it, that they got a task like this and, and to continue it, if they’ve began writing in class, but it takes loads of time in school, if you write here.” - Jouni*

(12) *“Koska mä oon huomannu, että monille se on hirveen hyvää vaihtelua. Täällä on aika paljon semmosta, nykyään varsinkin, niin suositaan aika paljon pari- ja ryhmätyöskentelyä. Toisaalta ne tykkää siitä, mut toisaalta monet on sit sellasia, et ne tykkää myöskin yksilötyöskentelystä. Jotenki se jotenkin se rauhoittaa sitä niinku päivää, kun saa keskittyä vaan siihen omaan, et kaikki ei oo sit- Ja sit se ääni myöskin, et ei oo se niinku tavallaan semmonen puheensorina koko ajan siellä, et tota. (...)” - Tuija*

(12) *“Because I’ve noticed that for many it’s excellent variety. Pair and group work, especially nowadays, is quite popular. On one hand they like it, but on the other hand a lot of them like working alone as well. Somehow it kind of calms the, like the day, when you can just focus on your own, like not everything is- and it’s the sound too, that it’s not like the constant noise, so that. (...)” - Tuija*

(13) *“Kirjottaminen kyl tehään aika suurelta osin kotona. Meil koulussa tehään koeaineet ja semmoset ja alotellaan ehkä kirjojusta, mutta mä luulen, että se kotiympäristö voi olla parempi kun luokassa kirjottaminen. Abikursseilla kirjojetaan kyllä aineita luokassakin, semmoset missä niinkun nimenomaan sitä ainekirjojusta harjoitellaan. Ja sit varmasti näillä media- ja tai mediakursseilla nimenomaan kirjoitetaan paljon koulussa.*

*Mutta muilla kurseilla niin, niin joo, ehkä jotain lyhyempiä kirjotelmia kirjoitetaan koulussa, mutta mun mielestä koulutunnit käytetään enemmänkin suulliseen esitykseen ja puhumiseen siis.” – Maria*

(13) “Writing is mostly done at home. At school we do exam essays and the like and maybe begin writing, but I think that the home environment could be better than writing in class. We do write essays in class on the course that prepares students for the matriculation examination, the kind where you like practice writing an essay. And then of course on these media- and or media courses there’s a lot of writing in school. But on other courses well, well yes, maybe some shorter texts are done in school, but I think school lessons are used more often on oral communication and speaking that is.” - Maria

*(14) “Joo, eli jos on näitä näitä tämmösiä niinku puhuin, et on tehty näitä tämmösiä julistetyyppisiä mainoksia ja tota tämmösiä esittelyjulisteita ja näin pois päin, niin niitä on sitten tuolla yleensä aina laitetaan esille tonne taululle. Ja sit on, jos on tämmönen lyhyt, lyhyt kirjoitustehtävä, niin aika usein sitte tota me sitten luetaan niitä pienessä ryhmässä toisille, pareittain tai pienessä ryhmässä että joskus saattaa olla, että niitä ei niinku sitten tarkemmin käydä läpikään eli mä en niinku tarkasta niitä tai korjaa vaan et se on se viestin, viestin tuottaminen, tekstin tuottaminen on niinku se tärkeempi siinä hommassa.” – Olavi*

(14) “Yeah, so if there are these, that if we’ve made these, these kind of poster type advertisements and so on, like I was saying, so they are usually put up on the board. And there’s, if there’s a short, short writing task, so pretty often we, well, we read them in a small group to others, in pairs or in a small group that sometimes it might be that they aren’t like really gone through more precisely than that, so that I don’t like check or correct them, but it’s the producing the message, message, creating text that is the like the more important thing there.” - Olavi

*(15) “(...) Yks [posterin] purkumuoto ja välttämättä niitä ei aina esitellä suullisesti, vaan yks purkukeino tietysti on semmonen, mitä mä oon käyttäny paljon, tämmönen niinkun näyttelytyyppinen, et laitetaan seinille niitä, vaikka käytäville. Ja sitten niihin saattaa olla liitetty myöskin kysymyksiä, jotta tavallaan mä pystyn varmistamaan, että on oikeesti tapahtunu jotain aivotoimintaa siellä, kun kierrellään käytävillä niin, niin tota, ne projektitöiden kirjottajat on myöskin sitten kirjottanu jotain kysymyksiä siitä sisällöstä. Sitten niinku niitä luetaan ja vastataan kysymyksiin ja tavallaan sitä kautta tutustutaan niihin toisten, toisten töihin, ja nimenomaan sisällön näkökulmasta, et mä aattelen, et se on kuitenkin opettajan työ ensisijaisesti sitä kieltä pohtia, että opettaja on kielen ammattilainen ja oppilaat sitten antaa muun kielistä palautetta toisilleen.” – Tuija*

(15) “(...) One way to deal with [a poster] and they aren’t necessarily always presented orally, but one way to handle them is something that I’ve used a lot, this kind of a exhibiton where they’re put on walls or in the corridors. And then there can be questions attached to them, so that I can kind of make sure that some kind of brain activity has taken place when we’re going around in the corridors, so, so that well, the writers of the project work have also written some questions about the content. Then we like read them and answer the questions and kind of get to know each, each other’s work through the point of view of the content, so I think that it’s the teacher’s job to primarily look at the language, as the teacher is the language professional and the students give each other other kinds of feedback.” - Tuija

*(16) “Ne on aika arkoja laittaa mihinkään esille. (...) Mut siinä täytyy miettiä, et miten sen tekee, et jos siel on oppilaita, jotka on hirmu arkoja, jotka ei oikeen niinku, ihan paniikissa pelkäävät sitä, että se tuotos näytetään jollekin. Ethän sä vaan, niinku, lue sitä ääneen tai ethän sä, et eihän tätä lue kukaan. Ja lukiolaisissa sama, kun ne palauttaa Showbiehin, niin aika monet, että eihän nää näy sitten muille. S-se niinkun tavallaan se näkymä. Juu, ei näy. (naurua) (...) Et oisko amerikkalaiset vähän ulospäinsuuntautuneempia. Et en tiää, se on vähän vaikee siihen niinku muutosta silleen äkkiseltään saaha aikaseks enkä mä tiää tarviikokaan. Et kenenkään ei tarvi miettiä, että tää nyt oli surkee ja toi on ihan hyvä, ja se on ihan liikaa semmosta. Mutta et toisaalta tehään silleen, kun tuntuu hyvältä. Mun mielestä se on parempi.” – Laura*

(16) “They’re kind of timid to put anything out anywhere. (...) But you have to consider how you’ll do it, that if you have students who are really timid, who don’t like, who are scared in a panic of their work being shown to someone. Please don’t, like, read it aloud or or please don’t, no one will read this, right? And it’s the same for upper secondary school students, when they return something in Showbie, so a lot of them are like these won’t show to others, will they? Th-the kind of view. No, it won’t. (laughter). (...) Maybe Americans are a bit more extroverted. Well, I don’t know, it’s a bit difficult to suddenly try to make change in it and I don’t know if it’s necessary either. Like that nobody has to think that well this was terrible and that was okay and it’s far too much of that. But then again we do what feels good. I think it’s better.” - Laura

*(17) “No aika usein mä, niinku mä sanoin, niin mä teetan niinku kurssikokeen yhteydessä pienen kirjoitelman, koska perustelen sitä sillä, että, että tota, eähm, pitäis niinku jatkuvasti testata oppilaitten semmosta omaa*

*tuottamistaitoo. Niin ollen, kun mä pidän ison kokeen, jossa on sanastoo ja kielioppia, niin mä en haluu, että se on pelkästään sellanen, että ulkoo opetellaan jotain juttuja ja niitä testataan, vaan että aina niinku isossa kokeessa on pieni joku semmonen kirjutustehtävä. Niin, niin tota ihan eniten mä käytän niitä, että, että mulla on siinä just semmonen joku, se voi olla otsikko vaan, keksi siitä ja kirjota tai sitten että, että kuvaile näitä tapahtumia tai kerro mielipiteitäsi tähän asiaan. Ja sitten on muutama semmonen niinku vinkki tai apukysymys esimerkiks siellä, että voit kuvailla esimerkiks näitä asioita, mutta yleensä niin, että ne liittyy just niihin niinku kurssin asiasisältöihin, että sitten ois vähän niinku tukee siitä sanastosta, mitä on lukenu, just kirjan kappaleista, tai mitä on harjoteltu sanakokeisiin tai sitä koetta varten. Et harvemmin teetän semmosia ihan vapaita kirjotelmia, niinku sem-semmossa luovaa tarinankerrontaa ihan mistä tahansa aiheesta koko ryhmällä.” - Lotta*

(17) “Well pretty often I, like I said, I have a little writing assignment along with the exam, because I base it on that, that well, uhm, we should like continuously test the students ability to produce. So that when I have a proper exam where there’s vocabulary and grammar, so I don’t want it to be just something where you memorize some things and test those, but that there’s always some kind of a writing task in a big exam. So, so that mostly I use those where I have just some kind of a, it can be just a headline, invent something about it and write or then something like describe these events or describe your opinion about this matter. And then there’s a few like kind of a hint or an aid question, for example, like you can describe for example these things, but most often so that they’re connected to just like the themes of the course, so that they could like get support from the vocabulary they’ve read, from like the chapters of the book or what has been practiced for vocabulary tests or the exam. I rarely assign like completely free writing, like the kind of, kind of creative story-telling about any topic, to the whole group.” - Lotta

(18) “(...) Jos mä vielä toisen esimerkin kerron, yläkoulussa niin tota mulla oli semmonen viimeks, että mä annoin niille, niillä oli tää työelämä aiheena, työhaastatteluja tehdään tällä hetkellä, niin mä tulostin semmosia kaikkia kuvia kaikista lapsista ja nuorista ja teini-ikäisistä, ja sitten he sai ensin valita vaan sieltä mieleisensä kuvan. Ja sitten siihen kuvan ympärille heidän piti kappaleen sanastoa hyödyntäen kirjottaa semmonen, ää semmonen, semmonen et luotiin tulevaisuus sille hahmolle, ja ne sai kirjottaa siitä hahmosta ja keksiä sille. Ja sit siinäkin oli, et pitää käyttää tiettyä sanastoa. Et se oli se sanastotesti. Et tää on nyt ihan selkeesti mulla tää sanastotestijuttu.” - Laura

(18) “(...) If I’ll tell you yet another example, in secondary school, well, I gave them, their topic is work life, we’re doing job interviews at the moment, so I printed all these pictures of children and adolescents and teenagers, and then first they got to pick out a picture they liked. And then they had to write, um, a kind of, a kind of, that we wrote a future for the character using the picture and the vocabulary of the chapter, they were allowed to write about the character and invent for him or her. That it was the vocabulary test. Like it’s clearly a thing for me this vocabulary test thing.” - Laura

(19) “Mä tänään annoin tehtäväksi, ne ei oo nyt vielä kirjottaneet sitä, mutta tämmösen Doctor Jekyll and Mr Hyde, eli kirjasta tehtävän, tota, erivät mielipiteet, plusmiinus, pros and cons, jostaki asiasta. Ja edellinen oli varmaankin samalle ryhmälle tämmönen pieni kirjutustehtävä amerikkalaisesta koulusta, minkälainen kuva siitä välittyy telkkarin välityksellä, minkälainen on amerikkalainen koulu. (...) mitä kirjetetaan niin, niin tota hyvin monenlaista tekstiä ja yks mistä mä oon tykänny paljon on se, et me ollaan kuunneltu, et meil ei oo mitään... Se ei ollu mikään oppilaan oma tuotos, vaan ollaan kuunneltu tai katsottu videopätkä, esimerkiks tehtiin Georgia O’Keeffestä tällainen, eli kolme pätkää katsottiin hänestä ja ihan tuntematon taiteilija opiskelijoille, ja näiden pätkien perusteella piti sit kirjottaa juttu, kuka on Georgia O’Keeffe, mitä hän on tehnyt.” - Maria

(19) “Today I assigned, they haven’t written it yet, but this kind of a Doctor Jekyll and Mr Hyde, a task about a book, well, differing opinions, plus minus, pros and cons, about something. And the previous one was probably assigned to the same group, this little writing task about American school, what kind of an image is given of it through television, what is American school like. (...) what is written so, so, like, very different kinds of text and one that I’ve really liked a lot is that we’ve been listening to, that we don’t have anything... It wasn’t a student’s own creation, but we’ve been listening to and watching a video clip, for example we did a task like this about Georgia O’Keeffe, so we watched three video clips about her and she was a completely unknown artist to the students, and they had to write a piece based on these clips, who is Georgia O’Keeffe, what has she done.” - Maria

(20) “No nyt me ollaan käyty Yhdysvaltain vaaleja siellä mediakurssilla lävitse, ja ne on tehny niinkun esitelmiä noista presidenttiehdokkaista. Ja tänään meille tuli uus tehtävä, ja siinä me käsitellään sitten sitä, että onko autoilla tulevaisuutta. Ja useimmiten mä niinku pohjustan näitä näis kursseissa niin, et me katotaan esimerkiks joku TED-talk, ja sit mä annan jonkun artikkelin, eli niillä on lähdemateriaalia, mihin ne tukeutuu, kun ne kirjottaa niit juttuja. Ja sitten siinä ENA12:ssa (...) me ollaan käsitelty semmosia autenttisia news in brief - juttuja, josta ne on sitten löytäneet niinku pohjaa sille, että ne on ite kirjottanu joistain annetuista aiheista pikku uutisia. Ja useimmiten mä oon antanu ne sillä tavalla, että why, what, when, where, elikkä ne on ja voinu antaa

*otsikoitakin, jotka on ihan kuvitteellisia. (...) Mä tykkään ite hirveesti just siitä, et on paljon sitä lähdemateriaalia ja useimmat on vielä niin innostunu onneks niistä TED-talkeista, et ne kattoo ne kotona viel uudestaan ja se on mun mielestä niinku jes! Mä en kehtaa oikein tuulettaa siellä, mut mä voin täs jes tuulettaa, että jotkut on niin innostunu niistä, et me ollaan käytetty niitä siellä ENA12:ssa, et ne on voinu kattoo kaikista muistakin niinku niitä ihan ylppärikuunteluja silmällä pitäen.” – Kaija*

(20) “Well now we’ve been going over the U.S. election on the media course, and they’ve been doing like presentations about the presidential candidates. And today we got a new assignment, and in it we ponder if cars have a future. And most often I like do ground work on these courses so that we watch for example a TED-talk, and then I give them an article, so they have source materials that they rely on when they write their pieces. And then in ENA12 (...) we’ve been doing these authentic news in brief – pieces of news. And most often I’ve instructed those like why, what, when, where, so that they’ve been able to have headlines too, which are completely fictional. (...) I personally really like having a lot of source materials and luckily most have been so excited about the TED-talks that they watch them again at home and I think it’s like yes! I don’t really dare to punch the air there, but here I can do that, yes! That some are so excited by them, that we’ve used them in ENA12, that they might have watched them about all kinds of other things as well, like thinking about the listening part of the matriculation examination.” – Kaija

(21) “(...) sitä semmosta vapaampaa kirjottamista mitä nyt ei välttämättä arvioida. Niin varsinkin, kun on nyt nää oppimisympäristöt sähköstyy... Niin mulla on nyt tällönen kun edmodo-oppimisympäristö käytössä lukioyhmien kanssa. Niin tota, kun he pystyy ite julkasemaan sinne mitä vaan niin esimerkiksi saattaa olla joku, jotakin semmosia vaikka elokuva-aiheiseen liittyvä, et heidän pitää ettiä joku traileri jostakin tietystä genrestä ja sitten perustella siitä, niinku kertoo aika vapaasti, ja sitä ei niinku, siinä ei oo niinku päähuomio siinä, että, et onks siellä virheitä vai eiks oo. Vaan että niinku oikeesti viestitään nyt toistemme kanssa, vaan et se on vähän niinku, en tiää onks se sulle tuttu, mut semmonen niinku facebook oppimis- no, koulumaailman facebook. Ja tota, et, et se niinku oikeesti se kieli on myöskin se kommunikoinnin väline, kirjottaminenkin tässä tapauksessa.” - Tuija

(21) “(...) the kind of more informal writing that isn’t necessarily evaluated. Especially when the learning environments are going electronic... So I use this Edmodo- learning environment with my upper secondary school groups. So well, since they can publish anything there themselves, so there could be something like a movie-themed thing, where they have to find a trailer of a certain genre and then argument for it, like explain pretty freely, and it isn’t like, the focus isn’t on whether there are mistakes or not. But that it’s about really communicating with each other, so it’s like, I don’t know if it’s familiar to you, but it’s like a facebook learning-well, a school-world facebook. And well, it’s, it’s like the language is really the means of communication, writing too in this case.” - Tuija

(22) “Emmä osaa sellasta, mut semmonen mikä on ollut musta itestäni hauska, nii kulttuurikurssilla mä oon pistänyt ne kirjottamaan tota nii Shakespearen innostamana ihan siis oikeaa sonettia sillä ababdcdeeff-kaavalla. Ni sitä on ollu sillain hauska kattoo, kun osa on niinku sillain että et voi olla tosissas ja sit taas osa on niinku sillain että aijaa, miten me saadaan nää riimit. Ja sitte joillekin mä oon heittäny vielä senkin, että siellä pitää olla niinku kymmenen tavua joka rivillä, nii se, se on ollut niinku siinä, siinä semmosessa erilaisuudessaan...” - Paula

(22) “ Well I can’t name something like that, but one that I think was fun, on the culture course I’ve had them write, well, inspired by Shakespeare, so a real sonnet with the ababdcdeeff –rhyme scheme. So that has been fun to watch as some are like you can’t be serious and then some are like well, hmm, how can we get these rhymes. And for some I’ve thrown a bit more, that they have to have ten syllables n every line, so that, that has been in how different it is...” - Paula

(23) “(...) Ja just runojakin esimerkiksi, mitä on mun mun mielestä vaikee niinku opettamalla opettaa. Se on musta hankalaa, niinku varsinkin vieraalla kielellä, koska niitä on aika hankala lukea äidinkielelläki, ja opetella esimerkiksi tulkitsemaan tai sitte just kirjottaakin. Niin, niin sit samaisella kulttuurikurssilla on niin, on muutamia aika mahtavia tuotoksia tullu ja sitte samaten siellä lukion vitoskursilla, niin, et tota, yks poika, joka suoritti itsenäisesti sen, niin oli aivan mahtavia runoja. Siis olisin voinu pistää millek tahansa yliopiston runoanalyysikurssille (naurua) niinku sinne analysoitavaksi. Että tosi syvällinen.” - Lotta

(23) “(...) And just like poems, for example, are something I think are difficult to actually teach. I think it’s hard, like especially in a foreign language, because they’re pretty difficult to read even in a native language, and to learn for example how to interpret them and then like writing them too. Yeah, yeah, then there have been some pretty great products on that same culture course, and also on the fifth course of upper secondary school, so that, well, there was a boy who was doing the course independently, so absolutely brilliant poems. I mean I could have sent them on any university poem analysis course (laughter) to be analysed. Like really deep.” - Lotta

(24) *“Kyllä ne, niinku ehkä parhaat tuotokset, mitä on sitten lukenu, ni on ihan pieniltä oppilailta sillon, kun mä opetin alakoulussa vielä, niin jotain nelkkiluokkalaisia, kun ne on oppinu jo vähän englanniks sanastoa. Niin niiltähän tulee ihan huikeita tarinoita, esimerkiksi, silloessa oppikirjassa oli niinku semmonen, vähän niinku semmonen fiktiivinen, fiktiivisiä avaruushenkilöitä, niin ne jotenkin tuntu ruokkivan tarinankerrontaa aika hyvin, että sitten kaikki tarinat melkein, mitä pojat varsinkin kirjotti, niin siellä siekkaili, tota ni, aliens ja ufoja ja mentiin Marsiin ja avaruusaluksilla ja tuli örkkejä ja (nauria) tapettiin ehkä hiukan. Et ne on varmaan motivoinu kaikista eniten.” – Lotta*

(24) *“Yes, the maybe best texts I have read have been by very young students when I used to still teach primary school, so like fourth graders, when they have some vocabulary already. So they produce really amazing stories, for example, the current textbook had these like, these kind of like fictional, fictional space characters, so they kind of inspired story-telling pretty well, so that almost all stories, especially by the boys, they had, well, the adventures, well, of aliens and ufos and we went to Mars and on spaceships and there were orcs and (laughter) perhaps a little killing. That those might have been the most motivating.” - Lotta*

(25) *“Semmonen huimin mitä mä oon nähnyt, ni oli, yks tyttö halus kirjottaa sit jonkun tarinan sillain, että hän ei halunnu käyttää yhtään, mikähän kirjain sillä nyt oli pannassa, se oli joku siis hyvin keskeinen, a tai e, mut et siis se, et se joutu korvaamaan sitte artikkelitkin niinku jotenkin sillain, et ei käyttäny... Että sieltä ei löytynyt sit yhtään sellaista kirjainta. Kaikki, kaikki sanat oli etitty sillain, että... Ja se oli sellanen ainakin semmonen 400-500 sanaa pitkä juttu. Se- se oli niinku vähän niinku sillain, että ei hyvää päivää, miten pystyy.” - Paula*

(25) *“Perhaps the most impressive that I’ve seen was, was, this girl wanted to write a story so that she didn’t want to use any, I wonder which letter she had banned, but it was some very essential one, a or e, but it’s that she had to replace even articles so that she didn’t use... That there wasn’t a single one of those letters. All, all words had been found so that... And it was like at least 400 to 500 words long. It- it was sort of like oh good day how can someone do that.” - Paula*

(26) *“Mä ehkä tykkään sellasista tehtävistä, jotka on tietyllä tavalla kuitenkin semmosia niinku moniin taitoihin sidoksissa, että se ei painotu pelkästään siihen, että me tehhän nyt tekstiä siinä pelossa, että tota ne kaikki virheet bongataan. Toki niillä on omat puolensa niillä, mut mä jotenkin tykkään siitä, että niinku niitä eri taitoja ja osa-alueita yhdistellään, ja ehkä, ehkä semmonen kaikkein mieluisin juttu on, on... Emmä osaa sanoo mitään yksittäistä juttuu, mutta noin niinku kirjoitusyppinä semmonen, et kun näkee, että oppilas ite innostuu siitä.” – Tuija*

(26) *“I think I like the kind of tasks that are in some way like connect several skills, so it’s not focused just on that now we’re producing text in fear of, well, all our mistakes being spotted. Sure they have their benefits, but I sort of like it when like the different skills and areas are connected, and maybe, maybe the thing I like the most is, is... I can’t pick any single thing, but as a type of writing the kind where you can see the student getting excited about it.” - Tuija*

(27) *“(...) semmonen, jossa ei ollu niin kauheen tarkkaan niinkun ohjeistettu, et se oli sellanen mul oli niinkun moniste, jossa mulla oli kuvia hyvin erinäköisistä ihmisistä, joista ehkä pystyi kuvistakin päätteleen, että niillon erilaisia taustoja ja erivärisiä ja sit mä- tehtävän anto oli vaan sellainen että valitse yksi näistä henkilöitä ja kirjoita sen henkilön niinkun taustatarina, että mitä se henkilö on kokenut ja mahdollisesti elämässään, millainen elämä sillä on ollut. Tää ei sillä kertaa ainakaan toiminut, et. Oppilaat eivät vaan niinku päässeet siitä oikein eteenpäin. Tai sitten ne oli jotenkin ihan, ihan niinkun päättömiä ne tarinat et mentiin niinku, et siel oli hyvin paljon alkoholismia tämmöstä. Pojat varsinkin et ne tuntu et ne siihen aikaan ei osannu niinku, osannu ajatella siitä mitään muuta.” - Olavi*

(27) *“(...) the kind where the instructions weren’t very specific, so it was like that I had a paper with pictures of very different-looking people, and maybe you could deduct from the pictures too that they had different kinds of backgrounds and they were of different colours and then I- the instruction was to just choose one of these people and write the backstory for that character, what that person has experienced and perhaps in their lives, what kind of a life he or she has had. This didn’t work out, at least not that time, so. The students didn’t really get on with it. Or then their stories were just like, like without any sense, so that there was a lot of alcoholism and such. The boys especially didn’t seem to be able to think of anything else at the time.” - Olavi*

(28) *“(...) missä mä opettajana koen, että en oo ehkä niin onnistunu, on sillon, jos tavallaan se mun ohjeistus on ollu sellanen niinkun sanotaanko koko oppilasryhmää ajatellen liian vaativa. Että, että kaikilla välttämättä se itseohjautuvuus ei riitä siihen, että pystyy toteuttamaan vaikka kuinka niinkun opettaja innostus siitä, että saa vapaasti valita ja muuta. Että esimerkiksi niinkun peruskoulun puolella niin enemmän tyydytystä antaa sitten semmonen, että kun onnistuu antamaan semmoset ohjeet, että siitä tulee jotakin niinkun semmosta runkoo ja*

*selkärankaa siihen kirjottamiseen, et se ei kuitenkaan kaikille peruskoululaisille oo mikään itsestäänselvä, tietenkään, taito, kun sitä ei oo niin paljon vielä harjoteltu.” - Tuija*

(28) “(...) the time that as a teacher I feel that I haven’t been that successful is if my instructions have been too demanding considering the whole student group. That, that maybe everybody doesn’t have the autonomy to be able to accomplish it, no matter how excited the teacher is about the chance to freely choose and so on. Like for example in secondary school it’s more satisfying to give something, that when you can give instructions that bring some kind of a structure and spine for the writing, since it’s in no way obvious to all secondary school students, of course not, the skill, since it hasn’t been practiced that much yet.” - Tuija

*(29) “Vuosi vuodelta oppilaille on yhä vaikeempaa analysoida tekstiä, elikkä kun on niitä novellianalyyseja. Niin jotkut ei kertakaikkiaan enää niinku saa niistä irti, et ne, ne vaan hirveen konkreettisella tasolla pystyy käsitteleen niitä, ja sama on tapahtunu niissä, kun me luetutetaan se romaani siinä vitoskurssissa ja sit siit tehdään se evaluointi, eli pitää olla tosi konkreettiset kysymykset mulla, mitkä johdattelee oppilaita vastaamaan, et ei, ei tuu enää semmost muuten mitään analyysia, vaan tulee pelkkiä juoniselostuksia. Eli se on heikentyny ihan hirveesti, ja nyt sitten, kun se siirretään koko tää kulttuurikurssi tulevassa opsissa sinne kolmoseen ni mä, mä en tiedä mitä tulee tapahtumaan. Koska ykköset nyt on vielä konkreettisemmalla tasolla. En tiä mihin mahtaa mennä. Jännittävää, muttei ehkä hyvässä mielessä.” - Kaija*

(29) “Every year it gets harder and harder for students to analyze text, so that when we have those analyses of short stories. So some just simply can’t get anything out of them, that they, they can handle them only on a very concrete level, and the same thing has happened in those, when we read the novel on the fifth course and then we do the evaluation of it, so I have to have really concrete questions that lead the students to answer, that, that otherwise I won’t get any analysis but just descriptions of the plot. So that it has seriously weakened, and now then, when the whole culture course will be moved to the third year in the next National Core Curriculum, I don’t, I don’t know what will happen. Since the first years are on an even more concrete level. I don’t know where this might go. Thrilling, but perhaps not in the good sense.” - Kaija

*(30) “(...) suurin osa mitä kirjotetaan ni on niinku fiktiota et ne ite niinku keksii näitä tarinoita, että on tyliin niinku matka- matkakertomusia Afrikasta tai postikortteja Aasiasta tai tällaisia. (...)” - Olavi*

(30) “(...) the most of what we write is like fiction, that they make up these stories, that there are like travel-travel stories about Africa or postcards from Asia or something like that. (...)” - Olavi

*(31) “(...) ysiluokalla on viimeinen kurssi kulttuurikurssi, niin siellä sitten mä annan yleensä niinku lopputyöksi, ööm, sellasen, että jokasen on tehtävä kolmesta viiteen jotain kulttuuriin liittyvää tehtävää ja ne voi olla kyl suullisiakin esityksiä vaikka, joku laulun tekstien kirjottaminen ja sen esittäminen ja nauhottaminen tai jotain muuta, mutta aika moni kirjottaa siellä sitten tarinoita myöskin. Tai just vaikka laulun sanoja tai runoja tai muuta. Ja sitte ehkä ne millon mä muullon käytän semmosta vapaata kirjottamista ni on sitten ihan semmosina niinku lisätehtävinä tai eriyttävänä tehtävinä joillekin nopeille tai näppärille, hyville oppilaille. Et, että heille antaa vaikka viis sanaa kappaleesta tai, tai jostain aiheesta ja sitten kirjota ton ympärille tarina. Se on hirveen nopee semmonen eriyttämisen keino.” - Lotta*

(31) “(...) on the ninth grade the last course, the culture course, so there I usually assign as a final assignment, umh, the kind that everybody has to do three to five tasks that are somehow connected with culture and they can be like oral performances too, writing song lyrics and performing them and recording them or something else, but quite a few write stories there too. Or just like song lyrics or poems or something. And then perhaps the other times I use the kind of creative writing are as the kind of like extra tasks or scaffolding tasks for some quick or skilled, good students. That, that giving them like five words from a chapter or, or some topic and then asking them to write a story around it. It’s a very quick way to scaffold.” - Lotta

*(32) “Juu, kyllä, kyllä. Se on niinkun mä tykkään ite sellasesta niin, ja nyt me ollaan tehty tänä vuonna mä oon tehny runon niin, että mä niinkun ohjasin sen tavallaan. Että mä niinkun pyysin katsomaan ulos ikkunasta, kuuntelemaan ääniä ja niin pois päin. Ja sit lopuks ne teki siitä semmosen vapaan runon sitte. Ja se onnistu mun mielestä kans aika hyvin, että otin sieltä pari talteen ihan, ja totta kai pyysin luvan, että jos tarvitaan, tarvitaan meidän koulun kuvastoon jotakin niin sieltä sitten näitä loistavia runoja saa käyttää.” - Kaija*

(32) “Yeah, yes, yes. It’s that I like that kind of thing so much myself, and now this year we’ve done, I’ve done a poem so that I sort of directed it. Like that I asked them to look out the window and listen to sounds and so on. And then in the end they made a free poem of it. And I think it was pretty successful, so that I even saved a couple, and of course asked permission, that if we need them, need something for our school’s publication, so that that’s where you find these brilliant poems you can use.” - Kaija

(33) *“Ja sit tietysti, no runoja, runoja on varmaan vähä vähempi, mut sit räppejä on jonkun verran kirjoitettu, mikä on tätä nykyaikaa. Et siellä taitaa olla jossain oppikirjassa semmosii tehtävänantojakin, että kirjoita räppi jostain tietystä aiheesta, tän tyylisiä mut et runoja ei.” - Olavi*

(33) “And then of course, well poems, poems somewhat less, but then we’ve done quite a few a raps, which is part of the current times. That there might be exercises in some textbook to write a rap about some specific subject, something like this, but that no poems.” - Olavi

(34) *“(…) monipuolisesti erilaiset tekstityypit huomioitua. Lähtien sit tosiaan, et onks se fiktiivistä tai ei-fiktiivistä myöskin sitten se, että, et niinku onks se, onks se jotain niinku tarinamuotoo vai sitten, et niinku, onks se niinku dialogia, jolloin se mahdollistaa taas sen semmosen niinku viestinnällisyyden painottamisen siinä ja mahdollisesta sen toteuttamisen käytännössä suullisesti.” - Tuija*

(34) “(...) acknowledging different text types versatily. Starting with if it’s fictional or non-fictional then also that, that if it’s like, if it’s prose or like if it’s dialogue, so it allows the kind of emphasis on communication and it makes possible doing it orally in practice.” - Tuija

(35) *“(…) sitä kautta just mä lähen hakemaan tietysti tuntumaa heihin niinku uusina oppilaina, äää niinku ihmisinä ja että sitä sisältöä. Ja sitten myöskin mä nään aika kätevästi siinä jo vähän sitä kielenhallintaa ja niitä mahdollisia ongelmia, että mihinkä sit täytyy sit tarjota tukee. Niin, niin tota ihan tämmösessä mielessä säännöllisesti sitä.” - Tuija*

(35) “(...) that way I just start to get a feel for them as new students, umm, like as people and that the content. And then also it is a pretty handy way to see a bit of their language skills and the possible problems that will need support. So, so, well, in like this sense I do that regularly.” - Tuija

(36) *“Tosin, mulla oli myöskin se vaihtoehto siellä, että saa kirjottaa suomeks, että siinä nyt ei ollu pääpaino siinä kielessä. (...) Itseasiassa nyt kun mä sitten niitä luin tossa niin aika monet oli valinnu englannin kielen, ja ne nautti siitä, että ne sai just vapaasti kirjottaa, tietää, et joku lukee, et se ei oo niinku täysin sitä niinku heille itselleen pelkästään, ja, ja aika pitkiä juttuja kirjotti sit suhteessa siihen, että... Että tota, kun mitään semmosta niinku kauheen sellasta rankkaa sanamäärävaatimusta ollu, niin sielt saatto tulla sivutolkulla sitä tekstiä, vaikka niinku yks A4 ois periaatteessa riittäny. (...) tää päiväkirjatouhu, niin semmosta numeerisesti arvioitavaa, vaan enempi just sitä semmosta vapaata kirjottamista, osa kurssiarviointia sillä tavalla, et se pitää olla hyväksytysti niinku hoidettu se homma, mutta, mut että ei niin, että siitä tulis numeroo. Varsinkaan niin, että mä bongaisin sieltä virheitä. Vaan tämmöstä niinku viestintävälineenä.” - Tuija*

(36) “Though I did also have the option to write in Finnish there, that the focus wasn’t on the language that time. (...) Actually now that I was reading them, quite a few had chosen English and they enjoyed the chance to write freely, know that someone will read them, that it’s not just for them, and they did write rather long texts in relation to that... So that since there was no actual demand for length, they could produce pages and pages of text, even though one A4 would have been basically enough. (...) this diary business, like numerically graded, but more the kind of free writing, part of the course evaluation in that sense that it has to be completed, that thing, but, but not so that it would be graded. Especially not so that I’d be looking for mistakes. But as like a means of communication.” - Tuija

(37) *“(…) Kirjeitä mulle, joo, siis kurssipalaukset on tavallaan kirjeitä, kyllä ja kirjoitetaan englanniksi. Ja, ja sit tota, musta on kauhean kiva, kun useat opiskelijat kirjottaa mulle sähköpostia englanniksi. Et se on niinku se ihan luonteva kieli, mitä käytetään. Että, et tota, sitä kieltä käytetään, mitä, mikä niinku kuuluu asiaankin.” - Maria*

(37) “(...) Letters to me, yes, well the written course feedback is kind of like letters, yes, and written in English. And, and well, I think it’s really nice that a lot of students write e-mails to me in English. So that it’s like the natural choice of language to be used. So, so that the language is used, which, which like should be.” - Maria

(38) *“Varmaan parhaimpia on semmonen tosi pienellä käsialalla kirjoitettu 24 ruutuvihon sivua oleva tarina – ilman kappalejakoja, joka oli aika tiivistä luettavaa (naurua).” - Lotta*

(38) “One of the probably best ones was a 24-page story written with tiny handwriting in a school notebook – no paragraphs, so it was a pretty dense read (laughter).” - Lotta

(39) *“(…) Varsinkin nää tämmöset luovat tehtävät on ollu... On tullu pitkiä, on tullu huikean pitkiä tehtäviä vastaan (naurua). Että jotkut ovat nauttineet kirjottamisesta ihan hirveästi. Sekä siellä yläkoulun puolella että*

lukiossa, niin on tullut valtavan hienoja juttuja ja, ja tota... Tarinaa on aina vielä jatkettukin, että siitä on nähty monta versiota siitä ja jatkoakin niille, että se on kauhean kiva.” - Maria

(39) “(...) Especially the kind of creative tasks have been... I have come across, across some amazingly long texts (laughter). That some have enjoyed writing very much. In both secondary and upper secondary school, there have been some brilliantly fine things and, and well... The story has always been continued too, so that several versions of it have been seen and more of them too, so that’s really wonderful.” -Maria

(40) “Mulla kerran yks oppilas toi romaanin. Mä kyllä luin sen. Mut sen jälkeen mä oon sanonu, et mä en kyllä enää haluu lukee kenenkään science fiction -romaneja. Että. Mutta sillon mä nyt sitten suostuin, suostuin lukemaan sen, kun mä olin nuori ja tyhmä.” – Kaija

(40) “Once a student of mine brought me a novel. I did read it. But after that I’ve said that I don’t want to read anyone’s science fiction –novels anymore. So. But then I agreed to do it, agreed to read it, as I was young and stupid.” – Kaija

(41) “(...) no esimerkiks siellä kulttuurikurssilla jotain niitä runoja ja muita, niin ei se mun mielestä siellä oo tarkoituksenmukasta sieltä nyt välttämättä joka kielioppiasiaa korjata. Kuka muuten sanoo missä muodossa runossa pitää joku verbi olla (naurua). Tai sitten jos tehään sellasia kirjoituksia, vaikka esitelmiä, jossa pääpaino on siinä sisällössä, vaikka nyt maantuntemus, maantuntemukseen liittyvä joku poster, niin en mä halua, että siellä seinällä on semmonen työ, jossa on hirveesti punakynää, niin et kaikki vaan kattoo, että yäh, toi ei osaa mitään tai mä en osaa mitään, tietenkin se oppilas eniten, että sitten on pääasia siinä sisällössä vaan. Et ei joka juttua korjata.” - Lotta

(41) “(...) well, for example, on the culture course there were some of those poems and others, so I don’t think it’s purposeful to necessarily correct every grammar thing in them. Who is it that says how the verb has to conjugated in poem anyway (laughter). Or then we do some kind of writing, like presentations, where the focus is on the content, let’s say knowledge of countries, a poster related to the knowledge of countries, so I don’t want there to be a poster on the wall with a lot of red ink all over it so everybody just thinks that yuck, he or she doesn’t know anything or I don’t know anything, of course it’s the student himself or herself, that the focus is merely on the content. That not everything is corrected.” – Lotta

(42) “(...) Hampurilaispalaute (naurua). Ensin jotain hyvää ja sitte kauheesti korjattavaa, ja sit vielä, että ymmärsin kuitenkin kaiken mitä olit halunnut sanoa. Hauskaa luettavaa. Keep up the good work.” - Lotta

(42) “(...) The hamburger feedback (laughter). First something good and then an awful lot to correct, and then that I still understood everything you had wanted to say. Fun to read. Keep up the good work.” – Lotta

(43) “Eli pyrin antamaan sanallista palautetta, koska mun mielestä esimerkiks kirjottamisessa niin se, se kertoo hirveen paljon enemmän ehkä joillekin ihmisille kuin se pelkkä numero. Vaikka nuorille tuntuu se numero olevan tosi tärkeä asia. Eli pyrin antamaan sekä numeerista, että sitten tällasta sanallista palautetta, ja et se niinku ohjais eteenpäin jollakin tasolla. Välillä aika vaatimattomasti, mutta yritys hyvä kymmenen (naurua).” - Tuija

(43) “So I aim to give verbal feedback because I think that for example when it comes to writing, I think it says a lot more to some people than just a grade. Even though the grade seems to be a very important thing to adolescents. So I aim to give both numerical and this kind of verbal feedback, and so that it would like guide them forward on some level. At times a bit modestly, but an A for effort (laughter).” – Tuija

(44) “Nii mä uskon siihen palautteen voimaan sillain niinku oikeesti, että sillä palautteella pystys, pystys sillain... Että mua harmittaa ihan äärettömästi, että minkä takia kielenopetuksen puolella ni palaute on niinku jotenkin työstetty pelkästään tämmöseks error correctioniks. (...) Et siin ei kauheen paljoo sitten anneta muuta palautetta, ku korjataan virheitä. Ni tota, et kai sillä kirjottamisella täytyy olla joku muukin funktio ku et se on pelkästään sen kirjoitetun kielen semmonen... Niinku sen kielitaidon osoittamisen semmonen alusta. Et kai sillä tekstillä pitäis ainaki, ku aattelee kielitaitoa tämmösenä viestinnällisenä taitona, niin kai sillä pitäis olla jotain viestinnällisiäkin arvoja tai jopa esteettisiä arvoja eikä pelkästään sitten niinku se kielen oikeudellisuuden kuljetusalusta. (...) Nii et se, et musta, et mä niinku toivosin, että me kiinnostettäs vähän enemmän huomiota johonkin muuhunki ku siihen, että hei, sulta puuttuu tästä yksikön kolmannen persoonan ässä tai tässä pitäisi olla artikkeli. Jota olen tehnyt suurimman osan urastani.” – Paula

(44) “Yes, I do believe in the power of the feedback like really, like that with the feedback you could like... Like it really bothers me to no end that why feedback in language teaching has been cropped to mere error correction. (...) Like there really isn’t much other feedback than correcting mistakes. So that, that shouldn’t the writing have some other kind of function than to just to be something for the written language... Like a means for

demonstrating the language skill. Like shouldn't the text have at least, when you think about language skill as a communicative skill, shouldn't it have some communicative values or even aesthetic values and not just a means for the language accuracy. (...) So that, I think, I would hope that we could pay more attention to something other than hey, you're missing the third singular s or here you should have an article. Which is what I've been doing for most of my career." – Paula

(45) *"(...) et se palaute ei keskittyy pelkästään siihen; jos tässä tää paperi on nyt se essee, et mä en pelkästään niinku ruodi sitä, että niinku tässä se on kirjottanu näin ja tässä sulla on tämmönen kielioppivirhe ja mä annan tästä sulle 82 pistettä, koska tää on sellanen. Vaan et sen, sen tän hetkisen suorituksen ruotimisen lisäksi mä antasin jonkinlaisia niinku neuvoja eteenpäin, että jos – jos opiskelija haluaa esimerkiksi kirjottaa 90 pisteen aineen, että miksi se jää vajaaks, mitä siinä pitäis olla vielä, sitten niinku, minkäläisten muutosten avulla se ehkä sitten olis se 90 pisteen aine. Et tota, et yritän antaa niinku sitä sellasta palautetta siitä jo tehdystä suorituksesta, mutta antaa myös sitä feed forwardia, et miten tästä eteenpäin."* – Paula

(45) *"(...) so that the feedback wouldn't focus just on that: if the paper here is the essay, that I don't just go over that like here she's written this and there you have this kind of a grammar mistake and I give you 82 points for this because this is like this. But that in addition to going over the current text, I'd give some kind of advice for the moving forward, like if – if the student wants to write a 90 point essay, that why doesn't it reach that, what more should it have, and then like, what kind of changes will make it a 90-point essay. So that, that I try to give like feedback on the already done work, but also the feed forward, that how we'll move forward."* - Paula

(46) *"Niin se, se on kans sellanen, että, että tota noin se palautteen antaminen oppilaalle, ku mä haluan antaa sit henkilökohtasta palautetta, ni se on välillä niinku vähän munankuorien päällä kävelemistä. Ku toiset on ihan uskomattoman herkkiä, ja mä varmaan sitten joskus onnistun niinku pahottamaan jonkun mielen, vaikka mä en... Haluan vaan niinku parantaa hänen kirjottamistaan. Mutku ne on kuitenkin niin jotenki niin, kun ne on niitten oma teksti, oma vauva (...). Mut sit mä kuitenkin haluan antaa sitä henkilökohtastaki palautetta, mutta eihän se aina onnistu, mut sillon kun on aikaa siihen ja pystyy, niin sillon."* - Kaija

(46) *"So that, that is also something, that, that well, the giving feedback to students, as I want to give personal feedback, that sometimes it's like walking on eggshells. As some are so unbelievably sensitive, and maybe sometimes I end up upsetting someone, even though I don't... I just want to like improve their writing. But they're somehow so, so, it's like their own text, their baby (...). But still I want to give that personal feedback, even though it doesn't always work out, but when there's time and it's possible, so then."* - Kaija

(47) *"(...) kuka haluaa yhtäänkään, että, että ne on tarkemmin vielä katottu, niin mä voin oikein yrittää ne katsoa tarkkaan, et jos otatte niistä opiksenne. Mutta se on vaan valitettava tosiasia, että, että kun ne huitasee jonkun oman tekstin niin niistä 70%, 80% ei vilkasekaan muuta kun sen pistemäärän (...) Mut sitte mitä, mitä niinku huomaa ite niinku vaka- enempi vakavissaan ne on ja, ja mä tiedän, että, että ne on kiinnostuneita kirjottamiskyvyistään niin, niin mä pyrin ne korjaan ihan varsin tarkkaan. Saatan antaa palautetta toki myös sen kirjoituksen rakenteesta, mutta pitkälti se on sitä oikeeikielisyyttä sieltä (...)." - Jouni*

(47) *"(...) who hopes even a little bit that their text will be looked at in more detail, I'll try and go over them very carefully, if you'll learn from them. But it's just an unfortunate fact that, that when they whip together a text that 70% 80% of them will never even glance at anything but the score (...) But then something, something that I notice is like the more serious they are and, and I know that they're interested in their writing ability, so I aim to go over their texts really very carefully. I might give feedback also on the structure of the text, but mostly it's about the language accuracy (...)." - Jouni*

(48) *"Ei ne haluaa korjata niitä. Mut kyl mä oon tehny sitä, ja varsinki sitte kun on semmosia heikompia oppilaita, joilla toistuu ja toistuu ne virheet, niin mä pistän kyllä kirjottaa uudestaan ja ne on alleviivattu ne. Mut ehkä tää on ekan luokan juttuja enemmän. Nyt kun rupee miettimään. Ja varsinkin tukikurssilla tehään sitä sitten. (...)" - Kaija*

(48) *"They don't want to correct them. But I have been doing that, and especially when you have the kind of weaker students who keep repeating and repeating their mistakes, so I do make them write their texts again and they have been underlined. But maybe this is more for the first year. Now that I think about it. And especially on the review course we do that then. (...)" - Kaija*

(49) *"(...) Mä oon lukiossa aika useinkin tehny sillain, et mä oon vaan niinku harrastanu siis tätä indirect corrective feedbackia, et mä oon vaan merkannu ne, ja se ei kauheesti hyödytä kaikkia. Mut et mä oon jotenki aikoinaan ollu sitä mieltä, että se ois niinku tehokkainta, että ne joutus ite miettimään sitten, että mikä tässä oli väärin ja miten tää pitäis sanoo. Mutkun se ei toimi niin. Ni, ja sitten taas toisaalta osalle ei toimi sit se direct feedback, et se menee niillä ihan hukkaan, että niitä ei sitten kiinnosta se, että se on jo valmiiks korjattu, että ne*

kaipaa sen älyllisen haasteen. Niin niinpä nykyisin varsinkin siis tässä päättövaiheessa noitten abien kanssa, niin mä oon tehny sillain, et kun ne on nyt kirjottanu mulle ne aineet, niin ne on ensin kirjottanu siihen, että mikä on niiden se tavote, mihin ne pyrkii. Sitten miten ne haluaa sen palautteen, haluaaks ne suullisesti vai kirjallisesti ja haluaaks ne virheet merkittyinä vai virheet korjattuina. Ja sit mä oon korjannu sen mukaan. Ja suosittelen lämpimästi. (...) Eri opiskelijat on erilaisia, niillä on erilaisia oppimistyylejä, mut niillä on myös erilaisia tarpeita ja erilaisia toiveita, ni se, mä en usko siihen, että niinku one size fits all tai yhdellä keinolla niinku pystytään antaa se palaute parhaalla mahdollisella tavalla kaikille. Nii... Niin sen takia mä oon niinku, ku ne antaa ihan samoja perusteluja sillain, että joku saattaa sanoo, että mä haluan, että sä merkkäat ne virheet etkä korjaa niitä valmiiks, koska sillain, et mä joudun ite miettimään sitä, ni mä opin parhaiten. Sit toinen taas saattaa sanoo, et mä haluan, että sä korjaat ne valmiiks, koska sit kun mä katon sitä korjattua muotoo ja sitä mun virheellistä muotoo, niin mä opin sillain kaikkein parhaiten.” - Paula

(49) “(...) In upper secondary school I’ve pretty often done this that I’ve been doing indirect corrective feedback, that I’ve just marked them and it doesn’t really benefit everyone. But that somehow I’ve just thought that it would be most effective for them to consider it themselves, so that what was wrong with this and how should you say this. But it doesn’t work that way. So, and then again for some the direct feedback doesn’t work, that it’s wasted on them, that they’re not interested in it if it’s already corrected, that they need the intellectual challenge. So therefore especially nowadays in this final stage with the last years I’ve been doing this that when they’ve written me their essays now, that first they’ve written down what their goal is, what they’re aiming for. Then how they want their feedback, like do they want oral or written feedback and if they want their mistakes marked or corrected. And then I’ve corrected them accordingly. And I recommend it sincerely. (...) Different students are different, they have different learning styles, but they also have different needs and different hopes, so that, I don’t believe that like one size fits all or that one way will allow to give the feedback in the best possible way to all. So... So that’s why I’ve like, when they give the exactly same arguments for, like someone can say that I want you to mark the mistakes and not correct them, because so that I have to think about it myself I learn best. And then someone else might say that I want you to correct them because then I look at the corrected form and my incorrect form, so that’s how I learn best.” - Paula

(50) “Ja tää on kyl huono tekosyy, mut se on vähän aikaavievää kanssa (naurua). Että sitten taas jo, jo monesti se kirjelma on niinku yhestä aihepiiristä ja sitten mennään jo seuraavaan. Että, että se on vähän sellasta, et jos sulla on 25 oppilaan ryhmä ja sitten et jos ajatuksena on se, että, että mä vaikka siinä välissä kommentoin ne, ne tekstit, ja sitten oppilas jatkaa uudestaan siitä. Niin. Pitää vaan tehdä hirveen paljon ja nopeesti töitä, mut eihän siinä tarvii aina opettaja olla välissä. Että oon käyttäny myös sitä, että, että tota, just että esim neljän hengen ryhmässä ne ysiluokkalaiset tai ne lukiolaiset niin luetuttaa tekstisä toisilla ja sitte antavat palautetta ja kommentteja. Että se on musta kyl myös aika hyvä keino.” - Lotta

(50) “And this is a poor excuse, but it’s a bit time-consuming too (laughter). That then again already, already the writing is about one topic and then we’re moving on to the next one. That, that it’s a bit like you have a group of 25 students and then if the thought is that, that I’ll comment on the texts in between and the student will continue from that. So. You just have to do a lot of work and work very quickly, but it doesn’t always have to be the teacher. That I’ve used that, that, well, like in groups of four the ninth graders or the upper secondary schoolers read each others’ texts and then give feedback and comments. So I think that’s a good way too.” - Lotta

(51) “(...) Oppilaat ei vaan tai opiskelijat ei välttämättä aina siitä hirveesti tykkää. Et musta tuntuu, että meillä on kauheen usein sellanen olo, et minkä kirjoitin, sen kirjoitin ja se on jo sitten valmis. Niinku mitä sitä nyt enää tässä sitten niinku prosessoimaan. Et aika, aika harva tekee hirveen paljon sitten muutoksia, vaikka ne sais siellä välillä välipalautetta ja vaikka siellä olis niinku jotain semmosta, mutta oishan se tietysti. Mä en oikein usko siihen, että yksikään teksti on niinku ensimmäisenä versiona se kaikkein paras. (...)” - Paula

(51) “(...) Students just don’t really always like it very much. That I think that really often we feel that what I wrote is written and it’s done. Like what’s the point of processing it anymore. Like quite few, few make a lot of changes, even if they got feedback on drafts and if there was something like that, but of course it would be. I don’t really believe that any text would be like the best it can be as the first version. (...)” - Paula

(52) “Ja siinä itseasiassa varmaan se on tavallaan se prosessi ihan kurssillakin, että jos vaikka harjotellaan kielioppia ja sit tuotetaan jotain tekstiä sitä käyttäen, niin että sitä tulis myös siinä myöhemmin sitten uudestaan sitä testausta. Ettei se oo vaan se yks kerta. Ni se ois aika hyvä. Ja myöskin uuden opsin mukana ajattelutapa, että ei oo vaan yks loppukoe, jossa testataan hetkessä se tuotos. Et tää on nyt tässä, ja sit se oppilas ei saa tilaisuutta parantaa ja näyttää. Se ois oikeesti hyvä.” - Laura

(52) “And actually I think the course has the kind of process in it, that if we’re practicing grammar and they produce text using that, so that the testing would occur again later too. That it’s not just the one time. So that would be pretty good. And also the new National Core Curriculum suggests that there shouldn’t be just one final

exam that tests the product in the moment. That this is now done, and the student has no chance to improve and and show off. That would really be good.” - Laura

(53) “(...) sitten se palaute on sellasta niinku “ihan kiva” ja, ja tietysti sitten on ehkä eroja siinäki, että jos on niinku hyvä kirjottaja ja samassa ryhmässä sitten vähän heikompi kielitaito niin on se palaute ihan erilaista. Toinen kans korjaa tarkalleen toisen virheet ja sitte taas toinen ei pystykään puuttumaan niihin, tai niihin oikeakielisyyssjuttuihin siellä, että. Et sitten pitää miettiä, että onks se palaute sellasta niinku sisältöön liittyvää tai vaikka niinku jäsentelyyn, että tähän voisit laittaa ton asian ja ton tuonne vasta loppuun tai jotain muuta tai, että onks se niinku ihan yksityiskohtasta sanastoon ja rakenteeseen liittyvää.” - Lotta

(53) “(...) then the feedback is like “it’s okay” and, and of course then there are differences in that if someone’s a good writer and there’s a weaker language skill in the same group that the feedback is very different. One corrects the other’s mistakes and the other one can’t work on them or the accuracy issues there, so. Then you have to consider that is the feedback focused on content or like the organization, that you could put that thing here and this one only at the end or something else or is it like detailed feedback about vocabulary and grammar.” - Lotta

(54) “(...) ehkä just lukiossa eniten pystyy sit, no peruskoulussakin on, on oppilaita, jotka pystyy antamaan sitä palautetta ja olemaan asiallisia, mut sit kaikilla ei oo sitä kykyä samal tavalla, että siinä sitten käy sillä tavalla, että osa saa tosi, tosi hyvin sitä palautetta ja sitte osalla se jää hyvin sille et ihan kiva -tasolle. Niin, niin tota ihan sen käytännön toteuttamisen kannalta niin oon kokenu sen vähän silleen peruskoulussa vaikeaksi, ainaki sillä tavalla, että jos se niinku ajatellaan, että sitä pitäis sitä prosessia jatkaa sitten sen jälkeen niin sen palautteen perusteella mitä saa niin, niin tota... (...)” - Tuija

(54) “(...) maybe you can do it better in upper secondary school, well there are students in secondary school who can take in feedback and be appropriate, but not everybody has the ability the same way, that then it goes so that some get really, really good feedback and then for some it just stays on the it’s okay –level. So, so that just for the practical aspect of giving feedback I have found it hard in secondary school, at least in that way that if we think that the process should be continued after that based on the feedback you get, well... (...)” - Tuija

(55) “Et tokihan ne, niinku sanoin, et jos on tollanen projektityö ollu tämmösenä niinku näyttelykappaleena niin, et kyllähän ne on lukenu niitä juttuja ja sit me on voitu tehdä niin, että joskus on ollu vaikka just seinillä on ollu niitä projektitöitä, niin siin on ollu semmonen palautelappu sitten, että siihen on saanu kirjottaa semmosta palautetta, mut se nyt on aika silleen, silleen vaatimatonta, et ehkä tuolla lukiossa tosiaan taas jälleen kerran se on ollu semmosta vähän tehokkaampaa se ja tällä lukion kulttuurikurssilla niin siellä aika paljonki sitä just, että esiteltiin niitä omia ensimmäisiä versioita ja luettiin sieltä pätkiä kavereille ja, ja kaverit anto palautetta siitä, et onks tää selkeetä vai ei ja näin pois päin... Mut nimenomaan siihen, että sillon kun kaverit antaa palautetta niin se palaute ei keskity kieleen niinkään, vaan ehkä ensisijaisesti just siihen sisältöön, rakenteeseen ja semmoseen niinku fiilis, fiilishommaan myöskin.” - Tuija

(55) “Well surely those, as I’ve said, that if we have one of those project works as the kind of exhibition piece so, well, they have been reading the stuff and we might have done so that, like if we’ve had the projects on the walls, there has been a feedback sheet there, and you’ve been able to write feedback on it, but that’s kind of, kind of modest, that perhaps once again it has been a bit more effective in upper secondary school and on the upper secondary culture course, there we’ve had quite a lot of that, just that we’ve been presenting our first drafts and read pieces of them to others and, and they gave feedback on whether it’s clear or not and so on... But precisely that when students give feedback to each other that the feedback isn’t focused on language so much but primarily on the content, structure and the kind of feeling you get from it too.” - Tuija

(56) “Mutta oon pyytäny heitä antamaan toisilleen palautetta, eli joku vaikka vertaisarviointilomake tai sanallinen arvo tai palaute. Ja ne niitä kyllä kiinnostaa ehkä enempi ne toistensa palautteet kun minun palautteet välillä (naurua), et se on ihan kiva. Ja ne on aika hyviä arvioimaan toistensa töitä, myös. Kun vaan ohjeistaa sen palautuksen silleen niinku järkevästi. Niin sieltä tulee oikeesti hyviä havaintoja.” – Laura

(56) “But I’ve asked them to give each other feedback, like some peer review form or a verbal evaluation or comment. And they’re maybe more interested in each other’s feedback than in mine at times (laughter), so that’s nice. And they’re pretty good at evaluating each other’s work too. As long as you instruct the return sort of like sensibly. So they produce some really good observations.” - Laura

(57) “Ihan hyvin. Ne jotenkin mieltää sen niin selkeesti osana koulutyötä, et ne ei ees osaa kyseenalaistaa sitä. (naurua) Mut joillekin se on kauhee paikka, kun jos on vaikeeta ja hankalaa ja ei oikein osaa, niin semmosille oppilaille se on, se on tietysti tosi hankalaa. Ja jos on vaikka yläkoululainen, jonk-jolle se viiden lauseen tuottaminen on oikeesti tuskaa, niin se on heille vaikeeta, et sit pitää tosi paljon kiittää siinä ja auttaa, ja

*huomaatko tossa kohtaa ja hyvin menee. Ja tälleen. Mut varsinkin ne sujuvat kirjottajat, niin ne on kyllä aika... Ne vaan tekee. Ei siinä, monesti. Kyllä ne monesti kysyy tarkentavia kysymyksiä, just et miten pitkä ja mitä tässä halutaan, ja se on hyvä.” - Laura*

(57) “Quite well. They sort of think of it as part of schoolwork, they don’t even know to question it. (laughter) But for some it’s a terrible thing when it’s hard and difficult and they don’t really know how to do that, for that kind of student it is, it is of course really difficult. And if there’s like a secondary schooler to whom it’s like, like truly painful to produce five sentences, to them it’s hard, so you have to move around there a whole lot and help and can you see here and you’re doing well. And so on. But especially the fluent writers, they are pretty... They just do. Nothing to it, often. They do often ask defining questions, like just how long and what is expected and that’s good.” - Laura

*(58) “Kyllä se niitä ahistaa vähän, et se on sellanen että “emmä osaa, emmä osaa”. Se riippuu, se vaihtelee hirveen paljon luokittain. Mulla on tällä hetkellä semmosek, jotka niinku lähes pyörtyy ja tippuu jakkaraltaan, kun ne kuulee, että pitää alkaa itse kirjottaa jotain, tekemään. Ja he ei mitään osaa ja ei saa tehtyä. Sit on niitä, jotka “joo”, innoissaan, “joo, kiva, kiva, voiks tätä jatkaa kotona?” Ja sitten ne tuo niitä pitkiä stooreja. Et se tosiaan vaihtelee, vaihtelee tota hyvin paljon. Mut sekin on varmaan asia, jossa pystyy niitä sitten kouluttamaan, että kun ne tottuu ja, tottuu siihen niin ainahan se tietenkin helpommaksi käy. Mut kaikki, mikä aiheuttaa vaivaa, mikä vaatii keskittymistä, miettimistä, pohtimista, ni kaikkihan se on monille vastenmielistä. Olis kiva pelata pelejä ja täyttää niit lyhyitä työkirjatehtäviä ja, ja keskustella ja tehdä kaikkee semmosta, että, että samahan pätee vaikka käänöslauseisiin. Et ne ei oo kivoja, kun niissä joutuu kovasti miettimään ja säätämään.” - Jouni*

(58) “Well it does make them a bit anxious, so it’s the kind of “I can’t do it, I can’t do it.” It depends, it depends a lot based on the group. At the moment I have the kind who like pass out and fall off their stools when they hear they should start writing themselves, to do something. And they just can’t do anything and can’t get anything done. Then there are those who are “yes” excited, “yes, good, fun, can we continue this at home?” And then they bring those long stories. So it depends, really depends a whole lot. But I suppose that’s one of the things where you can train them, get them accustomed, accustomed to it, so it will get increasingly easier. But everything that requires effort, that requires focus, thinking, pondering, so all that is repulsive to many. It would be nice to play games and fill in the short workbook exercises and, and discuss and do all that, so, so the same thing applies to like translating sentences. That they’re not fun since you have to think and work so hard.” - Jouni

*(59) “(...) kyllähän osa, tota, mieluummin haluais, että on sellasia, niinku, mekaanisempia tehtäviä esimerkiksi, mitkä vaikuttaa arviointiin, että kun niistä on helpompi saada täydet pisteet, että, että tota... Siinä kohin usein kun on kokeessa se aine, niin tulee vähän sellanen, yäääh, mä en jaksa. Mut että sitten taas sellaset oppilaat, jotka ei välttämättä just jaksa niitä, niitä kurssin asioita, olkoon nyt kielioppia tai sanastoa niin kauheesti treenata, tyyliin eivät tee läksyjä niin hyvin. Niin sitten he monesti tykkäävät, että onkin kirjutustehtävä ja sitten saa niinku näyttää, että mä oikeesti osaan kieltä, vaikka mä en osaakaan näitä kappaleen kuusi sanoja.” - Lotta*

(59) “(...) well some, well, would rather have the kind of like more mechanic tasks, for example, that affect the evaluation, since it’s easier to get a full score on them so, so that... The usual reaction to finding the writing assignment in the exam is like aarggh, I don’t have the energy for this. But then again students who don’t necessarily feel like studying like the contents of the course, let it be grammar or vocabulary very hard, like they don’t do their homework that well. So they often like having the writing task and then can show like that I do really know the language even though I don’t know the vocabulary of chapter six.” - Lotta

*(60) “(...) Tosta motivaatiosta tuli vaan mieleen se, että siinä on myöskin semmonen pieni riski, et ihastuu niihin omiin tehtäväksantoihinsa, väsää niitä iltaisin siellä ja on kauheen tyytyväinen, ja just että sitten ehkä se pieni narsismi sieltä pukka esille joskus. Että pitää myös muistaa kenelle näitä tekee ja miksi. Et näkee joskus sen oman työnsä niin kauheen arvokkaana, siis sen tuotoksen, tavallaan, et vitsit mä tein hyvän, ja sitte ihmettelee, että ei nää oppilaat innostunu tästä yhtään, että nehän näkee sen vaan koulutyönä. Mut sit taas joskus kun huomaa, että oikeesti onnistuu tekemään sellasen, että oppilaat innostuu. Niin se on kauheen palkitsevaa. Mut kai tässä ammatissa joku homma on, et miksi sitä illalla niin innoissaan tekee niitä, sen sijaan, että tekis jotain muuta. Kyl siinä joku on. Silleen. Jos tiedät, mitä tarkoitan.” - Laura*

(60) “(...) The thing about the motivation reminded me that there’s also a bit of a risk in falling in love with your own tasks, making them at nights and being awfully satisfied, and then perhaps the little bit of narcissism comes up at times. That you have to remember to whom you’re doing them for and why. That sometimes you see your own work as so very valuable, the product, sort of, that man I did a good one and then you wonder why didn’t these students get even a little bit excited by it, as they just see it as schoolwork. But then again sometimes when you notice that I actually managed to make one that got the students excited. So that’s really very rewarding. But there is something about this profession that makes you do those at nights so excited instead of doing something else. There is something about it. Like that. If you know what I mean.” - Laura

(61) *“Se on ihan niinkun avainasemassa oikeestaan silleen, et just mitenkä sitte ite saa sitä, sitä inspistä siitä aiheesta. Totta kai jos mä nään, että oppilaat ite on niinku innostuneita ja motivoituneena, nii se tavallaan niinku, tavallaan tuo semmosen olon et mun työllä on jotain merkitystä (naurua).” – Tuija*

(61) “It’s really in a very central position like that, like in how you find the inspiration about the topic. Of course if I see that the students are excited and motivated, it sort of, kind of gives me the kind of sense that my work has meaning. (laughter).” - Tuija

(62) *“No siis motivaatioon niinku toimia kielenopettajana niin sillä tavalla vaikuttaa positiivisesti, että kuitenkin sitä kautta mä saan paitsi tietoo siitä kielen osaamisesta tietyiltä osin, mä pääsen myöskin aika syvälle ehkä sit sinne niinku oppilaan ajatusmaailmaan kiinni, semmoseenkin ajatusmaailmaan, mikä ei näy tunneilla välttämättä, et mä koen, et se on hyvin sellanen henkilökohtanen, vaikka se olis fiktiivinen juttu, ni mä pääsen jotenkin siihen niinku oppilaan, opiskelijan persoonaan jotenki sillä tavalla käsiksi, että se on mun mielestä hirveän tärkeä näkökulma sen lisäksi, että siinä on se ite kieli ja se kirjottamisen taito.” - Tuija*

(62) “Well it affects the motivation to work as a language teacher positively in that sense, that that way I get know something about the language skills on certain areas and also I can get pretty deep into the students mind, even the kind of thoughts that are not necessarily visible on lessons, so I feel it’s really kind of personal, even if it is completely fictional, I can get a sense of the student’s, the student’s persona in some way, so I think it’s a very important point of view in addition to the language itself and the skill of writing.” - Tuija

(63) *“Mun täytyy myöntää, että mä oon tän noin 20 vuotisen urani aikana, ni mä oon inhonnu aineiden korjaamista. Että se on musta jotenkin tylsää ja työlästä. Mut nyt sitte, kun mä sain tän Hattie-herätyksen, ni sitten mä ehkä niinku, nyt mä koen, että mä teen jollainlailla merkityksellisempää työtä sekä niille opiskelijoille että itselleni. Et siin on niinku enemmän, enemmän niinku jotenkin sellanen, että teet työtä, jolla on joku merkitys, koska aikasemmin monta kertaa kävi sillain, että oli korjannu ne aineet ja kirjottanu sinne jotain kommenttia ja pistäny ne pistemäärät ja sit sillain aha (ryttää paperia) ja suoraan roskiin. Et ne katto vaan ne pisteet. Et näistäkinhän on paljon tutkimustuloksia, et niitä korjaamisia ei ni, et ne ei paljon vaikuta. Mut ehkä nyt sitten, kun ne on ite saanu valita sen, et miten ne ottaa sen palautteen, nii ne myös on jollain lailla vähän ite kiinnostuneempia, vähän enemmän sitoutuneita sit siihen palautteeseen (...) Mut se on ollut musta itestäni jotenkin älyllisesti mielenkiintoisempaa yrittää miettii myös sit se feed forward, et aika rutiinillahan ne nyt tulee, et tästä puuttuu artikkeli, tuolta puuttuu yksikön kolmannen persoonan ässä, sun on epäsuorasta kysymyslauseesta puuttuu whether tai if – jotain tämmöstä, mutta että niinku sitten se, se että miten auttaa sitten muuta kuin sanomalla, että korjaa kielioppivirheet. Ni eteenpäin, se, se on ollut musta oikeestaan ihan mielenkiintosta.” - Paula*

(63) “I have to admit that over my about 20-year career, I have always hated correcting essays. Like I think it’s somehow boring and troublesome. But now then that I’ve had this Hattie-awakening, so now I sort of, now I feel like the work I do is more somehow more meaningful for both the students and myself. Like there’s more, more of the kind of a sense of doing meaningful work, because earlier several times I had corrected the essays and written some comments there and written down the score and the students were like huh (crumples the paper) and straight to the bin. So that they just checked the score. There are a lot of research results about this too, that the corrections, that they don’t have a big impact. But maybe now then, when they’ve been allowed to choose how they want their feedback themselves they’re a bit more interested, a bit more invested in their feedback (...) But I personally think that the feed forward brings this intellectual challenge to it, like it’s pretty much routine to mark that you’re missing an article here, the third person s there, your indirect interrogative clause is missing whether or if – something like this, but like then that how to help in other ways than just saying that correct the grammar mistakes. So forward, that, that has been really interesting to me.” - Paula

(64) *“Ei varmaan. Ei takuulla (naurua). Just tää, että, että tota, osa kattoo sen numeron ja sitten ne niinku, vaikka se ois hyväkin se numero, niin ne ruttaa vaan sen konseptipaperin sinne jonneki paperinkeräysroskikseen ja sillä selvä. Että, että tota. Joskus mä oon kysynyki ihan suoraan oppilailta, lukiolaisilta, että ketkä teistä haluaa sillälailla niinku yksityiskohtasta palautetta ja kelle riittää numero. Että sitten niinku, tavallaan, käyttäny aikaa niiden oppilaiden palautteen antamiseen, jotka oikeesti on sen halunnu. Että tota, sillain. Mutta en usko kyllä, että kaikki, kaikki peruskoululaiset esimerkiks niin, jos niillä vähän pidemmän kirjoitelman teettää, niin en usko, että kyllä ymmärtävät esimerkiks, et kuinka paljon siinä kuluu aikaa, jos sen kunnolla ajatuksella niinku lukee ja korjaa ja arvioi. Sen näkee siitäki, et ne odottaa aina, että ne on samantien tarkistettu. Niinku ehkä jo sillain, että, et jos saa kokeen valmiiksi puolelta ja tunti loppuu varttia vaille, ni eks sä oo jo tarkistanu niitä meidän aineita. Joo (naurua). Kakskytviis 15 minuutissa. No en.” - Lotta*

(64) “No way. Absolutely no way (naurua). Sometimes I’ve even asked the students, upper secondary school students, that which of you want the kind of more detailed feedback and which ones are happy with just a grade.

So than then, when I've kind of used the time to giving feedback to those students who've actually wanted it. So that, like so. But I don't think that all, well, that all secondary school students, if you assign them an essay, so I don't think that all would understand for example like how much time it takes, if you read through it with thought and correct it and evaluate it. You can see it in that too that they always expect to have everything checked right away. Like even so that they finish the exam at half past and the lesson is over at quarter to, so haven't you checked out essays already? Yeah (laughter). Twentyfive in 15 minutes. No, I haven't." - Lotta

(65) "(...) kylhän täs tietysti ku on paljon tunteja niin joutuu niinku miettimään sitä omaa jaksamistakin, et jotenki tuntuu että, että kun on pitkä, pitkä päivä niin, et ei siin ehdi, ehdi tota noin mitään muuta tekeen, kun vaihtaa tunnista toiseen, et kyl se varmaan niinku sillä tavalla, et just joutuu niinku, just joutuu niinku mieltii sitä määrää, et kuinka paljon niinku ja millaisia, minkä tyypisiä tehtäviä, kirjutustehtäviä tehdään ja onko ne semmosii, jotka mä korjaan kaikki ja. Et sit osittain varmaan tehdään osin sen takia, et jos on ihan ylitsepääsemätön urakka korjata niitä, niin aika paljon tehdään semmosia, et tuotetaan sitä tekstiä, mut ei välttämättä niinku joka kohtaa korjata sieltä." - Olavi

(65) "(...) well of course you have to consider your own well-being when you have so many lessons, that somehow it feels like when you have such, such a long day that you don't have time, time to do anything else than to switch from one lesson to another, so I suppose it does sort of that way, just that you have to like, have to like consider the amount done, like how much and what kind, what kind of tasks, writing tasks are done and if they're the kind that I correct and. So partly we probably do it like that because like quite often if it's an overwhelming job to correct them, so we do that that we produce the text but don't necessarily correct every part of it." - Olavi

(66) "No, joka kurssissa pitää nyt ainaki tulla yks pitkä kirjutustehtävä, et vaikuttaakoon mun intoon ihan mil tavalla vaan, mut se on niinku tehtävä. Mut nyt sitte kun joku mediakurssi, niin se pitää ottaa sillä tavalla vähän eri tavalla, että koska ne tuottaa niitä tekstejä niin paljon, etten mä aina kiinnitä huomiota niihin kielioppivirheisiin. Joskus mä en ees korjaa niitä kielioppivirheitä, ne luetaan vaan ne tekstit ja analysoidaan niinku sitä asiasisältöä siinä ja niitten mielipiteitä, et ei, ku mä mietin noita mitä portfolioita, 25 tekstiä kirjoitettu viime vuonna ni en rupee jokaikistä korjaamaan. Varsinki kun mullakin on nyt liki 30 oppilasta siellä, niin ei, ei onnistu. Mä en oo yli-ihminen. Mut se onki vähän erilainen kurssi. Mut kyllä oppilaat haluu noilla 1-6 kursseilla, jos mä antasin aineen, jota mä en oo korjannu, kyllä ne tulis pyytämään "eiks tässä muka ollu virheitä?" Kyllä ne vaatiikin sen korjaamisen. Ei ne niinku tajuais sitä ollenkaan, että, et vois niinku antaa takasin arvosanan silti. Onkohan se edes lukenu tätä." - Kaija

(66) "Well, every course has to have at least one long writing assignment, so no matter how it affects my enthusiasm, it just has to be done. But now then when there's the media course, it has to be considered in a different way, that since they produce so many texts so I don't always look at their grammar mistakes. Sometimes I don't even correct the grammar mistakes, we just read the texts and analyse like the content in it and their opinions, that no, when I consider like the portfolios, 25 texts written last year, that I'm not gonna correct each one. Especially now when I have nearly 30 students there that no, no can do. I'm not super human. But it's a different kind of a course. But on the courses 1-6 students do want, like if I gave back an essay that I hadn't corrected, they'd come and ask that "weren't there really any mistakes in this, at all?" They do require the correction. They wouldn't like get it at all that they could get the essay graded all the same. Has she even read this." - Kaija

(67) "Joo. Niit kulttuurikursseilla, kun mä teetäin nyt niitä, niitä niitten, et ne kirjotti myös niitä fiktiivisii tarinoita. Ni kyl siel on paljon sellasii, sellasii tarinoita, että vaikka mulla meni ihan sairaasti aikaa siihen, kun mä luin niitä noin viissataa, kun ne kirjotti kaks vähintään sellasia kurssilla, että noin 500 sanaa, kertaa 30. Kertaa kaks. Ni. Ni olihan, menihän, siihen meni ihan hirveesti aikaa. Mutta tota, siellä oli muutamia oikeesti sellasia, että mä niinku joko itkin niitä lukiessa, että niin surullisia tarinoita tai sitten niin, niin jotenkin semmosia hauskoja juttuja, että sitä niinku nauro siellä. Ja lueskelin niitä miehelleni ääneen, että kuuntele ku tää kirjottaa tälleen. Et ne oli, ne oli kyllä ihan. Siis se, että kun näkee sen, et minkälainen luovuus niissä oikeesti on. Et mitä niistä irtooo, kun niille vaan antaa vähän vapautta. Niin ne on ollut sellasia, mitkä on motivoinu." - Paula

(67) "Yes. On the culture courses when I assigned the, the, like that they wrote the fictional stories too. So there's a lot of the kind, kind of stories that even though it took enormous amounts of time to read the five hundred, they wrote two at least on the course, about 500 words times thirty. Times two. So. So it was, it took huge amounts of time. But well, there were some of those truly like, like I either cried reading them, since they were such sad stories or then like somehow so funny that it just like made you laugh. And I read them out loud to my husband like hey listen to what this one has written. That they were, yeah, they were quite. I mean that seeing what kind of creativity they have. Like what they can create when you give them just a little bit of freedom. So those have been something that have motivated me." - Paula

(68) “(...) Ehkä semmosia huippuhetkiä elämässä on justiin joskus, siitä on tosi, tosi kauan aikaa, kulttuurikursilla, joka toteutettiin silloin tommosena portfoliona, et siellä ei ollut paljon semmosia perinteisiä testejä minkäänlaisia, jossa kuitenkin tavallaan sitten niissä miten erilaisia projektitöitä toteutti ni sitten piti huomioida siinä niinku erilaiset taitoalueet, niin kyl semmosia huippukokemuksia tulee vieläki kylmät väreet on niinku kirjottamisen suhteen se, kun yks tyttö teki niinku oman laulun, sävelsi sen, esitti, äänitti, ja sit se pakkas ne kaikki ne omat projektityönsä semmoseen laatikkoon, ja sielt löyty kaikennäköstä, ne sanat oli tehty semmoseks niinku, laitettu semmoseen kääröön ja sit semmonen silkkinauha siihen päälle. Et niinku missä niinku todellaki siis niinku sokeeki huomaa sen, et niinku on näkyny se kiinnostus, motivaatio, sitä niinku omaa työtä kohtaan. Nimenomaan sen kautta, et saa ihan vapaasti toteuttaa itseään, juuri sellaisena kun on, ja jos sattuu olemaan tommosia lahjoja ihmisellä, että, et pystyy vieraalla kielellä tekemään omia kappaleitaan ni se nyt on yks tämmönen huippuesimerkki, niit on paljon kyl semmosia positiivisia asioita, mutta tos on niinku muutama maistainen.” – Tuija

(68) “(...) Perhaps one of the top moments in life has been just like something, it was a long, long time ago, on the culture course that was realized as a kind of a portfolio at the time, that there weren't really like a lot of any kind of traditional texts, but where they kind of did a lot of different kinds of project work and they had to like pay attention to different kinds of skills, so one of those top moments, still getting shivers, like in terms of writing, is that when this girl did like her own song, composed it, performed it, recorded it, and she packed all her project work in this box and there were all kinds of things in there, the lyrics had been made into this like, put into this scroll and there was a silk sash on it. It's like the kind of thing where even a blind person could see the interest, the motivation towards the work. Specifically through being allowed to freely express yourself, exactly as you are, and if someone has talents like this, that they can write their own songs in a foreign language, so it's just one of those top examples, there are so many positive things, but there's a taste.” - Tuija

(69) “Se oli tossa vuos sitten suurin piirtein, ku oppilaillahan ei niitä kännyköitä pitäis juuri olla siinä oppitunnilla, mutta se nyt vaan on niin, että kyllä niillä niitä siinä, siinä tota pöydällä silloin tällön näky, ja tietysti me siitä niiden käytöstä kielletään, mut sitten oli tämmönen ysiluokan tunti. En muista oliko meillä ollu vielä mitään ainekirjotusjuttuja niiden kanssa siinä vaiheessa vuotta, mutta sit siinä oli yks oppilas, sit- ne teki jotain hiljasta työtä, niin kesken kaiken se sano, et nii että, että, että [entiseltä oppilaalta] terveisiä. Ja mä, että jaa kiitos, hui, mitä häh, jaa että sekö, joka meni lukioon, ei tossa nimee tarvii mainita sen kummemmin. Joo se, ja sit mä sanoin, et onks sulla kännykkä, joo. No sit se, oli hiljasta vähän aikaa. Nii että se sano, että, että niin se on sen koko lukion, lukion ekan vuoden pärjänny niillä ainekirjotusopeilla, mitä te täällä kävitte. Että, että ei se siellä oppinu niitä, että ne on näillä yläkoulun eväillä se oli sit pärjänny näissä kirjoituksissa. Ja se oli ihan kiva tilanne, siinä oli se koko luokka kuulolla, ja se oli vielä semmonen sakk, joka ei kai kaikin puolin ollu aina niin hirveen motivoitunu kirjoitustehtäviinkään. Niin se oli ihan hauska, aika niinkun suora palaute siinä. Se siitä, että jotain oli tarttunu jolleki korvan taakse ja siellä oli sit semmonen hiljaisuus laskeutu taas. Ja sitten en tiedä mitä ne mieltivät, mutta ihan, ihan mukava hetki. Et siinä ei ollu se kirjottamisen opettaminen täysin hukkaan mennyt, että jotain hyötyä siitä oli jollekin. Semmoset on aika kivoja. Oli ihan vilpittömän tuntunen episodi.” - Jouni

(69) “It was a few years ago, as students shouldn't really have their mobile phones there during the lesson, but it's just so that they do have them there, you can see them on the desks every now and then, and of course we forbid them to use them, but then I had a ninth grade lesson. I can't remember if we'd had any essay writing yet at that time of the year, but there was a student, they were doing some quiet work there, so all the sudden she said that, that [a previous student] says hello. And I was like aha, thank you, yikes, huh, is she the one who went to upper secondary school, you don't have to mention the name there. Yes, that one, and I asked do you have a mobile phone there, yes. Then she, it was quiet for a while. So then she said the, the previous student had said that she had managed the whole first year of upper secondary school just on what she had learnt about essay writing here. That, that she hadn't learned those there, that they have been managing matriculation examination with the knowledge they got here in secondary school. And that was a nice, a rather honest feedback there. Knowing that something, something has stuck with someone and then it was quiet again. And I don't know what they were thinking, but it was a nice moment. Like there teaching them how to write essays wasn't completely wasted, but it was useful to someone. Those are pretty nice. It felt like a sincere episode.” – Jouni