STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE USE OF ORAL FEEDBACK IN EFL CLASSROOMS

Master's thesis

Noora Pirhonen

University of Jyväskylä

Department of Languages

English

May 2016

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Noora Pirhonen	
Työn nimi – Title Students' perceptions about the use of oral feedback in EFL classrooms	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Maisterin tutkinto
Aika – Month and year Toukokuu 2016	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 96 + 1 liite

Tiivistelmä – Abstract

Tämän tutkimuksen tarkoituksena oli selvittää lukiossa opiskelevien oppilaiden näkökulmia ja mielipiteitä yleisesti palautteen antoon liittyen. Pääpaino oli suullisessa palautteessa, ja tutkimus pyrki selvittämään, milloin, miten ja kuinka paljon suullista palautetta annetaan englannin kielen tunneilla lukiossa, sekä millaista suullista palautetta lukiolaiset haluaisivat saada, ja mistä kielen osa-alueista.

Palautteen anto on tärkeä osa oppimista ja opettamista. Palautteen antoa luokkahuoneessa on tutkittu aiemmin, ja usein tutkimukset ovat keskittyneet esimerkiksi korjaavaan palautteeseen ja sen eri muotoihin niin oppilaan kuin opettajan kannalta, tai kirjalliseen palautteeseen. Suullista palautetta on kuitenkin tutkittu vähemmän, eikä tutkimuksia suullisen palautteen käytöstä keskittyen oppilaan näkökulmaan ole tehty montaa. Siksi tämä tutkimus tuo uutta tietoa aiheesta, ja on tärkeä osa palautteen annon tutkimisen osa-aluetta. Tutkimus on määrällinen, sisältäen hieman laadullisia piirteitä. Aineistonkeruumenetelmänä käytettiin kyselyä, joka koostui väittämistä ja kahdesta avoimesta kysymyksestä. Aineisto muodostui 93 lukioikäisen opiskelijan täyttämistä kyselyistä. Kyselyt kerättiin itäsuomalaisessa lukiossa, ja kaikki osallistujat täyttivät kyselyn samaan aikaan paperille, jonka jälkeen tulokset syötettiin tietokoneelle, ja niitä jaoteltiin tarkempiin alaluokkiin. Dataa tulkittiin sisällönanalyysin keinoin ja SPSS- ohjelman avulla.

Tutkimuksen tulokset osoittavat, että oppilaat haluavat saada palautetta osana englannin kielen opetusta, ja oppilaiden tuntemukset olivat kaikin puolin positiivia palautteeseen liittyen. Eniten palautetta annettiin luokkahuoneessa, ja kielen kaikista osa-alueista annettiin melko paljon palautetta. Opettaja antoi palautetta eniten kiertämällä luokassa, ja koko luokalle kerralla. Kysyttäessä, millaista suullista palautetta oppilaat haluavat, eniten palautetta toivottiin kirjallisista tehtävistä sekä kieliopista. Oppilaat toivoivat enemmän henkilökohtaista palautetta. Monet oppilaista olivat valmiita käyttämään suullisen palautteen saamiseen myös vapaa-aikaansa. Suullisen palautteen toivottiin osoittavan virheet, tai auttamaan päättelemään virheet itse. Sekä positiivista että negatiivista palautetta arvostettiin, ja palautteen haluttiin motivoivan ja kehittävän.

Tutkimus vastasi tutkimuskysymyksiin hyvin, ja antoi lisää tietoa oppilaiden näkemyksistä palautteeseen ja erityisesti suulliseen palautteeseen liittyen. Tutkimus oli kuitenkin melko suppea, eikä sen tuloksia voi yleistää laajemmin. Tulevaisuudessa olisi mielenkiintoista tutkia suullista palautetta oppilaan näkökulmasta vielä laajemmin, ja käyttää määrällisen tutkimuksen lisänä laadullisia keinoja, kuten haastattelua. Oppilaan ja opettajan näkemyksiä olisi oleellista myös verrata, jotta saataisiin kokonaisvaltaisempi kuva aiheesta.

Säilytyspaikka – Depository: JYX

Muita tietoja – Additional information

Table of contents

1. Introduction

In a classroom, teacher is often, if not always, the one guiding the students and giving them instructions. Students, on the other hand, are also responsible for their own learning. However, guidance and feedback from the teacher is always necessary in order for the students to learn and develop further. Feedback as a concept is an essential part of teaching and learning, and thus this study focuses on the different ways feedback is present in the classroom. The focus is especially on oral feedback, and the students' perceptions of the use of it in English classes in upper secondary school. Also, the study will reveal the students' hopes and wishes, because it is important to find out how feedback is currently present in the classrooms, and how the students actually would like it to be used. In addition, current feedback practices and the students' perceptions about feedback in overall are studied.

Feedback is always present in schools, and thus it has been studied before from different angles. One has, for example, looked at corrective feedback and the use of it both from teachers' and students' perspective (see for example Lyster and Ranta 1997). Moreover, teacher's ways of using feedback, and the role of the teacher have been researched (Iwashita and Li 2012, Harmer 2004). Oral feedback is one of the most used types of feedback, but the focus previously has been more on corrective feedback or written feedback (Deirdre 2010, Hyland 2003). Thus, it is essential to focus on oral feedback, and find out more about students' perceptions on the topic. In addition, this particular study will reveal the situation of the use of oral feedback in a Finnish upper secondary school and in English classes, bringing forward important insights not only for the areas of feedback research, but especially for Finnish teachers and researchers.

Feedback, and oral feedback as a part of it, has several positive effects on learning. First of all, it helps the students learn (Moss and Brookhart 2009:44). Without feedback, it would be rather difficult to know what one has been doing right and where there is still need for improvement. Actually, feedback is a remarkable way of influencing learning (Hattie and Timperley 2007:81). It not only improves students' learning, but also guides them into the right direction (Westberg and Hilliard 2001:13). Second of all, providing students with feedback motivates them and gives them control over their own learning (Bookrhart 2008:1). It is relatively easier to learn and develop as a

language user, if one is directed into the right direction while practicing. Also the National Core Curriculum for Basic Education acknowledges the role of feedback in learning, and points out that teachers should provide students with diverse feedback throughout the learning experience (2004:260-261). Finally, oral feedback is the most natural one of the feedback types, because it can be given instantly and frequently when needed (Clarke 2003). For example, with written feedback, students often have to wait longer to receive the feedback, and they might not have a chance to ask questions about the task or discuss with the teacher. With oral feedback all of this is possible, and even desirable.

Researchers before have divided the use of feedback into different strategies and methods (Brookhart 2008, Hargreaves et al. 2000), and in this study, the role of those strategies is also investigated in order to find out whether these strategies are used and whether they work well, according to the students. Askew and Gipps have also divided teaching into different models (2000) which will be studied in order to find out in which ways oral feedback is used in the classrooms. Most importantly, one has to remember that feedback has to be used in the right way for it to be effective (Frey and Fisher 2011). It the teacher does no fully understand how and when to give feedback to his/her students, the feedback provided might not produce the desired outcomes in the classroom. For example, it is essential to take into account the students' role in the feedback process, as well as it is for the teacher to find the right ways of providing feedback (Askew and Lodge 2000, Harmer 2004). Preston (1985) already studied students' perceptions about the use of effective feedback in the 1980's, but this current study will reveal more about the issue and bring forward the current ways oral feedback is used in Finnish English language classrooms.

The current study is for the most part quantitative, including some qualitative aspects as well. The data consisted of 93 upper secondary school students, most of them studying for the first or second year in that particular school in Eastern Finland. The data was collected in the form of a questionnaire, where most of the questions were statements of the use feedback in upper secondary schools, the ways teachers provide feedback, and most importantly, the ways the students would actually like to be provided with feedback. There were, however, two open-ended questions, where the participants of the study had a chance to write more about their views on the topic of oral feedback. The questionnaire was collected from the students in the school in paper version, after which the results were entered into Excel and from there to SPSS analytic software in order to form

a more cohesive picture of the data. The results where then analyzed more closely and divided into different subgroups according to the guidelines presented for questionnaire analysis (see for example Dörnyei 2010). Open-ended questions were analyzed manually using content analysis and also divided into different groups, according to the answers. Possible gender differences and correlations between different statements were also taken into account.

The current study began with this introduction of the phenomenon of feedback and oral feedback. Section two presents the current literature and research written about the topic. The focus is especially on oral feedback, but feedback as a whole is presented in the section as well. Since this study focuses on the use of oral feedback in the classroom, it is essential to consider the different feedback strategies and methods, the feedback content and models of teaching as well as the students' and teachers' role in the feedback process. Section three focuses on the above features, providing an overall picture of the use of feedback in the classrooms. Section four presents the current research design in more detail, after which in section five the results of the study are presented and analyzed more closely. Finally, in section six, these results are discussed in more detail, and conclusions about the results and about the success of the study are made.

2. Feedback

2.1 Definitions of feedback

Feedback is a term that has numerous definitions, and it has been proven relatively difficult to define precisely. Moreover, feedback can relate to several issues, and it can be used for different purposes. Here, however, the focus is on education and thus definitions related to that context are presented. One way of understanding feedback is to see it as "information that students are given about their performance with the intention of guiding them in acquiring desired attitudes and skills" (Westberg and Hilliard 2001:13). Hattie and Timperley (2007:81) modestly say feedback to be "one of the most powerful influences on learning and achievement". With this note, it is important to truly see the effect that feedback has on people in different contexts and situations, all the way from homes to schools and classrooms. Another definition of feedback relating to the field of education arises from the assumptions that feedback ultimately is what one needs in order to learn,

a key to learning. It is "a product that is presented to learner by someone" (Taras 2013:31). This views the process of feedback giving ending up to be a product, and making the feedback receiver a learner in the context.

A dictionary defines feedback in the following way: "helpful information or criticism that is given to someone to say what can be done to improve a performance, product, etc." (Merriam-Webster 2015). From this statement, one can already see that feedback can be given on multiple issues and with different approaches. What is important, however, is the fact that it is given in order to improve the receiver's performance in the future. According to Askew (2000:6) feedback is simply "a judgement about the performance of another". She continues to state that when feedback is given, the receiver is usually someone who is not as skilled in that topic as the feedback giver. In other words, it is assumed that the one giving feedback is competent enough to advice someone else. This is often the case with teacher- student feedback, when the teacher helps the students and shows his/her expertise. Moreover, it can be assumed that whether the person giving the feedback is a student talking to another student, or a child giving feedback to an adult, the receiver of the feedback is someone who at that point is not aware of the issues and will want to hear what the other person has to say. These are assumptions that will not always hold true, but are a good base for the concept of feedback.

The definition I will use in the present study is Moss' and Brookhart's definition of feedback as "a teacher's response to student work with the intention of furthering learning" (2009:44). This simple definition takes into consideration not only the fact that teacher's must often reply to students' work by giving suitable feedback, but also the issue of the usefulness of feedback. After all, a teacher's job is to make sure people learn the topics they are meant to learn, with the focus on effective learning and thus also effective feedback.

2.2 Curriculum and feedback

The Finnish National Core Curriculum of Basic Education has an important role in creating a base for Finnish schools and their education systems. It sets ground rules, goals and guidelines for all the schools, and the local curricula are formulated on the basis of the core curriculum (2004:8).

However, the questions of feedback and how it is addressed in the core curriculum is not completely straightforward. Even if several studies and research have concluded that feedback indeed has an essential role in teaching and learning (See for example Brookhart 2008, Askew 2000), one only finds few notions of it in the core curriculum. First of all, when describing student learning, the curriculum states to apply "various ways of cooperation" as well as "expressions of one's own thoughts and feelings" (2004:36-38). Both of these ways demand the use of feedback in order to succeed, but it is not directly mentioned in the guidelines. Second of all, under the instruction of foreign languages, it is stated that students learn to evaluate their work and skills, and work with other students in small groups, as well as develop one's own language learning. Here feedback is also mentioned, and one of the goals stated is "utilizing feedback obtained in an interactive situation" (2004:139-142). As one can see, the guidelines are relatively broad and only give certain advice, without explaining *how* or *why* to do it. Finally, under pupil assessment, the importance of ongoing feedback from the teacher is brought up. Verbal assessment and oral feedback have a significant role, and other types of assessment are encouraged to be used as well. In fact, it is mentioned that both the pupils and their parents or guardians must receive assessment feedback throughout the year in a diverse manner (2004:260-261). Feedback is covered especially in pupil assessment part, which is naturally a good thing. However, one must remember that feedback is not only related to assessment, but also to learning and teaching overall.

The National Core Curriculum for Basic Education has also had some amendments and additions, one of which applying to feedback. It is written that working approaches used should help pupils to evaluate their learning and to seek feedback and thus reflect on their actions. (2011:5). The facts about feedback mentioned above are all from the valid core curriculum of basic education. However, the Finnish education system is going to change rather soon, and the new core curriculum with changes is presented in August 2016. The curriculum reform includes notions about the use of feedback, and how it should be used in schools. It states that teachers should give constructive and honest feedback in order to strengthen learners' self-confidence and learning motivation (2015:25). Moreover, pupil assessment is discussed and a shift from assessment of learning towards *assessment for learning* and *assessment as learning* is made. Relating to this topic, the importance of positive feedback is encouraged (2015:32). Here, for the first time, feedback is given a more significant role and it has even been cut into smaller pieces such as constructive and positive

feedback to help teachers make use of it properly. However, these are still broad guidelines, and the execution of these guidelines is for the schools and the teachers to put into practice.

2.3 Types of feedback

2.3.1 Oral feedback and written feedback

Oral feedback is one type of feedback, and as its name already states, it is feedback that is given orally and often in interaction with people. It can be given to an individual, to a group or to the whole class (Brookhart 2008). As a feedback experience, it is the most natural one, because it can be given instantly and frequently (Clarke 2003). Moreover, one knows what one has done right and what could be improved right after the performance, not a day or a week later. With oral feedback there is also a chance to ask questions about the feedback one received, or justify or argue one's choices. Thus, the issue is still fresh and one can assume that the student also feels more motivated to listen to the feedback, because he/she still remembers how the task and the performance was like. One requirement for oral feedback, according to Clarke (2003:17), is that it should focus on the learning intention of the task in order to be effective and worthwhile (see also Brookhart 2008).

There are, of course, many ways of giving feedback orally, and some of the most common ways to give oral feedback to an individual are at the student's desk quietly, while the class is doing something else. This way it does not have to be planned beforehand, and a teacher can easily talk about issues that arise during class or something else he/she wants to give feedback on. Teacher can also give feedback at teacher's desk, either by planning it beforehand with a student or more informally, for example if a student decides to come and ask something. Oral feedback to an individual can also be scheduled for a specific time, even after school or during recess. (Brookhart 2008: 48). It often depends on the type of feedback one wants to give, whether one needs to make an appointment or casually implement individual feedback as part of the class. Oral feedback to a group or class is often given at the start of the class, when one wants to summarize previous issues that arose in the last session. It can be a way of ending the class, and for example corrective feedback is one option (Mendez and Cruz 2012). Moreover, it is a good way of giving information about a certain issue, for example when a teacher wants to make sure students understand everything. Group

feedback is profitable also during performances, and it can be given both live as the matter arises, or even videotaped, later in the class. Videotaped oral feedback is still more personal than written comments (Harmer 2004). One should always remember the importance of feedback, and during class it is often easier to give feedback to a whole class rather than focus merely on individuals.

Written feedback is an essential part of the feedback system, and it has been used in education alongside oral feedback. With written feedback, one basically aspires to achieve the same goals as with oral feedback. The main target is to help the students and give feedback in a way that succeeds in developing their skills in the best possible way. However, Deirdre (2010:23) indicates that teachers and writing instructors always assume that students' writing is a process, in which they modify their writing after a received feedback from the teacher. Moreover, this means that students should have the time and resources available to do so, and this is not always the case. The feedback, then, must be encouraging and respective, making the students develop using their own ideas and own strengths during the process, while the feedback only works as a guiding mechanism. Harmer (2004) has divided written feedback broadly to two categories: responding and correcting. Responding refers to the type of written feedback that is concerned with the content and the outline of the writing, not merely accuracy. Teacher's role in this case is not to judge student's work, but to build an atmosphere for affective dialogue. As for correcting, it focuses on pointing out the errors in various ways and thus indicating that there is something wrong in student's work. Especially if one uses process-writing, responding has proven to be more useful. (Harmer 2004:108-109) Moreover, it is always important to remember to handle errors and their correction with specific care, because it can be threatening or demotivating for students to receive information on where they performed wrongly. Interestingly, students often prefer feedback on grammatical items instead of for example on content or the design (Harmer 2004:112).

A study by Hyland (2003) examined the relationship between student revision and teacher feedback, the data forming of six students and the feedback given to them about writing during a single course. Students and teachers were interviewed during the course in order to find out more about their views. Results show, most importantly, that even though teacher's had different approaches to teaching, they nevertheless focused on grammatical accuracy in students' texts. In addition, how students used the feedback they got also varied: most of them used it to revise their

texts, but the extent to which the feedback was used varied. Moreover, all the students in the study believed that feedback repeatedly on same issues would help them improve, and they realized that form-focused feedback rarely gives immediate results. In addition, they wanted to get feedback about their errors relating to form, which supports Harmer's (2004, above) view of the fact that students do want feedback mostly on form.

The effect of both oral and written feedback on students' writing revisions has been studied (Telceker and Akcan 2010). What was found was that all students improved their grammar significantly during their writing process. They revised their texts based on grammar error codes given by the teacher. Teacher also held one-on-one conferences, during which he/she made questions and comments to help students improve the content of the text. However, students were not as successful in revising their ideas as they were in revising their language. Surprisingly, only 35 % of the teacher's comments were judged to have a positive effect on the next draft. Moreover, a study by Bitchener et al. (2005) investigated whether the type of feedback given to adult migrant students on three types of errors result in improvements in writing over a 12-week period. 53 students participated in the study, and feedback types included in this study were direct explicit written feedback combined with individual oral feedback, explicit written feedback only, and no corrective feedback at all. Error types consisted of prepositions, the past simple tense and the definite article. With the last two error types, combination of written and oral feedback was proven helpful. Nevertheless, there was no overall effect on accuracy improvement. There was significant variation in the different pieces of writing, which supports the idea that when one acquires new linguistic forms, one can at some point perform well, but also fail in a similar situation.

2.3.1.1 Nonverbal feedback

Even though feedback is mostly given verbally or in written form, teachers can use nonverbal feedback as a part of their teaching in language classroom. Epstein and Raffi (2014) use the term communication also about nonverbal communication. According to their definition (Epstein and Raffi 2014:1), communications "are based on a learned, shared system of acts we do that we deem to be symbolic". In a teaching and learning environment these communications include for example looks, postures and body movements. A common example of nonverbal feedback is a case where

teacher is explaining something and hears a student or a group of students talking in the class. Teacher reacts to this by stopping what he or she is doing and just simply looking at the interrupting students quietly. This a simple way of showing that the teacher wants the situation to change and the students to stop talking and start listening. Many other nonverbal feedback techniques are seen when studying the classroom talk in more detail. Moreover, simple looks and gestures can be very effective in certain points, and words are not always needed. However, when studying feedback, nonverbal gestures are often only a part of the larger phenomenon, and used perhaps more in situations that do not relate to the topic here, such as maintaining a good working atmosphere (see for example Tainio 2007). For this reason, this study does not focus on the role of non-verbal feedback any closer.

2.3.1.2 Peer feedback

Peer feedback is one of the feedback types one can use in the classrooms. Before, it was only the teacher who had the right to give feedback and help the students improve their language use. Nowadays, using peer feedback is a natural part of many classrooms. This type of feedback enables students to gain the role of the teacher and take active part in giving feedback to each other (Stajduhar 2013:87). One of the main advantages peer feedback has is the fact that it makes it easier to exchange ideas for the students. This way, students do not only have to rely on the teacher's knowledge, but instead get to receive often useful information and opinions from each other. However, peer feedback does not work well in every situation. In some cases, peer feedback can be less trustworthy than the teacher's feedback. Moreover, students may not know how to give feedback properly, or are not motivated to do so. (Brown 2004).

There has also been some positive evidence about the usefulness of peer feedback, and one study (Krych-Appelbaum and Musial 2007) found out evidence about the students' perspectives. Participants of the study were 20 undergraduate students, who completed a writing assignment. Randomly chosen, some of the students received written feedback from a classmate after the first draft, while the other group discussed the paper orally with each other before and after writing the draft. After writing the papers, the students filled in a questionnaire about the feedback forms used. It was noted that rather than receiving their feedback written, students valued oral peer feedback and the fact that they could interact with other students.

2.3.1.3 Corrective feedback

Corrective feedback has received a significant amount of attention in the research field and it has been studied from different perspectives. Thus, I consider this topic to be important also for my research and have covered corrective feedback relatively extensively here. There are researchers who find corrective feedback to be even unnecessary, and, in fact, feel people learn best without the focus on error correction. This field of research is based on Krashen's and Chomsky's views about learning: according to Chomsky, there is a Universal Grammar system build in us that helps us learn, and thus we do not need to specifically focus on errors (Smith 2004:39). The theory of Universal Grammar supports the fact that positive evidence is sufficient for L1 acquisition. Even if proof for negative input was found by caretakers, they still believe negative evidence is not necessary. When it comes to learning an L2, some researchers believe Universal Grammar is available during the learning process here as well, while others see negative evidence as essential to learning. However, there is a middle line to these opposite views, where the effect of negative evidence and the importance of it is acknowledged, but it cannot have any effect on L2 interlanguage grammar. (Profozic 2013: 21-23). As for Krashen, he sees correcting as unnatural and unnecessary, arguing that children should learn languages naturally, without interference and error correction from an adult. Related to this is Krashen's theory of comprehensible input, which is a factor making foreign language learning or second language learning easier for people (Usó-Juan and Ruiz-Madrid 2006:220). However, most researchers nowadays have acknowledged the important role of corrective feedback, and the next paragraphs seek to present the issues relating to it.

Lyster and Ranta (1997, 46-48) have divided corrective feedback into six categories, and their definitions have been used on several studies later on. First, according to them, explicit correction occurs when a teacher provides a correct form, indicating that what the student said was incorrect. Second, recasts refer to reformulation of all or part of the student's utterance, except the error. Third, clarification requests indicate that there is something wrong in the student's utterance, or that it has been misunderstood. Fourth, metalinguistic feedback occurs when a teacher does not explicitly provide the correct form, but uses comments, information or questions in order to help a student. Fifth, elicitation refers to the ways teacher can directly use to get the correct form from a student. It can be done by pausing the speech, asking to reformulate, or asking questions to get the correct form. The sixth and final type of corrective feedback is repetition, which occurs when a teacher repeats a

student's erroneous utterance, often using intonation as help. Moreover, it always depends on the situation and the case when deciding what corrective feedback type to use. For example, if the goal of the task is to simply produce the right form of the word, then a teacher can simply repeat the incorrect form or even provide the correct form. Time, unfortunately, is often in short supply in classrooms, and thus it is not always possible to spend a great amount of time trying to get students to correct their mistakes. Thus, explicit correction is often used when correcting errors.

According to Profozic (2013: 13) corrective feedback is a term used to indicate to the learner that there is something wrong in the utterance, and some change or correction must be adjusted in order to make it more target-like. Research about feedback supports the fact that corrective feedback and error correction are important functions (Moss and Brookhart 2009: 44). Moreover, we recognize the importance of corrective feedback when considering both explicit and implicit knowledge. Corrective feedback has a significant role in the acquisition of both those knowledges when learning a second language (Reitbauer and Vaupetitsch 2013:40). However, in the school environment learning is often explicit and thus this study will focus more on that.

Students have an essential role in the process of corrective feedback, since they are the ones responding to it. There are indeed several ways one can respond to corrections: some students benefit from the feedback and actually learn from it, while others might forget it as soon as it is said. For corrective feedback to be beneficial, it has to be timely, specific, understandable and actionable (Frey and Fisher 2011). More information about this will be under section three, "Feedback in the classroom". If feedback does not fulfill this criteria, it will most likely be unpurposeful and even negatively received by the students. Ferris (2006) has divided the typical ways students answer to corrective feedback into seven subcategories. Error corrected simply means that the error made was corrected after the feedback. Incorrect change happens when a student corrects the mistake, but it remains incorrect. No change, as it states, means that the student did not change anything. Deleted text occurs when the erroneous part is deleted. Correct substitution, in other words a case where a correct change is made by substituting for the identified error. In addition to previous, an incorrect substitution happens when a change is made, but the error remains. Finally, a teacher-induced error, which is the worst case scenario, results in a student error after teacher gives feedback. Similarly, Yoshida (2009:38) divided the students' responses into different categories: uptake, acknowledgement, uptake and acknowledgement, unsuccessful uptake, and no uptake and no

acknowledgement. The first takes place when the student responds to the feedback somehow, the second when the students responds with simple expressions such as "yeah", the third when both the above happen, fourth when the learner tries to correct the error but fails, and the fifth and final option occurs when the student gives no response at all.

Yoshida (2009) states that the effectiveness of corrective feedback for the student depends on several issues. First of all, availability of multiple scaffoldings and collective scaffolding. The glossary of education reform (2016) has defined scaffolding as different techniques used to gain students' understanding, and in the end, independence in the process of learning. With the help of multiple and collective scaffolding, teachers can adapt their teaching to meet the needs of the students. Second of all, whether the environment is relaxed and collaboratively. Obviously, the better and the more supporting the environment, the more successful the results are. Third of all, learners' focus on the topic and the instructions. as well as other learners' answers, plays a significant role. If one does pay attention to anything that goes on in classroom, or is partly focused, learning is not likely to happen. Finally, learners' goals influence the effectiveness of corrective feedback. For example, a well-motivated and interested learner will more likely learn faster, whereas someone who is not interested or feels his/her goal is purely to pass the test or the course, will not benefit from the feedback a great deal. (Yoshida 2009:127).

Noticing is a term that is often linked to corrective feedback. Noticing can be explained as the amount of correction used after the feedback (Santos et al. 2010:131). Moreover, it is done consciously and attention is paid to the input received, so that the input could become intake. In other words, when noticing, one makes a conscious effort of correcting something that is incorrect. When considering noticing together with corrective feedback, it enables learners to realize and understand the difference there is between a target form and what they said (Profozic 2013:27). In other words, learners are constantly comparing their use of language to the target form. Furthermore, it may be extremely beneficial to notice the negative evidence, because learners' learning and restructuring can improve a great deal (ibid.).

Arab students' preferences for oral corrective feedback were studied by Abukhadrah (2012). 20 male students and 10 teachers were interviewed, observed and focus group interviews were held. Students were all adults, over 23 years old. The results point out that the students and teachers both have positive attitudes towards error correction. Thus, L2 learning can benefit from corrective feedback.

Moreover, most students find focusing on grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary important, and feel these areas should receive the most attention. Errors relating to other areas, such as social interaction, are seen as less important. However, there was a difference between teachers and students when studying different error types. Teachers believed that in addition to grammatical errors, semantic errors should receive more attention, too. The most popular feedback strategy for students was metalinguistic feedback, followed by explicit feedback, elicitation, recasts and clarification requests. As for teachers, they preferred recasts and prompts in the form of clarification requests, followed by repetitions and elicitation. As the results show, there is a mismatch between students' and teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback strategies. Moreover, it is important to consider studies from different parts of the world, because the school system definitely is not the same in every country. In this case, the students saw error correction as important, which has been the case in other studies as well (see for example Preston et al. 1985).

Lyster and Saito (2010) investigated the use of oral feedback in SLA classrooms through a meta-analysis. The material focused on 15 studies. First of all, the results indicated that corrective feedback has major effects on target language development. Second of all, the largest effects were observed with the use of free constructed responses, prompts and recasts. Third of all, explicit correction was shown to have positive effects as well. Thus, all types of correction can positively affect L2 learners' interlanguage development. Age was also considered, and it seems that younger learners benefit from corrective feedback more than older learners. Furthermore, similarities and differences in corrective feedback and learner's uptake between four classroom settings in France, Canada, New Zealand and Korea were investigated by YoungHee (2004). The results show that recasts were the most typical feedback types in all contexts, but more frequent in Korea and New Zealand. Uptake and repair following recasts played a more significant role in the two classrooms. Moreover, recasts leading to uptake and repair may be greater in the cases where recasts are more salient, and where students orient themselves more towards linguistic forms than to meaning. Thus, the context can have a noteworthy role in corrective feedback and learner uptake.

2.3.2 Reasons for giving feedback

The way one should give feedback depends greatly on the task, and the reasons for giving feedback are often relatively different depending on the task or situation. Harmer (2004) has made a distinction between fluency work and accuracy work, in other words the oral work of students. According to Harmer, during fluency work teacher should only correct errors that are in the way of communication. Correction needs to be subtle and one has to use one's judgement to see what needs to be corrected and what does not. The point with this is the fact that students are speaking a foreign language in order to gain experience and become more confident in speaking. Thus, there is no point in correcting all the little mistakes they make. Moreover, by using gentle correction students do not feel incompetent and have the courage to speak in the future (Harmer 2004: 104-109). Luoma (2004: 189) also points out that informal feedback is rather common with speaking assessment. On the other hand, she also states that one needs to develop more organized strategies for reporting feedback. When it comes to accuracy work, however, feedback can be more precise and the focus is usually on one issue at a time. For example, if students are practicing the present tense of a verb, it is essential that they are being corrected, if the form is not present, or if they are not sure how to say something. During this oral work, teacher corrections are not meant to give away the right answers directly. Here, as in all aspects of feedback, teacher should strive for feedback that helps the students find the right answer themselves, using their own thoughts and previous knowledge as help. (Harmer 2004). Moreover, oral feedback works well in situations where writing could feel overwhelming to the student (Connie and Brookhart 2009: 49). In other words, if a teacher feels he/she has so much to say that in writing all of it might go to waste or make the student anxious, it is a good strategy to use oral feedback. Verbally one can focus on many issues if one wants to, but still be encouraging and effective. Moreover, oral feedback instead of written feedback is especially useful with young students or with students struggling with written text (ibid.). With oral feedback, it is easier for students to pay attention in some cases, and they can just listen and absorb the information, whereas written text demands concentration and skills for assimilating the matters in a different way.

The term formative assessment is often mentioned when talking about feedback, and feedback also is an essential part of formative assessment. One definition for formative assessment is that it is "assessment for enhancing and shaping learning through modifying teaching" (Spendlove 2009:4). Whereas summative assessment focuses on students' grades and accountability, formative

assessment uses students' results in a feed-forward way (Frey and Fisher 2011: 132). Moreover, the same assessment can be used in both ways, depending on how one makes use of the information received from the assessment. There are several reasons why formative assessment is an important part of teaching and giving feedback.

First of all, feedback itself is not useful if not used effectively. Combined with formative assessment, feedback can improve students' performance and do it efficiently (Frey and Fisher 2011: 2). Thus, teachers must be able to take advantage of feedback as a part of formative assessment. If feedback is merely given because that is what teachers are supposed to do, it might not result in good achievement. Second of all, Hattie and Timperley (2007) have designed a formative assessment system consisting of three components: feed-up, feedback, and feed-forward. They see feedback as an important part of the system, providing students help and information about their progress. Feed-up consists of the part where students are presented the purpose of an assignment, whereas feed-forward is a phase where student learning is guided based on their performance. Together these phases ensure an effective learning process. Finally, formative assessment describes not only to teachers but also to students how the students are performing when compared to classroom learning goals. Formative assessment takes into account both the cognitive and motivational factors of the students. If feedback is given properly, students can understand where they are at the moment and where to go next. Moreover, when they know where they are, they will probably be more motivated to continue and feel that they have some control over their own learning. (Brookhart 2008:1). According to Clarke (2003:3), in the field of feedback and assessment, misguided views and bad practice affect learning, and thus make learners loose some of their self-esteem and motivation. That is why cognitive and motivational factors both need to be taken into account, and teachers need to plan their way of giving feedback when teaching.

Formative assessment takes time, but it is also a powerful way for effective feedback. Clarke has made an important notion about the use of formative assessment and feedback:

> "In order for formative assessment to be embedded in practice, it is vital that
> teachers have children learning as their priority, not their teaching or the opinions
> of outside parties."
>
> (2003:1)

Here the role of the teacher is again emphasized greatly. It seems self-evident that learning is always the main goal in schools. However, it can easily take a step back while teachers start to focus more on their own performance. This does not necessarily mean the teacher is incompetent or that he/she does not care about the students. On the contrary, teachers might focus on teaching and spend a significant amount of time planning lessons. Unfortunately, something else rather than learners' needs may be controlling him/her and the end result is not what expected. One might think that since one has seen someone else use this technique, it must be good, or that if one does something completely different from the others teachers, one gets judged by them. However, learning must always be kept the priority and children's needs the main goal when teaching. With formative assessment, feedback is also more powerful than in situations where it is not linked to anything. Jackson (2009:131) states that feedback used in the right way can provide children with real-time feedback. It is especially important to give feedback during the learning process, so that the effect is the most efficient. If one gives a great deal of feedback to students, but has no bigger goals or a larger system to support it, the results may not be as good as one hoped. Moreover, a teacher's job during formative assessment is to collect information constantly during the lesson and then use this information to adapt his/her teaching to meet the students' needs (Gardner et al. 2010:170). Students have an active role as well, because the feedback they get guides them and helps them move to the right direction.

It is self-evident that people acknowledge that students need positive reinforcement and positive feedback when studying. Teachers should use praise as a part of teaching, and the end result would be helping and motivating the learners, and, moreover, developing students' mindsets (Reitbauer et al. 2013:30). As pointed out earlier, learners always interpret teacher's words in their own way, and the situation is the same when praising them. Combining teacher's input and learner's input one gets the outcome (Brookhart 2008:3). In other words, students take into account both input sources when making decisions and forming their study schedule. Observing the situation and giving adequate praise is effective, but one should not praise students to an excess. To praise effectively is an area of its own, and the first issue to encounter are the forms of praise one uses: as a teacher one should become aware how one uses praise, and in which situations. As a guideline, it is profitable to notice that "praise needs to separate the action or process from the person or product" (Reitbauer et al. 2013: 31).

The research and studies above reveal the large effect that different types of feedback have in teaching and learning. Oral feedback received the most attention, because it is the most important type of feedback when considering this research. However, one must notice that for example oral and written feedback have many common issues, such as the goal to motivate and help the students learn in the best possible way. Most importantly, feedback needs to be effective in order to work, and this only succeeds if formative assessment is included in teaching and in giving feedback. There are, of course other types of feedback as well, such as peer feedback and non-verbal feedback, which both are often present in the classroom. Peer feedback can be widely profitable if used correctly and often enough. In the classrooms and in language learning the intention is to learn new issues, and thus correction is often needed. Corrective feedback, as stated above, is a large part of the field of feedback, and it has, for example, been divided into different sections according to the ways teachers' correct students' errors. The following section will focus on the role of feedback in more detail, providing information about the feedback contents, feedback strategies and methods, and models of teaching related to the use of feedback in the classrooms. Moreover, the role of feedback is observed from both the teachers' and students' perspective, examining the previous research relating to the topic of oral feedback.

3. Feedback in the classroom

3.1 Feedback content

Feedback includes choices about the feedback content, and teachers have several issues to consider when deciding on the suitable content on each topic. Content can also be divided into different subgroups, and Brookhart (2008) and Moss and Brookhart (2009) have used a division consisting of seven issues: focus, comparison, function, valence, clarity, specificity and tone. All of these issues matter a great deal when choosing the feedback content, and they should be used accordingly in order for feedback to be effective and to gain results. When used in wrong situations, they can do more harm than good. Below all the issues relating to feedback content have been addressed and examples of good use of feedback have been given, according to Brookhart (2008) and Moss and Brookhart (2009).

First, feedback content can vary in focus. Thus, focus can be on multiple matters, such as on the process, on the work itself, on the students' self-regulation or the student personally. Good focus always describes the relationship between the content and the process, it avoids any personal comments, and, more importantly, it only comments on self-regulation if it is constructive and fosters student's self-efficacy. Second, comparison is a part of content, consisting of criterion-referenced, norm-referenced and self-referenced comparison. All the three parts should be used in ways that help students learn and develop their skills. Criterion-referenced feedback should give information about the work itself, giving guidelines for good work, and norm-referenced feedback gives information about the processes and efforts the students make, compared to other students. Finally, self-referenced feedback is useful for struggling students, so that they realize the progress they make. Third part of feedback content is function, meaning simply whether the feedback is evaluative or descriptive. Both of the functions need to be used properly, and evaluative feedback should never be used to judge people (see also Hargreaves et al. 2000). Valence, the fourth part of feedback content, refers to positive and negative feedback. The use of both is important, and positive feedback should be used to describe what is done well, not who has done well. Negative or constructive feedback is essential for the improvement, but Brookhart (2008: 6) suggests it should be given together with positive feedback. One does not want to discourage the students, so giving positive feedback along with the negative helps to maintain students' self-esteem. The fifth part, clarity, is essential in teaching: whether something a teacher says is clear or unclear to the students matters significantly. For feedback to be clear, one should use understandable language and take into account students' level of knowledge. Moreover, it is clear that older students can comprehend more than young students. Sixth, specificity of the feedback needs to be taken into account as well. It needs to be just right, not too general so that the main point remains a question mark, but also not too strict, so that the student feels anxious about the amount and specificity of the feedback. The final and seventh component of feedback content, according to Brookhart (2008) and Moss and Brookhart (2009), is tone. Moreover, word choice is essential, because one wants students to feel respected, make them think, and words that make students focus on the work itself. Overall, just the feedback content includes multiple issues to consider. If one did not realize it before, this is the proof that convinces us of the multidimensional role of feedback in the classroom.

3.2 Feedback strategies and methods

Feedback strategy or feedback method can be defined as an aspect of feedback where the teacher is "imparting directly a judgement of a child, a child's strategies and skills, or a child's attainment (often in relation to goals) and giving information about the judgement" (Hargreaves et al. 2000:23). Strategies are always present in classrooms, and often it is the teacher who determines the direction the whole class is heading for by choosing a strategy he/she assumes to provide the best outcome.

Brookhart (2008: 5) has made a distinction between different feedback strategies. In her division, strategies can vary in several ways. One has to take into account timing of feedback, in other words how often and when feedback is given. Amount is an essential issue to consider: on how many issues one wants to focus on and how much should one talk about each point. Moreover, feedback mode affects the use of strategies. Whether it is oral, written or visual/demonstrated influences a great deal. For example, oral feedback is very useful especially when a student needs instant feedback, but written feedback might work better when correcting a test. Furthermore, one has to remember the impact of the audience with feedback strategies. As mentioned earlier, individual and group or class feedback differ from each other, and one has to consider the usefulness of each strategy before deciding what to do. A similar division to timing, amount, mode and audience is made in a book written by Connie and Brookhart (2009:48). Students should receive feedback as soon as possible in order for it to be effective. When it comes to amount, students should get the right amount of feedback for each task, and feedback needs to be given individually. Some students might need more feedback, while others may feel overwhelmed if they get too much of feedback. The mode of feedback depends on the assignment, but also student's age and verbal abilities matter, as well as the initial learning target of the lesson (Connie and Brookhart 2009).

Feedback strategies have been studied, and for example Hargreaves et al. (2000) studied 23 teachers' feedback strategies in twenty schools, and found out that teachers used a variety of different strategies. Feedback was then divided into two different strategies: evaluative and descriptive. The first one includes the use of rewards and punishments, and the expressions of approval and disapproval. Evaluative feedback strategy is not focusing on the task or students' progress, but it is meant to either encourage or discourage the student to do something. From teacher's perspective, it is important to become aware of the ways we use praising (Reitbauer et al.

2013:30). However, descriptive feedback strategy is more complex and includes for example ways of telling students that they are right or wrong. Moreover, a teacher or someone else can describe why an answer is incorrect. Thus, descriptive strategies are more complex and useful for students when it comes to learning. A teacher can also specify a better way of doing something, instead of only pointing out that he/she was wrong. Furthermore, explaining the achievement levels and how they have been reached is one part of descriptive feedback, same as involving other students in the process of feedback as well (Hargreaves et al. 2000:23). As one can see, evaluative feedback strategies are more shallow and their impact is very different from descriptive feedback, which aims at a deeper level of understanding. In the study (2000:25), Hargreaves et al. also found out that even though teachers used evaluative feedback, they often realized that it needs to be accompanied with descriptive feedback in order for it to be effective. As Reitbauer et al. (2013: 30) also points out, praising should always focus on the process of the children's work.

Brook and Brooks (1993: 15) have combined altogether twelve strategies for teachers to use when giving constructive feedback. Some of the strategies go together with Brookhart's divisions, such as encouraging students to engage in the classroom (Brookhart 2008:102). They seem to highlight the role of the students even more, praising student autonomy and initiative, allowing students' answers to change the course of the lesson, inquiring their understanding of concepts before introducing them, seeking elaborations of students' responses and engaging them in situations where their world view is contradicted. Moreover, Brooks and Brooks find it essential to use primary sources and raw data with versatile material. The use of cognitive terms, such as "classify" and "analyze" is also approved, which seems controversial with the fact that teacher's should also use simple vocabulary (Brookhart 2008, above). Furthermore, students are encouraged to ask questions and actively participate, talking with other students and with the teacher. One important fact is to leave time for students to respond and for students to create links and relationships between issues in their mind. Finally, students' natural curiosity should be nurtured throughout the lesson, making learning interesting and motivating. (Brooks and Brooks 1993: 15).

Discussion has nowadays become a more popular area of classroom talk. Multilogues are suggested to be effective according to Reitbauer et al. (2013: 51). What they essentially mean is that these multilogues include students and teacher in a conversation together, instead of a one-on-one dialogue. Individual feedback is no doubt effective, but it can be difficult to give in a large

classroom. Multilogue is useful especially when the problem or issue covers many of the students, since the teacher can address the issue simultaneously with everyone. In addition, this exchange of talk can be done both orally and in written.

Brookhart also specifies feedback strategies to use with struggling students (2008: 102). She for example refers to the use of self-referenced feedback, because if one looks for signs of improvement from student's earlier work instead of refers to the criteria, the student can see where he/she has done well, and will be more motivated to continue. Moreover, the focus should be on the process, and teachers should explicitly show how the student has improved. In the case of struggling students, it might be useful to only focus on main points and use simple vocabulary, explaining the terms, so that the student does not get overwhelmed. Most importantly, one should always make sure that the student understands what is said, so for example simple follow-up questions can help here.

3.3 Models of teaching and feedback

Askew and Gipps (2000) have studied different models of teaching and their relation to feedback. They identify three models: receptive-transmission, constructive and co-constructive. The first one, receptive transmission model sees teacher's role as an expert and as someone who imparts knowledge, concept and skills. Feedback in this model is quite traditional, and students should feel happy to receive a gift of feedback from the expert, and where the main goal is evaluating. The second one, constructive, still views teacher as an expert, but his/her goal is also to help students learn by gaining new insights and making connections. Feedback here is more expanded discourse compared to receptive-transmission model, and the primary goal is describing and discussing instead of evaluating. Askew and Gipps (2000: 10) use a term "ping-pong" to refer to this feedback model. The third and final model, co- constructive, sees students more equally working with the teacher, and even the teacher is viewed as a learner. Practice of self-reflection is also seen as essential is this model. As for feedback, it is based on common discourse and discussing learning, in other words "loops of dialogue and information" (Askew and Gipps 2000: 13). Moreover, the first model seems relatively outdated and the second and third one appear to consider the students'

role and needs in more detail. Feedback should definitely not be a gift, but rather something both the students and the teacher create together.

Feedback can be divided into four levels, according to Hattie and Timperley (2007) and Frey and Fisher (2011). First, feedback about the task is a level where the teacher informs the students about how they are performing. Moreover, this level often includes the use of corrective feedback strategies. Second, feedback about the processing of the task focuses not only on the results of the task, but on the processes one uses when doing it. Third, feedback about self-regulation is related to students' themselves, their self-appraisal and self-management. Teacher is in an important role when guiding students in the right directions and helping them to understand their abilities and how to use them. Fourth and final level is called feedback about the self as a person. This level fully focuses on the student, and even though this sort of external feedback is often not effective if used alone, it can be useful together with other levels. As Frey and Fisher 2011:66) continue, a simple praise such as "good job" does not probably result in any changes, but when it is linked to the reason why the work was good, it has a deeper meaning.

Reed and Stoll (2000) suggest that feedback has four different functions in organizational learning: bridging, illuminative, challenging and a renew purpose. First, bridging functions in a way that feedback used links chunks of information together and shows their relationship with each other. Second, illuminative function clarifies problems and makes them easier to manage in a classroom. Third, challenging feedback, as the name states, challenges old views and enables new ideas and information to shape the way we think. Fourth and final function is a renew purpose, where the issue concerns the possibility of re-connecting the whole school into its primary goal and task in education. Moreover, it looks feedback from a point of view that affects the whole school system.

3.4 Teacher's role in the feedback process

Harmer (2004:57-67) has pointed out several different roles for the teacher in the classroom. According to him, teacher is often seen as an examiner when asked from the students. It is one of the roles the teacher has, but it should not be the most important one. Teacher must examine student's level of achievement and often grade them, so in addition to examiner, a teacher is also

an evaluator. Moreover, teachers should be resources for the students. Students should feel free to ask questions and trust that the teacher will help them as well as he/she possible can. Assisting, thus, is also a part of teacher's work. If one sits behind the desk and lets the students work on their own, or does not even offer help at any point in the class, students get the feeling that they are alone, and nevertheless, they have to achieve good results. In addition to the above roles, a teacher is also an editor and an audience. Editing student's work, both orally and in written form is essential for students' language development. Audience here refers to situations where students perform and show their knowledge in class and the teacher in there to observe and give feedback. As one can see, Harmer's division of roles already proves the multiple and versatile roles a single teacher must remember during every classroom session.

In addition to research, corrective feedback has been extremely important for teachers, since in a formal teaching situations error correction is usually expected (Profozic 2013). Moreover, some type of analysis of errors and misconceptions is substantial, because it enables teachers to make meaningful decisions (Frey and Fisher 2011: 95). Analysis makes it possible for teachers to find out what is difficult or easy for the students, and they can also focus on individual students and their needs. Furthermore, with the help of corrective feedback, teachers receive a basis for their teaching and re-teaching. Some concepts may have to be covered more than others, and when teachers notice there appears several errors in a certain issue, they will know they have to pay more attention to it (Frey and Fisher 2011).

A study in China aimed to find out teachers' use of corrective feedback in a task-based EFL classroom. Students were aged 17-19 years, and the research consisted of 50 students and one teacher. The data was collected in the north-west of Beijing in a university by recording lessons, and the final material was eight hours of recorded data. Iwashita and Li (2012) found five different types of corrective feedback: explicit correction, teacher recast, student recast, clarification request and elicitation. Recasts were the largest group, consisting of over half the corrections, whereas clarification requests and elicitation were both about ten percent of the data. Moreover, a study conducted in Belgium (Lochtman 2002) found out that teachers mainly use three types of oral corrective feedback: explicit corrections, recasts and teacher initiations to self-corrections by the pupils. The latter one was the most used in the data, recasts came next, and explicit corrections were the smallest unit. The data consisted of 600 minutes of classroom recordings, altogether 12 lessons.

Three Dutch speaking secondary schools and three teachers participated in the study, and the students in the classes were aged 15-16. Both these studies show that explicit correction and teacher recasts are a popular way of correcting errors among teachers. It is slightly troubling that explicit correction is used relatively extensively, because many researchers have pointed out that it is the least productive way for students to learn. For example, Clarke (2003), Askew et al. (2000) and Brookhart (2008) all strive towards learning where students have a major role in becoming better learners through corrective feedback that helps the learners realize and notice the error themselves.

Mendez and Cruz (2012) wanted to find out more about teachers' perceptions about the use of oral corrective feedback. They used an interview and a questionnaire in the data collection. The study took place at a Mexican university, and five language instructors aged 25-60 were interviewed. 15 instructors filled in the questionnaire. The results of the study show that teachers have a positive view about oral corrective feedback, and they strongly feel they need to correct students' errors in order for them to become fluent and accurate. They also see corrective feedback having a positive effect on language learning. However, some teachers were also concerned about students' feelings when giving corrective feedback. The minority of the teachers thought that corrective feedback is not relevant when acquiring accuracy and fluency. Interestingly, self-correction was judged to be less effective from teacher correction. Finally, the majority of the teachers believed that their students also prefer teacher corrective feedback rather than peer's. Overall, teachers have a positive perception about oral feedback in this study. Kamiya (2012) also studied teachers and their beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in the US. Four teachers read three studies of oral corrective feedback and they were then observed, interviewed and recalled. Surprisingly, the results show that classroom practices did not change much, regardless of the teachers' previous experience. However, the teachers with more experience had already stated and firm believes of oral corrective feedback, and the studies they read had no influence on their teaching. Since the studies were of contrasting findings, all of the teachers seemed to select certain information from the studies to identify themselves with. Research showed that the teachers' language learning and teaching experience had a significant impact on their stated beliefs on corrective feedback.

Gurzynski-Weiss and Révész examined the role of the teacher's feedback in the classroom interaction (2012). In the study, 23 lessons from nine classrooms were taped and transcribed, the learners being university-level intermediate Spanish learners in the United States. The aim was to

find out whether feedback is given during the task, during focused or unfocused tasks, or during pre-, during-, or posttask phases. The teachers had taken part to a teaching methodology course before teaching, apart from one teacher. Altogether nine teachers participated, five of which were native speakers and four non- native speakers of Spanish. Each class had students aged 18 to 22, and number of students varied from 14 to 18 students per class. Overall, 73.4% of the errors received feedback, and teacher feedback was more often given during nontasks than during tasks. Nontasks consisted of tasks that did not fully focus on meaning, focusing primarily on form, such as drills. Compared to tasks, students produced modified output more during nontasks, and teachers also provided them with more chances of doing so during nontasks. Focused and unfocused task had an effect on the amount of feedback, since more feedback was given related to unfocused tasks. However, the type of feedback given by the teachers did not change much according to this division. Finally, most of the errors found occurred in the posttask phase, and the least errors in pretask phase. Teachers gave more feedback in the posttask phase compared to the possibilities for it in the during-task phase, and they also provided implicit feedback more often during the posttask phase. This study shows that there are indeed differences in how much and in which way feedback is given during the different parts of the class and during different tasks or nontasks. One cannot simply see a lesson as one unit and feedback as one simple way of providing information: they are both a complex phenomenon and should be examined as one.

Teacher's role in giving feedback, corrective feedback strategies, and learner uptake has been studied in Finland, too. Surakka (2007) studied the different ways the teacher used corrective feedback in an EFL classroom, and how students responded to it. Students were recorded for four years, and they were on grades 3-6 during the process. With the help of 48 hours of classroom video recordings, she found out that teachers often react to students' mistakes with implicit feedback, for example recasts. This, however, shows that teachers do most of the work for the students, since recasts usually give away the right answer. Moreover, the results indicate that learners take on the feedback in over half the cases, and also corrected the error in 52% of the cases. Pehkonen studied teacher's evaluative turns in Finnish CLIL classrooms (2008), and also used video recordings as her data. She revealed that teachers use multiple and varying methods, both linguistic and nonverbal. Moreover, it seems that the teachers use exceptionally direct ways when abandoning students' answers as wrong. Finally, the results show that nonverbal communication appears to play a significant role in classrooms, and that teachers' ways of evaluating can be quite versatile.

31

3.5 Students' role in the feedback process

Students' views and their feedback to teachers and to each other should be taken into account in every class (Askew and Lodge 2000). A teacher surely knows the basis for teaching, and what is considered to be effective, but it is also essential to hear the students' ideas. Moreover, with the help of the students, teachers can improve their teaching to meet the needs of a certain class or a group of people. People are different, and thus one cannot teach everyone in the same way using the same methods. Moreover, even though the teacher has a clear message or an action plan, it is the learners' interpretation that matter in the end (Reitbauer et al. 2013). That is why teachers should observe the class and change their ways if necessary. In addition, students' experiences about certain comments can be divided into information and judgement (Brookhart 2008:8). One should always avoid judging people, and the role of the teacher is to provide information and help students form a mindset of their own. Judging often leads to motivation problems or, unintentionally or not, given statements. Overall, students need to actually understand the feedback they get in order to succeed and for it to have an effect on their self-assessment. According to Osler (2010:1), several schools lack the capability to include students in the decision- making process. It seems strange that schools are specifically designed for children, but children do not have a say in the development processes. Moreover, this ruling of schools makes students frustrated, because they feel that their opinion does not matter at all.

A study conducted in the mid 1980's by Preston et al. (1985) already gave some insights into what students' find to be effective oral feedback. The researchers recorded speeches given by students along with the instructor's oral feedback. Students were then asked what aspects of the feedback they find helpful and whether some of the feedback would increase or decrease their self-esteem. Personally directed feedback and feedback that focuses on certain features of the speech was found to be most helpful by the students. Complements were said to make them feel good, but not significantly improve their skills. Negative feelings were sometimes caused by critique from the instructor. Most of all, this study shows that students want to receive quite specific feedback and feedback that they can relate with or understand. The researchers also state that teachers should use both positive and negative feedback, because critical but constructive feedback is seen as helpful, and positive feedback promotes good self-esteem. (Preston et al. 1985).

A survey studying students' perceptions about how to improve schools and how to learn effectively was conducted in English Midlands, and 13 schools participated in the study, forming the data (Osler 2010). The results show that there is indeed a great deal one can improve in schools. First of all, students often requested more innovative teaching and the use of multiple teaching styles. Relating to this, they wanted to get more positive feedback and encouragement instead of error correction. This is an essential remark. since some studies also point out that students want their errors corrected. (For example Abukhadrah 2012). Second of all, teachers should listen to students more when giving feedback. Again, the feedback and the signs from students are vital and every teacher should be willing to notice the requests and change his/her behavior accordingly. Third of all, students in this study were worried about the pressures they felt from the teacher to succeed and perform well. In other words, they felt that they could not always fulfill their teachers' wishes. This is an interesting remark, since it should not be about what the teacher wants, but about what the student feel is useful and important to learn within the guidelines. Finally, students expect teachers to treat them with respect, since they are also respecting the teacher in return. Overall, fair and equal treatment is valued. (Osler 2010).

Relations of student perceptions of teacher oral feedback with teacher expectancies and student self-concept were examined in a study in Taiwan (Yi-Hin et al. 2011). The data consisted of nearly 1600 Taiwanese pupils on grades 3-6, from four cities and 47 classrooms. Teachers were asked to choose certain pupils from their classes to a high- expectancy group, certain pupils to a low-expectancy group, leaving the rest of the pupils to an average-expectancy group. A questionnaire was used to measure students' perceptions of teachers' oral feedback. Feedback was divided into two sections: academic feedback about test performance, assignments and so on, and nonacademic feedback about helping a classmate or breaking the rules, for example. Thus, with both the groups and positive and negative feedback, four feedback subgroups were formed for the study: positive academic, negative academic, positive nonacademic and negative nonacademic. The results show, first of all, that teachers had higher expectancies for girls than boys. Second of all, those students who teachers chose in the high-expectancy group received more positive than negative feedback, both in academic and nonacademic groups. Thus, teachers provide feedback to students differently, according to their own expectations. Third of all, students had a higher self-concept if they had received more positive academic feedback, and lower self-concept after receiving negative academic feedback. However, positive academic feedback is still more reliable compared to negative academic feedback when

looking at students' academic self-concept. Moreover, nonacademic feedback had little effect on self-concept. What is also considerable was the fact that boys received more negative feedback than girls. On the other hand, there was no difference in the amount of positive feedback. In addition, one must remember that a Taiwanese culture can differ greatly from the culture for example here in Finland, so the results must be interpreted accordingly. For example, the pupils in Taiwan are quite school oriented, and thus the nonacademic feedback did not affect their self-concept, but in Finland the results might be different.

Self- assessment is an important issue to consider when considering the importance of students' role in a classroom. Hand in hand with students' self-assessment goes reflection. One can actually learn to reflect with practice and help from the teacher. Reflection is seen as an important factor in students' learning process (Westberg and Hilliard 2001). Students assessing their work themselves during and after the task or performance is essential in order for them to learn issues thoroughly. Reflection also helps learners to build on what they already know and identify deficits in the knowledge. Moreover, errors are more easily detected in the thinking process with the help of reflection. Connected to this is the concept of generalizing. It is relatively easier to apply new information in different situations once one knows to reflect on issues. Thus, learning can be accelerated. If learners feel they can have an effect on their own learning, they will also more likely have motivation and confidence. (Westberg and Hilliard 2001:2-8). During classes, leaving students time to reflect on what they have learned will considerably help them to internalize the knowledge and develop the skills they need in the future (Dean et al. 2012). Finally, the feeling of active participation plays an essential role (Carnell 2000:60).

Self-assessment is an issue that has raised awareness more now than before. Lyster (2007:116) has incisively reported self-repair as to "increasingly handing the floor to students". In other words, it is nowadays not only the teacher who assess or corrects the students, but they can do it their selves to a greater extent. Connie and Brookhart (2009: 45) state that feedback according to self- regulation theorists is external regulation, in a way that when students receive feedback from a teacher, it changes into internal regulation. Hathaway (1997:13) points out that self-assessment can be both positive and negative. In order to change self-criticism to positive self-talk, one has to change the way one thinks and believes, because simply believing something has a significant effect on self-esteem. Moreover, students' misconception can influence learning (Frey and Fisher 2011:94). False

assumptions from previous experiences or misguided information follows students to the next topic, and can affect learning. They are, unfortunately, rather persistent, and even intractable to some degree. Therefore, it is important to understand their role. Misconceptions are influenced by students' own perceptions about school and learning. Moreover, even their expectations can affect learning. As a teacher, one has to consider this side of learning and adapt one's teaching to meet the needs of the students. Both self- assessment and misconceptions are influenced by the type feedback teacher decides to use. In addition to this, learners need to understand that external factors are not, at least always, a reason for their failures. One should instead focus on the positive factors and work for a successful outcome (Reitbauer 2013: 31).

Overall, feedback as a concept has been widely acknowledged among researchers, and information on feedback can be found from different types of feedback, not to mention feedback models and strategies. However, this current study will bring forward the voice of the students and focus on their perceptions of the use of oral feedback in upper secondary schools in Finland. This area is one of the least studied, and thus it will be essential for future teachers and practitioners in the field of education. Feedback is, after all, one of the most influential forces in teaching and learning, and the use of it should be studied more extensively also in the future. Naturally, it is important to study feedback use in the classrooms and take into account teachers' opinions as well as study how the already established feedback strategies are being used. However, students have an important role in developing teaching as well, and their views on the topic need to be covered. Thus, this study will widen the views on the use of oral feedback and hopefully inspire and provide advice to teachers.

4. Research design

4.1 Research questions and aims

The research questions of the study are the following:

1. How do students feel about oral feedback in the English classes in upper secondary school, compared to other types of feedback?
2. In which situations is oral feedback given in the English classes in upper secondary school?

3. What kind of oral feedback do students find useful in English classes in upper secondary school?

The main aim of the study is to clarify students' perceptions of the use of oral feedback in an English classroom in upper secondary school in Finland, focusing on teachers' role and on how much students feel teachers give oral feedback to them, and in which situations. In addition to the teachers' role and the amount of oral feedback given, the study wishes to look into the opinions of the students on the matter: the purpose was to study how they feel about the use of oral feedback, whether they want to receive more or less of it, and most importantly, what kind of oral feedback they wish to receive. Moreover, it was essential to study how oral feedback relates to other types of feedback, mostly written and peer feedback, in the minds of the students.

The research will then compare the two sides of the issue: how consistent or inconsistent is the amount and type of oral feedback received from the teachers, according to the students, compared to the wishes of the students on that matter. The hypothesis of the study is that students would like to receive more oral feedback from different topics than what they do at the moment. Moreover, many studies have shown that students often want to receive feedback on grammar, instead of the content, for example in writing tasks (see for example Abukhadrah 2012), so it will be interesting to find out whether the case is the same in this research and in a Finnish foreign language classroom. In addition, corrective feedback is closely linked to this study as being one part of the oral feedback researched, so results concerning that issue are considered as well. Corrective feedback has been an interesting topic for many researchers (for example Profozic 2013, Lyster and Ranta 1997 and Moss and Brookhart 2009), but studies focusing on Finnish upper secondary school students and the use of oral feedback especially are few. Thus, this research will bring new insights into the field of feedback. However, compared to many larger scale studies, the study is rather minor.

The results of this study will be especially useful for future and current foreign language teachers in upper secondary schools, because the topic relates closely to their field of knowledge. With the help of the results and findings gained from this study, teachers and other practitioners can better understand the influence of oral feedback on students' learning, and, more importantly, understand how, when and in which situations they should take advantage of oral feedback. Even though the

teachers in Finland are well trained and the education system has received attention even from other countries, there is always room for improvement. Moreover, these results can to some extend be useful in other countries, as well as in elementary school and secondary school levels.

4.2 Gathering the data

After a careful consideration and comparison of different data gathering methods, the current research uses a questionnaire. I believe the best results are achieved with this method for several reasons. First of all, a questionnaire enables to collect a large amount of data (Hirsjärvi et al. 2009:195). It is easy to give out to the participants and, moreover, takes relatively little time compared to for example with interviews. Larger data also makes it possible to form more generalizable conclusions. Second of all, questionnaires work well when one wants to cover several issues and find answers to different questions (Dörnyei 2010:6). The versatile nature of questionnaires makes them suitable for many occasions. They work well in cases where one wants to get a large amount of data in a limited time, because with the help of questionnaires one can address several issues without taking too much of the participants or the researcher's time. In this particular study, the focus is on researching students' own perceptions about the use of oral feedback in an English classroom, but also to discover the current oral feedback practices in upper secondary school. Finally, questionnaires are the most popular form of research instruments. They are relatively easy to construct, and suit well for many purposes. However, this can also be considered a weakness: questionnaires are thought to be something everyone can easily make. (Dörnyei 2010:1). On the contrary, a questionnaire demands careful consideration in order for it to produce valid results. One cannot form a questionnaire only by listing down questions, but instead one has to actually consider how, why and in which parts of the questionnaire these questions need to be asked. A questionnaire was chosen as a data gathering method in this study because of the reasons stated above, and because other methods, such as an interview, would not produce the same kind of results. An interview without doubt has its strengths, such as gathering more detailed data and the possibility to bring forward the voice and opinions of the participant in more detail (Dufva 2011:132). Interviews may seek to find deeper meanings and focus on a limited data, but a questionnaire helps to form a more comprehensive image of the phenomenon. I created the

questionnaire to help answer to the research questions the best possible way. The interview used in this study can be found from the appendix.

Most of the questions in the questionnaire designed for this research were close-ended, meaning that the participants are given ready-made alternatives to choose from. Dörnyei's (2010) suggestions and instructions were used when compiling the questionnaire, making it as valid and reliable as possible. The questions were formed using the well-known Likert- scale, where the participants answer to the questions based on their agreement or disagreement level (Dörnyei 2010: 27). This style was chosen mainly because one can cover all the issues on the questionnaire one finds important, and because it makes it more straightforward for the participants to answer. Likert scales are also considered to be reliable (Dörnyei, ibid.). However, possible additions from the participants' side were allowed by adding questions such as "something else, what?" at the end of the ready- made lists or questions. In addition to the closed questions and the possible additions, two open-ended questions were added at the end of the questionnaire about the topic of oral feedback. This gives the participants an opportunity to write about something that they think are especially important, but was perhaps not mentioned in the close-ended questions. Furthermore, most part of the data gathering method is considered to be quantitative, since close-ended questions are used. Some qualitative features emerge with the open-ended questions. In conclusion, one can say that this data gathering method combines both quantitative and qualitative methods, the main focus being on quantitative.

Before collecting the data, the questionnaire was piloted by two people that were around the same age than the actual participants. Some minor adjustments were made according to the feedback received from the pilot. The data was collected from an upper secondary school in Eastern Finland. I first spoke to the headmaster of the school face to face, and after she agreed to let the students participate in the study, I sent further information and permission papers to her via e-mail. On the data gathering day, students were all gathered in the school hall and I briefly introduced the questionnaire to them. After the introduction they filled in the consent form and then were given the questionnaire to fill in. Basic instructions were written on the questionnaire as well. The questionnaires were handed to all of the students at the same time, and they were given 15 minutes to answer the questions. Altogether 93 students participated. There were 36 boys and 54 girls, and

three people who did not reveal their sex. 32 people were aged 15-16 years, 59 people aged 17-18, and one person aged 19 or more. One participant did not answer this part of the questionnaire. A larger amount, 48 people, studied in the upper secondary school for the second year, and 41 for the first year. For four people it was their third year of studying.

4.3 Methods for analyzing the data

Before the data can be analyzed, it must be quantified and coded. The data was entered into a digital mode to Excel and changed into numerical codes that could be more easily interpreted and summarized. One also had to check the questionnaires and the answers before including them into the data, in case there were some answers that could not be part of the data for their erroneous answers. A "missing value code" could also be used in cases where an answer was missing, showing all the cases where answers were lacking. (Grey et al 2007:141-142). In this case, a zero (0) was placed to sections that had no answer. There were five missing answers at the maximum in this particular study, and most questions were answered by everyone. With open-ended questions the amount of people who did not answer was higher, with the first question 20 people and with the second question 76 people. With missing answer, however, one could also leave the particular section empty (Dörnyei 2010:86). These procedures worked well with Likert scales, but with open-ended questions one had to code the answers according to how many different answers there were. Altogether there were seven different subgroups in the first open-ended question, dealing with whether oral feedback should be used and why, and four subgroups in the second open-ended question about any additional comments on oral feedback. This took more time, but after the coding phase the data was easier to process. The data was entered into SPSS programme, which is a statistical software used for analyzing and coding data. After coding the data and entering the questions and answers to the program, one got the report of the answers summarized. In this case, the results covered all the percentages people answered for each statement, differences between age, gender, and the year of studying. The age factor and the year of studying were left out from the analysis, because they were not directly a part of the research questions, and because the differences comparing those with the statements were relatively minor. Moreover, gender differences are mentioned and explained in the analysis, when there were large enough differences to report.

Possible correlations between the questions were also investigated concerning every statement, and the most significant ones were reported in the analysis. A well-known and popularly used among researchers, Pearson correlation coefficient schema, was used when calculating the correlations. Altogether there were significant correlations in 16 of the cases, all presented later in section five in the tables. In this study, correlations over 0.3 or under -0.3 were considered slightly significant, and correlations over 0.5 or under -0.5 were considered relatively or remarkably significant. After coding the data and entering it to the analysis program, the data was analyzed following the guidelines presented for questionnaire analysis (Dörnyei 2010:83-110). The results were first analyzed separately, after which the answers were classified and themed into different groups, always keeping in mind the research questions the data was based on. Finally, analysis and possible conclusions were made on the grounds of the findings (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2004:94).

The statements of the questionnaire were divided into three sections in the questionnaire: the first one sought to find out the students' overall opinions about the use of feedback, the second one studied where, how much and in which situations oral feedback has been provided to the students in their opinion, and the final section focused on how much and in which situations the students would like to receive feedback. The statements in the first section were first divided into even smaller units, combining the statements about the use of oral feedback and written feedback, the students' opinions about peer feedback, and the use of corrective feedback. In the second part, tables were combined according to the places the participants have received feedback, how the teacher provided feedback, in which parts of the class the feedback is usually provided, and from which parts of language learning the students receive feedback (for example grammar or vocabulary) the most. In addition, separate tables were gathered according to the qualities of teacher feedback from the students' opinion, whether the feedback relates to the task or is given during or after it, and finally, whether the oral feedback the students have received has been timely, fair, and equally provided. The third section focuses on students' personal opinions, and the statements were divided firstly according to the use of free time versus classroom time for receiving feedback. Next, statements about the usefulness of oral feedback and the possible negative qualities were combined into one table, followed with the statements that oral feedback does not help the student learn, or that it is a gift from the teacher. Error correction was placed into a table of its own, and one table also sought answers to the questions whether oral feedback for the whole class is useful, and if students in general want to receive oral feedback and personal feedback. Naturally,

the different parts of language learning that the students wish to receive feedback on were combined together, followed with the focus of feedback and positive and negative feedback, and questions whether feedback should help the students to conclude the error, or point it out for them. Finally, some positive qualities were gathered in one table, and the time that feedback should take, according to the students, in another table. In overall, these tables where then carefully analyzed, together with the possible correlations and gender differences in order to find trustworthy answers to the research questions. Correlations and gender differences were mentioned only, if the results were significant enough to report. The two open-ended questions and their answers were analyzed and divided into different subgroups using content analysis, so that one can make certain assumptions based on the answers. A similar analysis framework was used with the open-ended questions as with the close-ended questions (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2004:94) First question was divided into seven subgroups, and the second question into four subgroups, with examples from every subgroup presented in the analysis.

5 Students' perceptions about the use of oral feedback in EFL classrooms

The data for the research consisted of 93 questionnaires, in which most of the questions were multiple choice options, and at the end of the questionnaire there were two open- ended questions. The answers to the questions will be analyzed and discussed in this section. I will answer each of the three research questions one at the time, presenting the questions and answers related to each question. The open-ended questions will then be addressed and analyzed, as well as the possible differences between the two sexes.

5.1 Students' perceptions about the use of oral feedback compared to other types of feedback

The first part of the questionnaire was related to students' overall opinions about feedback, and how oral feedback was placed in these opinions. The first statement stated that feedback is

important. The second and third statements were related to oral and written feedback. Below one can see answers and percentages for each option.

Table 1. Opinions about feedback and the usefulness of oral and written feedback

Statement	Totally disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree	Totally agree	Total %
Getting feedback is important to me.	2.0	0.0	2.0	51.0	45.0	100.0
Oral feedback is more useful than written feedback.	1.0	3.0	36.0	44.0	16.0	100.0
I´d rather receive written feedback than oral feedback.	3.0	19.0	49.0	21.0	8.0	100.0[1]

It was not surprising that nearly every student quite agreed or totally agreed that getting feedback is important to them: only 2% (2/93) disagreed and another 2% had no specific opinion. This supports the fact that feedback clearly is appreciated and wished from the students' side. Feedback also furthers learning (Moss and Brookhart 2009:44) and it can even be considered to be one of the most important influences on students' learning (Hattie and Timperley 2007:81), so it is only natural the students feel getting feedback is important. Moreover, the Finnish curriculum reform (2015: 32) also states that it is a teacher's responsibility to provide students with constructive and honest feedback. However, the next two statements have relatively mixed answers in relation to each other. First of all, oral feedback is seen as more useful than written feedback by 60% (56/93), when one looks at both quite agree and agree- options. 36% (33/93) of the people neither agreed nor disagreed, which is quite a large amount. The third statement "I´d rather have written feedback than oral feedback" had even larger amount of students answering neither agree nor disagree, 49% (46/93). However, 29% (27/93) agreed that they would prefer written feedback over oral, and 19% disagreed that they would rather have written feedback. This shows that even though several students seem to have no strict opinion about the use of oral or written feedback, oral feedback is nevertheless preferred over written feedback: twice as many students agreed to have rather oral

---

[1] Due to the rounding of the figures in the SPSS analysis software, in some of the cases the total may not be exactly 100%, but is still written down in a way to avoid misapprehension. However, the biggest variation is only one percent, if there is any.

feedback than to have rather written feedback. This could be due to the fact that oral feedback is more natural than written feedback, and it can be given right after the student's performance (Clarke 2003). Moreover, the second and the third statement also correlated negatively (-.407), which supports the fact that there is some negative variation between the participants' answers.

Table 2. Gender differences on written and oral feedback

I´d rather receive written feedback than oral feedback.	Totally or slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree or totally agree	Total %	Correlation
Boys	30.0	46.0	24.0	100.0	
Girls	19.0	52.0	30.0	100.0	.825

There were some differences between the two sexes as well considering the last statement (see table 2): the amount of people agreeing or neither agreeing nor disagreeing was nearly the same between boys and girls, but 30% (11/36) of the boys disagreed to have rather written feedback than oral feedback, whereas the percentage of the girls disagreeing with the same option was 19% (10/54). It seems that even though both sexes agreed with the statement similarly (24%, 9/36, of the boys and 29%, 16/54, of the girls), a larger amount of the boys also clearly denied to rather have written feedback, thus showing that they would rather receive their feedback in oral form. There is also a rather strong positive correlation (.825) between the two genders' answers.

The next statements in section one were related to the usefulness of peer feedback (see table 3 below). Here the results are relatively more divided into different opinions.

Table 3. Students' perceptions about the usefulness on peer feedback

Statement	Totally disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree	Totally agree	Total %
Oral feedback from peers is useful.	3.0	21.0	33.0	35.0	8.0	100.0
Written feedback from peers is useful.	8.0	23.0	34.0	29.0	7.0	100.0
Feedback from peers helps me learn.	11.0	21.0	28.0	36.0	4.0	100.0

When asked whether peer feedback helps participants learn, 40% (37/93) of the students agreed: less than half of the participants. This is a rather surprising fact, because some studies have proven that students do wish to receive feedback from each other, and it does actually help them improve and learn (for example Krych-Appelbaum and Musial 2007). Moreover, Stajduhar (2013) points out that with peer feedback, students can take active part in giving feedback and thus also gain the role of the teacher for a moment, making it a profitable way of providing feedback. 32% (30/93) considered peer feedback not to help them, and about one third (28%, 26/93) did not have a particular opinion about the issue. It has to be taken into account that nearly third of the participants argue that peer feedback is not useful for them. This means, first of all, that they do not think peers can give them good feedback, and second of all, that they only rely on teacher feedback. There were no great differences between the usefulness of written and oral peer feedback. However, oral feedback was thought to be slightly more helpful (43%, 40/93) than written feedback (36%, 33/93). In all the three questions in the table 3 above, the amount of people neither agreeing or disagreeing was quite similar, consisting of about one third of the students. This may be due to the fact that students honestly cannot decide or do not know whether the peer feedback they have received in English classes is upper secondary school has helped them or not, or they might not have the ability to give proper peer feedback (see also Brown 2004). In addition, the rather large percent can be a result of the little amount of peer feedback. If they have not had experiences about peer feedback, it is rather difficult to have an opinion about it.

Table 4. Gender differences on peer feedback

Written feedback from peers is useful.	Totally or slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite or totally agree	Total %	Correlation
Boys	29.0	41.0	29.0	100.0	
Girls	30.0	30.0	41.0	100.0	-.500
Feedback from peers helps me learn.					
Boys	29.0	20.0	51.0	100.0	
Girls	33.0	35.0	33.0	100.0	-.724

Interestingly, boys chose the option "neither agree nor disagree" more often than girls (41%, 15/36, of the boys and 30%, 16/54, of the girls) relating to the statement that written feedback from peers is useful (see table 4 above). Moreover, 41% (22/54) of the girls and 30% (11/36) of the boys agreed with that statement. Thus, boys do not seem to have as strict opinions about the usefulness of written peer feedback as girls do have, even though the differences are not essentially different from each other. The answers between boys and girls also correlated negatively to some extend (-.500). A larger amount of the boys (51%, 18/36) also agreed with the statement that peer feedback as a whole helps them to learn, whereas the amount of the girls agreeing here was 33% (18/54). Boys, thus, seem to trust on the power of peer feedback as a whole more than girls. In this statement, the negative correlation was quite high (-.724).

Corrective feedback is one of the most researched areas in feedback studies, so it seemed only rational to include it in the questionnaire and the current study as well (see table 5 below). The statements were designed to find out whether students have received more corrective feedback in written or in oral form.

Table 5. Corrective feedback received orally and in written form, according to the participants

Statement	Totally disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree	Totally agree	Total %
I get corrective feedback orally more than in written form.	2.0	8.0	31.0	42.0	18.0	100.0
I get corrective feedback mostly in written form.	2.0	14.0	35.0	40.0	9.0	100.0

The results of these statements are relatively confusing, because there are no large differences between the statements. Again, about one third of the students neither agreed nor disagreed (31%, 29/93, with oral corrective feedback and 35%, 33/93, with written corrective feedback). Moreover, the majority of the participants, 60% (56/93), quite agreed or totally agreed that they receive more oral than written corrective feedback. Quite surprisingly, nearly half, 49% (46/93), thought they receive corrective feedback more in written form. These results seem to somewhat rule out each other, even though the majority still tilts towards oral corrective feedback. This may be due to differing opinions, or the unclear statements: perhaps it was not quite clear to everyone what one means with corrective feedback, or what one should count as feedback as a whole. It has also been

stated that all types of corrective feedback can indeed have a positive effect on interlanguage development when learning a second language (Lyster and Saito 2010). However, 10% (9/93) disagreed to some level of receiving oral corrective feedback, and 14% (13/93) disagreed of receiving written corrective feedback. In conclusion, the majority of the people agreed to have received some sort of corrective feedback from the teacher, whether oral or written, even though all did not have a particular opinion about the issue. Many studies have been conducted on corrective feedback, and for example Mendez and Cruz's study (2012) states that teachers themselves have a positive view about oral corrective feedback. Moreover, Preston studied students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback already in 1985, and found out that students do want to receive corrective feedback and that they want to receive it most on specific issues and in an understandable way.

5.2 When and how is oral feedback given, according to the students

The above topics were all under the section one in the questionnaire, and the section 2, introduced next, relates to the issues *when and how* oral feedback is given in the school, in English upper secondary school classes. The next statements all relate to oral feedback. It was essential to discover the possible different places where the teacher gives oral feedback to the students, and look at the differences between the places. Table 6 below presents the amount of oral feedback received in the classroom, outside the classroom, during a break and outside school time.

Table 6. Places teachers provide feedback to the students, in students' opinion

Statement	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Quite often	Often	Total %
In the classroom	4.0	9.0	38.0	29.0	21.0	100.0
Outside the classroom	21.0	34.0	35.0	7.0	4.0	100.0
During recess	39.0	43.0	15.0	1.0	2.0	100.0
Outside school time	75.0	21.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Naturally, there are several places one can provide feedback in. The largest amount, 50% (47/93), agreed to some level to have received oral feedback in the classroom often, and 38% (35/93) also

answered to have received it sometimes. Only 13% (12/93) argued to have seldom or never gotten oral feedback in the classroom. The classroom is often the easiest and most natural place to give and receive feedback, therefore it is no surprise that the other options did not prove to be as popular in the data. However, even outside that classroom 46% (43/93) of the participants answered to have received oral feedback either sometimes, quite often or often. This proves that not all the oral feedback happens in an instant and during the class, but it can be given even outside the classroom territory by the teacher. Moreover, oral feedback was rather seldom received during the break or outside the school time, since 82% (76/93) said to have seldom or never received it during the break, and 96% (89/93) outside the school time. The results seem to point out that even though oral feedback is sometimes received after the classroom, it still does not take place during the break or even before or after school. Overall, this shows that oral feedback is mostly given during the class, and even outside classroom, but quite seldom outside the English lesson. It has been proven that the way feedback should be provided also depends greatly on the feedback type (Mendez and Cruz 2012), and because teachers often give feedback about the issues that are currently going on in the classroom, the place to provide feedback is naturally often the classroom as well.

Table 7. Gender differences about the amount of feedback received in the classroom

I have received feedback in the classroom.	Seldom or never	Sometimes	Quite often or often	Total %	Correlation
Boys	6.0	34.0	60.0	100.0	
Girls	17.0	43.0	41.0	100.0	.841

Boys agreed to have received relatively more oral feedback in the classroom (60%, 22/36) than girls (41%, 22/54), see table 7 above for the results. Perhaps boys' overall opinion about the amount of oral feedback is thus slightly more positive than of the girls. There is also a rather high positive correlation between the boys' and the girls' answers (.841). After discovering the most common places of providing and receiving feedback, it is time to focus on the varying ways a teacher provides feedback, according to the students. Table 8 below presents the first findings collected in the table.

Table 8. The ways the teacher provides feedback

Statement	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Quite often	Often	Total %
Spontaneously	3.0	12.0	41.0	37.0	7.0	100.0
Arranged in advance	10.0	25.0	39.0	22.0	4.0	100.0
By going around in the class	4.0	11.0	34.0	40.0	11.0	100.0
At his/her desk to single students	14.0	31.0	40.0	13.0	2.0	100.0
To the whole class	1.0	11.0	32.0	39.0	17.0	100.0
To me personally	4.0	26.0	51.0	19.0	0.0	100.0
To a group of students	10.0	30.0	49.0	9.0	1.0	100.0

Just by briefly examining the table, one notices that the most common answer to almost all of the options has been "sometimes". This already states that feedback in the classroom is provided to some extent, because the answers "never" or "seldom" are not as popular, when asked about the different ways a teacher gives feedback. "Quite often" or "often" the participants answered to receive feedback from the teacher to the whole class (56%, 52/93), by the teacher going around in the class (51%, 47/93), and, finally, spontaneously (44%, 41/93). It is in fact reassuring to observe that according to this data, the teacher does go around in the classroom perceiving students' work and helping them by providing feedback, and also can do it in a spontaneous way. This also means that the teaching is moving more and more into the direction where the teachers and students are cooperating and working together, and what Askew and Gipps (2000) describe as constructive and co-constructive models of teaching. Moreover, it is not a great surprise that most participants think the teacher most often provides feedback to the whole class, since he/she is responsible for teaching everyone equally. In addition, it might also be the easiest way to provide feedback, if the whole class has been dealing with the same topic and tasks relating to it.

The least amount of feedback, according to the data, has been given by the teacher's desk to single students: 45% (42/93) answered either never or seldom. Brookhart (2008) described this way of providing oral feedback to be one of the possible ways to do it in the classroom, either planned beforehand or even unplanned, but according to these results, this type of feedback giving is not popular in upper secondary school. Less than a half (40%, 37/93) agreed to have never or seldom received feedback given to a group of students at once, and 35% (33/93) answered the same about

feedback that is arranged in advance. When it comes to first statement, it can be quite seldom that the teacher uses this sort of feedback technique, because as one can see, it has been discovered that the teacher often goes around in the class and provides feedback that way, instead of asking students to come to the teacher desk. Moreover, one can also think that by inviting students to leave their own desk and work, they are being disturbed and taken away from their work, which is something the teacher does not want to do. This relates to some extent also to the last statement about feedback being arranged in class. Since the spontaneous feedback was proven to be quite commonly in use, it is only logical that rearranged feedback sessions are fewer. Brookhart (2008) points out that it also depends greatly on the task type, whether one needs to schedule a specific time, or just receive the feedback in a spontaneous way. In addition, it also seems that feedback is rather given either to the whole class or to an individual, than to a small group of students. Perhaps teachers see these two separate ways to be working, and do not feel the need to give feedback particularly to a group. One reason could be that group work is not used as much as individual work, which would explain the fewer amount of feedback in this section. According to Harmer (2004), group feedback is especially profitable with performances, and one could even videotape, still making it more personal than written comments about the performance.

Whether the participant of the study felt he/she has received individual feedback, provided to them personally, was also looked into, and the results indicate that over half of the students claimed to have received personal feedback sometimes (51%, 47/93). Less than a fifth also answered to have received it quite often (19%, 18/93), and no one selected the option "often" (0%). Now, the term "sometimes" is of course difficult to explain, because it can mean slightly different things to different people, but still it can be said that personal feedback is given to some extend in the English language classrooms in upper secondary school.

Table 9. Gender differences on the different ways the teacher provides oral feedback

Teacher provides feedback to the whole class.	Seldom or never	Sometimes	Quite often or often	Total %	Correlation
Boys	11.0	20.0	69.0	100.0	
Girls	13.0	39.0	48.0	100.0	.795
Teacher provides feedback spontaneously.					

Boys	6.0	55.0	39.0	100.0	
Girls	20.0	35.0	44.0	100.0	.761
Teacher provides feedback in advance.					
Boys	21.0	47.0	32.0	100.0	
Girls	46.0	32.0	22.0	100.0	-.506

Moreover, in all of the statements in the table 9 above and in table 10 below, boys more often answered in a more positive way, whereas girls were more critical. For example, when asked whether the teacher provides oral feedback for the whole class (table 9 above), nearly 70% of the boys agreed (69%, 25/36), and as for the girls, 48% (26/54) of them agreed. The correlation between the two sexes is relatively high (.795) with this statement, as well as in the statement about spontaneous feedback (.761). The differences between the sexes can be a result of different expectations between the two, or the way the participants have interpreted the questions. Defining for example how much "often" or "sometimes" is for the boys or for the girls is difficult, so the differences may be due to that fact. Moreover, girls may have the need for support and feedback to a larger extend. 20% (11/54) of the girls, however, answered to have seldom or never receive oral feedback spontaneously, whereas the amount of the boys answering this way is only 6% (2/36). A similar effect can be noticed when asked about feedback given in advance: 21% (8/36) of the boys disagree that they have received oral feedback in advance, and twice as many of the girls (46%, 25/54) answered to disagree. There is also a slight negative correlation between the answers with this statement (-.506). As a result, in this case too, boys are more content with the amount of feedback.

The timing of oral feedback can naturally vary during the class. According to Brookhart (2008), timing is something one should always consider when providing oral feedback to students. Below in table 10 are participants' answers summarized, when asked whether they have received oral feedback at the beginning of the class, during it, or at the end of the class.

Table 10. Oral feedback provided during the class

Statement	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Quite often	Often	Total %
At the beginning of the class	8.0	28.0	40.0	22.0	3.0	100.0

In the middle of the class	2.0	12.0	33.0	44.0	10.0	100.0
At the end of the class	6.0	12.0	47.0	32.0	3.0	100.0

According to the data, oral feedback seems to be most often provided during the class, with 54% (50/93) of the students answering either "quite often" or often". At the end of the class follows, with the popularity of 35% (33/93) saying they have received oral feedback then. It appears that the least favorite time for oral feedback is at the beginning of the class, with only 24% (22/93) answering "quite often" or "often". Moreover, 36% (33/93) of the participants claimed to have seldom or never received feedback at the beginning of the class, making it the biggest group in this section, followed with 18% (17/93) of the participants' answers at the end of the class, and 14% (13/93) saying they never or seldom receive feedback in the middle of the class. The option "sometimes" received a rather large amount of the answers again in this section of the questionnaire as well. For example, nearly half of the students (47%, 44/93) answer to have received oral feedback at the end of the class sometimes. Mendez and Cruz (2012) state that oral feedback given at the beginning of the class is a good way of summarizing the issues that the class has been going through for example during the previous lesson. Thus, it seems slightly surprising that only a quarter of the students feel they have received oral feedback then. It only seems reasonable to review previous topics before moving on to the next one. Perhaps reviewing and summarizing is done in some other way, for example by checking homework assignment without much feedback related to it, or with the teacher reviewing the issue using lecturing. It is, of course, difficult to know why or how something is done, when the data only states students' perceptions. Oral feedback can be a good way to end the class as well, and corrective feedback for example can work well in this situation (Mendez and Cruz 2012). However, it proved to be more popularly used also according to the data in this study. At the end of the class one can use oral feedback similarly to how it can be used in the beginning: summarizing issues and providing students with information on their performance. It is always profitable to somehow end the class and conclude what has been learned.

Now, there can be several reasons to the popularity of oral feedback given during the class. First of all, as stated above, teachers' seem to spend time going through the class and giving feedback to students then, rather spontaneously. This often happens during the class, when the introductions

to the new topic have been made, and when there is still time for students to practice what they have been taught. It is also essential to give feedback during the learning process, so that the best possible outcome can be achieved (Jackson 2009:131). During the class, the students are often in the middle of processing new information, so it seems only reasonable to provide oral feedback then. Second of all, it is the time space that takes the most amount of time from the whole class, since the students probably imagined the beginning and the end to last somewhere from a couple of minutes to maybe ten minutes. Since no strict timelines where given, the option "during the class" is the longest period of time, and thus it seems reasonable that the most amount of feedback is placed there. Finally, during the class is often the best possible time frame also for the teacher, because he or she might have planned the lesson in a way where there is room for students' work and feedback after the beginning, and, then again, maybe the teacher needs to use the time advising of guiding the students for the next class at the end. Overall, most feedback was given during the class, followed with at the end of the class, and the least amount of feedback was given right at the beginning of the class.

Learning a foreign language, in this case English, consists of several small parts. One should not only learn the words of the new language, but also to pronounce them, to understand the grammar and morphology of the language, and most of all, to use the language both for conversations and in written form. Thus, the current study aimed to find out how the oral feedback is divided between different topics of language learning, and whether there are great differences in the areas. Table 11 below presents the data relating to this issue.

Table 11. Oral feedback received about certain topics

Statement	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Quite often	Often	Total %
Homework assignments	12.0	17.0	47.0	22.0	2.0	100.0
Grammar	4.0	15.0	48.0	28.0	4.0	100.0
Vocabulary	7.0	26.0	36.0	28.0	3.0	100.0
Speaking and pronunciation	11.0	23.0	44.0	19.0	4.0	100.0
Writing	7.0	12.0	38.0	38.0	5.0	100.0
Listening	16.0	21.0	44.0	16.0	3.0	100.0
Tests	6.0	9.0	40.0	34.0	11.0	100.0

The results spread quite evenly in many cases. For example, it is a positive sign that in every case in the table the option "never" and "seldom" have, even combined, received more answers than the option "sometimes". Moreover, it seems that oral feedback is in fact used in all the areas of language learning, even if in some cases more than in others. This is remarkable, because oral feedback indeed can improve learning and even help to develop students' self-esteem and motivation level during the learning process, if given at the right time (Brookhart 2008). In addition, students can lose their motivation to learn, if feedback is ineffective or not related properly to the task (Clarke 2003).

Table 12. Gender differences about oral feedback on vocabulary

I have received feedback about vocabulary.	Seldom or never	Sometimes	Quite often or often	Total %	Correlation
Boys	9.0	54.0	37.0	100.0	
Girls	48.0	22.0	30.0	100.0	-.997

Relating to differences between the two sexes (table 12 above), boys, again, had a more positive view of the amount of feedback they have received from different areas of language learning. The greatest and most remarkable difference concerned the feedback given about vocabulary. In fact, almost half of the girls (48%, 26/54) claim to have seldom or never received oral feedback about vocabulary, and only 9% (3/36) of the boys chose that option. The difference is rather great, and it is difficult to explain why so many more girls find that vocabulary is not one of the topics they have been provided feedback about. Perhaps boys see the learning of the vocabulary as a more multidimensional, whereas the girls were thinking of feedback given precisely on a certain word, for example. The negative correlation relating to receiving feedback about grammar is very high (-.997) when comparing the two sexes.

However, there are some other differences in the data as well. First of all, most oral feedback has been received from tests and writing: almost half (45%, 42/93) answered to have received oral feedback from tests quite often or often, and the same percentage for writing was 43% (40/93). Now, oral feedback from tests is quite ordinary, probably because teachers often want to go through the results and right answers in the hope of supporting learners and teaching them where they performed well and where there was room for improvement. However, it can be questioned whether

the feedback actually helps the students at this point, because the tests are often given at the end of the course. Moreover, students know the course is already done, and that the grade they received from the test is not going to change even though the results are processed together with the teacher. This is of course not always the case, and tests can be held and given feedback at also during the courses, in which case the oral feedback can be very useful. Unfortunately, most schools seem to focus on tests held at the end of the course, not giving the students a chance to actually show that they have learned from the possible feedback. When it comes to writing, I was rather surprised that it was the second most popular topic where students get oral feedback. Reading through writing assignments takes a significant amount of time, and giving feedback to everyone, even in written form, takes even longer. Oral feedback, on the other hand can be given instantly, and the actual feedback session does not need to last long. However, scheduling feedback sessions for example to 30 students' demands time and effort from the teacher, which is why written feedback is often a more popular option when reading and grading written assignments.

The following table below (table 13) focuses on some of the features of oral feedback given by the teacher, and, most importantly, how students feel about those features. They were asked to rate how often or how seldom the oral feedback they receive is explicit, or on the other hand hard to understand. Moreover, they were asked whether the feedback supports their learning.

Table 13. The explicitness and supportiveness of oral feedback given by the teacher

Statement	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Quite often	Often	Total %
Is explicit	1.0	3.0	7.0	36.0	53.0	100.0
Is hard to understand	23.0	56.0	17.0	2.0	2.0	100.0
Supports my learning	1.0	7.0	24.0	46.0	22.0	100.0

The results appear to be rather positive, when it comes to the clarity and support of the feedback. A large majority, 89% (83/93) of the participants feel that oral feedback is explicit, and only 4% (4/93) consider it to be hard to understand quite often or often. However, the percentage of the option sometimes is slightly higher with the statement that oral feedback is hard to understand: 17% (16/93) chose that option, whereas only 7% (7/93) chose the same option when asked if oral feedback is explicit. Overall, one can still rather safely state that for the most students, the oral feedback they have received in upper secondary school during English lessons has been easy to

understand and explicit. The explicitness of the feedback is one of the feedback contents that is considered to be important, because the feedback provided cannot be too general, or focus on too many issues at the time (Brookhart 2008 and Moss and Brookhart 2009). For example, one can use simple vocabulary when providing feedback (Brookhart 2008). This way, the feedback also supports students' learning, which is an important factor of oral feedback (Moss and Brookhart 2009, Westberg and Hilliard 2001). Almost 70% of the participants also feel that the oral feedback supports their learning (68%, 63/93, answered either quite often or often). 24% (22/93) of the students picked the option "sometimes", leaving only 8% (7/93) to feeling that they do not receive feedback that also supports their learning. As mentioned, these results are rather good, because it is the large majority in all the three statements agreeing that oral feedback is easy to understand and supports their learning. However, this only relates to the oral feedback that they receive. Because of the positivity of the results here, one would hope that teachers would take advantage of this atmosphere and find time to give oral feedback to their students, since they clearly feel it is useful to them.

After stating the inevitable positive effect that oral feedback has on students, the next table (table 14 below) includes the statements about the use of oral feedback with different tasks, and whether the feedback relates to the task.

Table 14. The feedback given by the teacher relating to task

Statement	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Quite often	Often	Total %
Relates to the task	1.0	7.0	20.0	52.0	21.0	100.0
Is given during the task	9.0	13.0	44.0	25.0	9.0	100.0
Is given after the task	4.0	9.0	33.0	44.0	10.0	100.0

The first statement was placed in to the questionnaire to clarify how often the participants feel that the oral feedback teacher provided relates to the task they have been working on. Indeed, the majority agrees that it often relates to the task (73%, 68/93). One fifth (19/93) answered "sometimes", and only 8% (7/93) found that oral feedback seldom or never relates to the task. This is in fact an interesting result, because this shows that students quite often feel that they receive feedback about the task. Moreover, this shows that different types of tasks are a large part of English language learning, because over 70% (68/93) of the participants answered that oral

feedback relates to them. However, it is not a surprise that tasks are used so extensively in classroom, but still one must notice the essential role they have in teaching. When it comes to the timing of the oral feedback related to tasks, almost half of the participants answered to have receive feedback during the task sometimes (44%, 41/93), and 34% (32/93) either quite often or often. As for the statement that feedback is given after the task, over half (55%, 51/93) of the students answered quite often or often, leaving 33% (31/93) to answer "sometimes" and only 13% (12/93) who answered never or seldom. It has been studied and proposed by many researchers that feedback should in fact be given to the students even before, but especially during the task in order to achieve the best results and help the students in the best possible way: this is made possible with the use of formative assessment (Hattie and Timperley 2007, Frey and Fisher 2011). Thus, it is slightly worrying that the larger majority has answered to receive oral feedback after the task, not during it, even though 34% (32/93) agreed to have received feedback quite often or often also during the task. Nevertheless, the percentages are much lower than in the statement about getting feedback after the task.

The fact that feedback is more often given after the task can be due to different reasons, but I would be of the opinion that the greatest reason lies on the classroom practices. It is often that students are given certain tasks to perform, and they may do them either alone on by working together. After the tasks, teacher either shows students the right answers or they may go through the task together. However, in these cases the feedback is given too late if compared to the feedback the students could receive during the task. When the students are focusing on the task and trying to perform well, it would be essential to provide them with oral feedback. This would enable for the student or students to develop their skills during the task, and actually register the possible mistakes or errors they might do. After the task they are not often as receptive, since they only want to correct the "wrong" answers and move on.

Table 15 below focuses on the equality factors when given oral feedback in the classroom, and also seeks to explain the students' opinions about the timeliness of oral feedback, or whether the feedback relates to their personal features.

56

Table 15. The timeliness, personality and equality of oral feedback given by the teacher

Statement	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Quite often	Often	Total %
Is timely	7.0	5.0	29.0	39.0	20.0	100.0
Relates to my personal features	18.0	19.0	43.0	15.0	6.0	100.0
Is given equally to all	3.0	11.0	22.0	36.0	28.0	100.0
Is given in a way that some people receive more feedback than the others	12.0	43.0	30.0	12.0	2.0	100.0

First of all, over half of the participants feel that the feedback they receive is given at the right rime (59%, 55/93). Less than third answered "sometimes", and only 12% (11/93) thought feedback is seldom or never timely. Moreover, this also relates to the information in table 9, where it was discovered that feedback is more often given after the task than during the task. It appears that students feel it is a proper and suitable way of giving oral feedback, because quite many think that the oral feedback they have received has been timely after all. Second of all, it is clear that feedback should never focus on anyone's personal features (for example Moss and Brookhart 2009). Commenting on anything else expect the learning and the task, one can often only do more harm than good, and if the feedback is given about something that has nothing to do with the actual learning, it can damage the learner's self-esteem and learning motivation. The curriculum reform (2015:25), that sets the ground rules for the schools and teachers together with the National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, already states that feedback should be improving students' self-confidence. The results point out that about one fifth of the students feel they have been given feedback relating to personal features (21%, 20/93), and, alarmingly, 43% (40/93) of the participants answered sometimes. 37% (34/93) thought they seldom or never receive this sort of feedback. However, the amount of students answering that they have received feedback about personal feedback is too high, since nothing good usually comes out of this type of feedback. It is hard to say why this is, but one option is that students did not precisely know what was meant with this statement. Maybe they consider personal features to partly relate to their learning features, in which case the results would not be so worrying. Moreover, the questionnaire did not ask to specify any cases, or give examples of these situations, so it is difficult to know exactly what they think giving feedback about personal features means to them. Nevertheless, this shows that not all

feedback relates to the learning, but also on the students themselves. Third of all, the next two statements wanted to reveal how equally oral feedback is given in the classroom. 64% (60/93) answered that feedback is quite often or often given equally to everybody, 22% (21/93) answered sometimes, and 14% (13/93) of the participants felt feedback is seldom or never equal. This reveals that most of the students think that equality works rather well in the area of oral feedback. However, not everyone seems to be completely happy with the amount of feedback they get. When asked whether some people receive more feedback than the others, the results are slightly different from the statement of everyone getting feedback equally. 14% (13/93) agree that some students indeed get more feedback than the others, 30% (28/93) answered sometimes and slightly over half (55%, 51/93) answered seldom or never for this to happen. The amount of people agreeing to get equal feedback is thus higher than the amount of people who think that feedback is not given more to some students than others (64%, 60/93, and 55%, 51/93). In overall, there seem to be slight problems with equality, but still the majority of the participants find equality to work relatively well when receiving oral feedback. Naturally, equality is one of the most important factors of oral feedback, so that the students can feel themselves safe and motivated in the classroom.

Table 16. Gender differences on equality and fairness of oral feedback

Feedback relates to my personal features.	Seldom or never	Sometimes	Quite often or often	Total %	Correlation
Boys	20.0	63.0	17.0	100.0	
Girls	45.0	30.0	25.0	100.0	-.221
Feedback is given in a way that some people receive more feedback than the others.					
Boys	44.0	32.0	24.0	100.0	
Girls	66.0	26.0	8.0	100.0	.995

There were, again, some gender-related differences to be found from the participants' answers relating to the equality of the feedback giving and whether some people receive more feedback than the others (see table 16 above). Over half the amount of the boys agreed, compared to the girls (63%, 34/54 and 30%, 11/36), that they sometimes receive feedback relating to their personal features. That is a significant difference, and since it would be best not to give any kind of feedback

that relates to the students' personal features, it is rather concerning that so large amount of the boys chose this option. However, the statistical correlation is not very significant, even if slightly negative (-.221). In other cases, above, boys have usually had a more positive mindset, for example, on the amount of feedback given, but in this case it is the boys that receive the type of feedback they should not receive. One reason for this difference between the two sexes could be the fact that boys more often cause distractions in the classroom, and thus receive more feedback relating to the working atmosphere and general behavior. This sort of feedback rarely relates to the topic of the class, so there is a chance that the teachers more easily use personal feedback to make the students focus on the issue. In addition, relating to the statement that some people receive more feedback than the others, 66% (36/54) of the girls chose the option seldom of never, and the amount of boys choosing the same options was 44% (16/36). Thus, the majority of the girls view the amount of feedback given to work equally, and the boys slightly more disagree. In fact, 24% (9/36) of the boys (compared to 8%, 4/54, of the girls) agree that some people receive more oral feedback than others in the classroom quite often or often. This statement also has a very high positive correlation between the two sexes' answers (.995). Perhaps the boys would, then, rather receive more oral feedback on the language- related issues, and less on their personal features.

5.3 The kind of oral feedback students want to receive

Now that the type and the amount of oral feedback provided by the teacher from the students' perspectives in English classes in upper secondary high school have been covered, it is time to move on to the third and final section. This section seeks to find answers to questions such as what kind of oral feedback students want to receive and when. Moreover, the statements relate to students' perceptions about oral feedback in overall.

The first statements in section three relate to the issue whether students want to receive their feedback during class, or if they are willing to use some of their breaks or free time to meet with the teacher. Table 17 below shows the results combined for these two statements.

Table 17. Receiving oral feedback: during class and outside class

Statement	Totally disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree	Totally agree	Total %
I am willing to use part of the break, or my free time to receive oral feedback.	14.0	13.0	25.0	39.0	10.0	100.0
I want to receive oral feedback during the class.	1.0	2.0	13.0	51.0	33.0	100.0

It was assumed that most students would want to receive their feedback during class. Quite surprisingly, almost half of the participants (49%, 46/93) quite or totally agreed that they could use some of their free time or break to receive oral feedback from the teacher. However, the large majority still answered that they want to get the feedback during class (84%, 78/93). This was not unexpected, since free time is probably considered as something students would not want to use for school- related issues, such as feedback. Moreover, as already stated in table 6 above, students answered to have received most of their feedback in the classroom, so it partly explains why they want to receive it there also in the future. 25% (23/93) of the students did not have a particular opinion about the use of free time, and 13% (12/93) answered the same with the second statement. Only 27% (25/93) somewhat disagreed or totally disagreed to use their free time in order to hear oral feedback from the teachers, which is a substantially smaller amount that what was expected. Moreover, only 3% (3/93) disagreed to the statement that oral feedback should be provided in the classroom. In overall, one can assume that most students would rather have oral feedback received during the class, but if it is not possible, almost half of the students are willing to use some of their free time for this. Brookhart (2008) also points out that providing oral feedback is indeed possible to do also outside the classroom, for example during breaks or after school. These results shows that oral feedback is valued among students, since the option of using one's free time was not completely abandoned by the participants.

The next issues seen on table 18 below focus on students' personal perception about oral feedback, and how they feel about it, and whether in some cases oral feedback has negative effects on them.

Table 18. Students' overall feelings about oral feedback

Statement	Totally disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree	Totally agree	Total %
Negative oral feedback offends me.	30.0	38.0	24.0	7.0	2.0	100.0
I don´t find oral feedback to be useful.	48.0	36.0	14.0	1.0	1.0	100.0
I do not wish to receive oral feedback in front of the other students.	8.0	23.0	30.0	28.0	12.0	100.0
I feel pressure to perform well after the oral feedback I have received.	22.0	23.0	35.0	17.0	3.0	100.0
The oral feedback I receive makes me feel anxious.	42.0	34.0	17.0	7.0	0.0	100.0

The overall usefulness of oral feedback was asked by stating that oral feedback is not useful. Here, the results were not surprising, since the large majority (84%, 78/93) answered to slightly or totally disagree with the statement. Only 14% (13/93) had no opinion, which shows that oral feedback indeed is important to the students. 2% (2/93) agreed with the statement (see also table. 1 for overall feelings about feedback). Students were asked whether oral feedback offends them. Results reveal that most of the students do not feel that feedback is in any way offending, since 68% (63/93) disagreed either slightly or totally. 24% (22/93) had no particular opinion, and only 9% (8/93) of the students felt that they have been offended through oral feedback. It is a positive sign that the feedback provided by the teacher is very rarely felt as offending, and several researchers also point out that feedback should do the exact opposite, motivate, the students (see for example the Curriculum Reform 2015, Clarke 2003). Relating to this, it was asked if oral feedback makes students feel anxious. This is, naturally, a feature one would not hope to achieve when providing feedback. Instead, feedback should be anything else but that, such as motivating and inspiring. Again, the majority disagreed that feedback makes them feel anxious (76%, 71/93, 17%, 16/93) had no opinion, and only 7% (7/93) quite agreed with that statement. Of course it would be best if no one felt either offended or anxious after receiving oral feedback, but fortunately the percentages support the fact that most students have not felt that during their English lessons in upper secondary school.

Next step was to find out if oral feedback provided to the students in front of other students is something they do not wish to receive, and if students feel pressure to perform well after oral feedback. Here, the results are slightly more divided. As much as 40% (37/93) somewhat or totally agreed that they do not want to receive oral feedback in front of other students. 30% (28/93) had no opinion, and 31% (29/93) slightly or totally disagreed, stating that it would not be a problem. The results indicate that even though most students wish to receive oral feedback, many also want to be provided with it privately. Perhaps it has to do with the fact that for example written feedback is always private, and it the receivers choice whether one wants to discuss it with others. Oral feedback may be thought as private as well, and especially the fact that students do not know what the teacher is going to say, can feel threatening with the presence of the rest of the class. This supports the fact that feedback should support students' self-esteem and self-assessment (see for example Westberg and Hilliard 2001). Moreover, Brookhart (2008) also lists the impact of the audience as one of the strategies one need to take into consideration when providing feedback. When asked about the pressure to perform well, which relates to the previous statements as well, the results show that one fifth of the participants feel pressure to perform well after the oral feedback they have received (20%, 19/93). Quite many, 35% (33/93) had no opinion on this, and slightly under half of them (45%, 42/93) either slightly disagreed or totally disagreed with the statement. In overall, a larger amount did not feel pressure, whereas there still was a notable amount that did feel that the oral feedback "forces" them to improve their performance. In addition, it has been revealed in previous studies that it is possible for the students to feel pressure to perform well after the feedback (Osler 2010). Gender- related differences were rather small concerning the statements in the table 18 above, even if the boys, as before, slightly more often chose the option to neither agree nor disagree.

Table 19 below also relates to the usefulness of oral feedback, and here the statements were that oral feedback does not help them learn, and that oral feedback is a gift from the teacher.

Table 19. Oral feedback: helping to learn or a gift?

Statement	Totally disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree	Totally agree	Total %
Oral feedback does not help me learn.	37.0	45.0	15.0	3.0	0.0	100.0

Oral feedback is a gift from the teacher.	13.0	9.0	53.0	16.0	9.0	100.0

As already stated above (table 18), students mostly feel that oral feedback is useful. Thus, it was only normal to receive such results from the first statement (see above). No one totally agreed with the fact that oral feedback does not help them to learn, and only 3% (3/93) quite agreed. 15% (14/93) neither agreed nor disagreed, and the large majority (82%, 76/93) slightly or totally disagreed, stating that oral feedback does help them to learn. Especially lately it has been discussed that feedback is something the teacher and the students "do" together, and that feedback should not be considered to be a gift or any kind from the teacher, even though it was exactly that some time ago, and Askew and Gipps (2000) named this type of feedback system as receptive- transmission model. Instead, feedback is the result of a well-working cooperation between people (Askew and Gipps 2000). One can see from the results that this statement might have been rather strange for the students, because over half of them (53%, 49/93) neither agreed or disagreed with the fact that oral feedback is a gift. 22% (20/93) disagreed to some level, and 25% (23/93) agreed to some level. The fact that so many participants chose the option where they did not have any particular opinion also reveals that students hardly have thought of feedback as a gift. Maybe they see it as something the teacher is supposed to do, or something that just happens sometimes during the lessons, but they do not feel, nor they should, rewarded. However, it cannot be forgotten that oral feedback does also help students and even, if given in a proper way, increase students' motivation and self-esteem. Thus, even though it is good that only a minority consider oral feedback to be a gift, other results still point out the fact that oral feedback is important and valued in students' perspectives.

The next step is to investigate the opinions students have about errors and oral feedback. First, in table 20 below, it is stated that feedback should not focus on the errors, and second, that it is easy to correct errors after oral feedback from the teacher.

Table 20. Oral feedback and focus on errors

Statement	Totally disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree	Totally agree	Total %
The feedback should focus on the errors.	11.0	23.0	31.0	30.0	6.0	100.0

After the oral feedback, it is easy to correct the errors.	2.0	4.0	25.0	51.0	18.0	100.0

Some studies have pointed out that students wish to receive feedback on grammatical features and also get their errors corrected. On the other hand, it has been stated that one should not only focus on the errors, but give versatile feedback (Hargreaves et al. 2000). In this case, 36% (33/93) of the students quite or totally agree with the fact that feedback should focus on errors. 31% (29/93) had no specific opinion, and 34% (32/93) either slightly or totally disagreed. Here one can see the results have divided into three options relatively well. In other words, there are almost as many people thinking that one should focus on the errors, and as many that think one should not focus on the errors. The third group, apparently, has no strong feeling towards error correction. This is a slight problem for the teachers if one would follow students' wishes. One clearly cannot make everyone satisfied, unless one would give personalized feedback to every single student, which again demands a huge amount of time and effort from the teacher. When it comes to correcting errors, 69% (64/93) of the participants agree with the statement that error correction is easy after oral feedback. One fourth of the participants had no opinion about this (25%, 23/93), and only 6% (6/93) disagreed. What one can conclude from this is the fact that oral feedback seems to be working well for error correction, and only little amount of the participants feel that it would be difficult to correct errors after oral feedback. One possible reason for this is the type of oral feedback: if feedback clearly points out the errors and even reveals the "right" answers, then of course errors are easy to correct. Oral feedback can also be given in a way that a student gets to work on the issues himself/herself, which would be the best solution. Either way, it seems that errors are easy to correct. According to a study by Hyland (2003), students also find it a positive issue that they receive feedback repeatedly on the same issues, and thus learn to correct their mistakes over time.

Table 21. Gender differences on oral feedback and errors

Feedback should focus on the errors.	Totally or slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite or totally agree	Total %	Correlation
Boys	27.0	32.0	41.0	100.0	
Girls	39.0	30.0	32.0	100.0	-.621

A larger amount of the girls (39%, 21/54) compared to the boys (27%, 10/36)) disagreed that feedback should focus on the errors (see table 21 above). In fact, it could have been expected that the girls would rather have their errors pointed out to them than boys, since girls often have more specific goals, and perhaps the need to focus on smaller units in the language learning. There is a rather significant negative correlation between the boys' and girls' answers as well (-.621).

An important factor to look more closely is the fact whether students in overall want to receive more oral feedback compared to the amount they are receiving now, and, moreover, if they want to receive the oral feedback personally. Another statement, in addition to these two, is whether they find oral feedback for the whole class useful as well. Table 22 below summarizes the main findings concerning these issues.

Table 22. Usefulness of oral feedback, oral feedback to the whole class or personally

Statement	Totally disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree	Totally agree	Total %
Oral feedback for the whole class is useful.	8.0	14.0	22.0	41.0	15.0	100.0
I want to receive more oral feedback.	5.0	9.0	42.0	30.0	13.0	100.0
I want to receive personal feedback.	5.0	3.0	26.0	41.0	25.0	100.0

First of all, 66% (61/93) of the participants answered to quite or totally agree with the statement that oral feedback provided to the whole class is useful. 22% (20/93) had no specific opinion, and 26% (24/93) somewhat or totally disagreed with the statement. As one can see, the majority finds feedback even for the whole class to be useful. However, about one fourth of the participants disagree, which can be due to different issues. For example, if the teacher is addressing the whole class at once, it is possible that not all feedback concerns all the students in the same way. Moreover, this type of feedback is usually quite general, relating to students' overall performance, and some people may find it not profitable for that reason. Second of all, when asked whether students want to receive more oral feedback, the results are somewhat interesting. 43% (40/93) agreed with the statement, and almost as many participants (42%, 39/93) chose the option "neither

agree nor disagree". 14% (13/93) disagreed with the statement. The amount of students that do not seem to have a strong opinion about the topic is relatively high. The statement is clear, and one would assume that people know whether they want more oral feedback or not. However, maybe the students do not have such strong feeling towards oral feedback as a type of feedback, but they find it to be something one sometimes gets and sometimes does not get. Moreover, the fact that 14% disagreed, even if it is not a large amount, means that not all people like getting oral feedback. Third of all, personal feedback is something 66% (61/93) of the students want to receive. 26% (24/93) had no particular opinion about personal feedback, and 8% (7/93) disagreed. Personal feedback indeed has its advantages, especially now that the results have shown that there are some concerns about receiving feedback in front of other students, or whether feedback is always provided equally to everyone. During personal feedback the student has a possibility to ask questions about the feedback, and get more feedback on issues that are problematic or function well especially in his/her language learning (Clarke 2003). Preston et al. (1985) also found out students' personal feedback to be helpful, when asked directly from the students.

Table 23. Correlation between the oral feedback given to the whole class: the situation now and students' wishes

Statement			Correlation
	Oral feedback is given to the whole class.	Oral feedback to the whole class is useful.	.461

Answers between the current situation and the situation students wish to have was also compared with the question of whether oral feedback to the whole class is given and whether it is useful. As the results in the table 23 above point out, there is some correlation between the two statements (.461). Thus, the statements correlate with each other.

Table 24. Personal feedback, according to boys and girls

I want to receive personal feedback.	Totally or slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite or totally agree	Total %	Correlation
Boys	8.0	39.0	53.0	100.0	
Girls	7.0	19.0	74.0	100.0	.842

When looking at gender- related differences (see table 24 above), the boys, again, more often had no particular opinion on the personal feedback issue (39%, 14/36)), and as for the girls, a large majority (74%, 40/54) agreed that they want to receive more personal feedback. Positive correlation is also great between the two sexes' statements (.842). Overall, one can make the assumption that more people want to get personal feedback compared to getting oral feedback in overall, or getting feedback that is addressed for the whole class. This means that it would be important for students that teachers could make time for personal feedback also, even though oral feedback for the whole class is of course important as well.

Now that the students' feelings and opinions towards oral feedback have been somewhat extensively been clarified, it is time to move on to the different topics and issues students especially wish to get oral feedback on. In the questionnaire was a list of six different topics one can assume to be covered in the English classes: writing, vocabulary, speaking and pronunciation, grammar, listening and tests. There was also a change to add an issue of their own choice in the questionnaire, but no one wanted to add anything to this list. Table 25 has combined the results of the preferable oral feedback topics below.

Table 25. The areas students' want to receive oral feedback on

Statement	Totally disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree	Totally agree	Total %
Writing assignments	0.0	1.0	11.0	47.0	41.0	100.0
Vocabulary	0.0	9.0	23.0	44.0	25.0	100.0
Speaking and pronunciation	2.0	4.0	22.0	40.0	32.0	100.0
Grammar	1.0	3.0	19.0	37.0	40.0	100.0
Listening	1.0	7.0	23.0	40.0	30.0	100.0
Tests	1.0	4.0	15.0	37.0	42.0	100.0

The first issue one notices, not surprisingly, is the fact that in all the different topics the amount of people disagreeing they want to be provided with feedback is extremely or relatively small, and the amount of people agreeing to receive feedback is quite high. One would assume that there are few people who deliberately want to deny getting oral feedback on any issues. Writing assignments

were the most popular when it comes to agreeing that one want to receive feedback on them: 88% (82/93) of everyone somewhat or totally agreed with the statement, and only 11% (10/93) had no opinion and 1% (1/93) slightly disagreed. Written assignments are often the type of tasks one gets some type of feedback, so the results go well with this information. However, the fact that students would want oral feedback provided to them is interesting. Often teachers use written feedback when correcting written assignments, simply because it is considered to be easier and to take less time than oral feedback. These results prove that it would be worth the teachers' while to provide students with some oral feedback every now and then. It has been proven that oral feedback can work well in written assignments, because one can get more personal feedback, and the teacher, for example, can justify his/her decisions better and explain why or how something could be improved (Harmer 2004).

Second of all, there were no major differences in any of the topics, when it comes to the percentages and to the amount of people agreeing to receive feedback. In all the cases, 69% (64/93) or more wanted to receive feedback instead of disagreeing or denying feedback. Vocabulary and listening were the topics that had most people, even if only 8% (7/93) and 9% (8/93), disagreeing to some level that they do not wish to get feedback on those issues. Even though the differences are not major, this could be due to the fact that those two topics are the ones where oral feedback feels the least useful for the students. For example, listening exercises can be difficult to provide oral feedback on, because the teacher does not often know how the students have processed the information when listening to something and writing or answering questions. Moreover, vocabulary can also prove to be difficult to comment on, if one does not specifically focus on some word choices and comment on those, for example. It was rather surprising that grammar did not differ much from the other areas of language learning, since some studies have proven that students do want to receive feedback especially on grammar (Harmer 2004, Abukhadrah 2012). Here it appears that almost every aspect of language is considered relatively important. On the other hand, the questionnaire did not ask the students to choose which one is the most important to them, but just answer whether the students would like to receive feedback on the topics listed.

Table 26. Gender differences on oral feedback and grammar

I want to receive feedback about grammar.	Totally or slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite or totally agree	Total %	Correlation
Boys	6.0	33.0	61.0	100.0	
Girls	4.0	9.0	87.0	100.0	.896

Grammar- related feedback proved to be slightly differing among boys and girls (see table 26 above). 87% (47/54) of the girls agreed wanting oral feedback on grammar, and with the boys the amount was 61% (22/36), due to the fact that more of the boys chose the option neither agree nor disagree (33%, 12/36) than the girls (only 9%, 5/54). Oral feedback about grammar, thus, appears to be more important to the girls than to the boys. However, the main findings show that students do want to be provided with feedback on all of the abovementioned topics, and the amount of people disagreeing or not having a particular opinion is also relatively small. Moreover, there is a significant positive correlation when looking into the girls' and boys' answers (.896).

The fact that feedback should only focus on one issue at the time has been proven effective by some researchers (Brookhart 2008). It is not profitable for the students to receive too much feedback on all possible issues, because the information can then be hard to process and developing one's language is demanding, if one should focus on several issues at the time. This is why two of the statements in the questionnaire focused on the fact whether oral feedback should focus on one issue at the time, or on several issues. The results are different from the information above (see table 27 below).

Table 27. Students' perceptions about the focus of oral feedback

Statement	Totally disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree	Totally agree	Total %
Focuses on one issue.	12.0	20.0	29.0	29.0	11.0	100.0
Focuses on several issues.	2.0	3.0	24.0	47.0	24.0	100.0

Table 28. Differences between gender on whether oral feedback should focus on one issue at the time

Feedback should focus on one issue at the time.	Totally or slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite or totally agree	Total %	Correlation
Boys	22.0	31.0	47.0	100.0	
Girls	37.0	30.0	33.0	100.0	-.431

After examining the research and studies, one would assume that students would wish to receive oral feedback on one issue at the time as well, but the percentage of people agreeing with that statement is 40% (37/93), which is relatively low considering the knowledge one has on the focus of oral feedback. 29% of the participants (27/93) had no opinion on this, and 32% (30/93) disagreed. A slightly larger amount of the boys (47%, 17/36) compared to girls (33%, 18/54) also agreed that one should focus on one issue at the time (see table 28 above). There is a slight negative correlation between the two genders' answers relating to this issue (-.431). Moreover, when asked if oral feedback should focus on several issues, the amount of people agreeing was in fact higher: 71% (66/93) agreed, 24% (22/93) had no opinion and only 5% (5/93) disagreed. This is interesting because of many factors. First of all, it is clear that few people disagree with the fact that feedback should focus on several issues. The amount of people disagreeing when asked the question the other way around is higher, 32% (30/93) as stated above. This means that most students rather receive feedback on several issues than just one. Still, there are 40% (37/93) who would rather want to focus on one issue at the time. This, again, proves rather difficult to execute in the classroom: the teacher would have to know everyone's preferences in order to give the oral feedback every student wishes to be provided with. Then again, one could also use different techniques for different tasks or assignments, providing more specific feedback for some and then focusing on everything during other assignments. Of course, it is important for the teachers to understand when to give more general feedback and when to only focus on a single issue.

Positive and negative feedback are factors that have been studied relatively well in the field of feedback and classroom behavior. Here, it was also important to investigate the role of positive and negative feedback according to the students. Students were asked whether the oral feedback they receive should be positive, negative, or both positive and negative. In table 29 below one can see the results.

Table 29. Students' perceptions on the use of positive and negative oral feedback

Statement	Totally disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree	Totally agree	Total %
Is positive	2.0	0.0	26.0	46.0	26.0	100.0
Is negative	8.0	8.0	39.0	31.0	15.0	100.0
Is both positive and negative	0.0	1.0	5.0	37.0	57.0	100.0

The largest amount of participants agreed that oral feedback should be both positive and negative: 94% (87/93) of the people agreed, only 5% (5/93) had no opinion and 1% (1/93) slightly disagreed. This proves that students do not fear negative feedback either, but they rather receive it together with positive feedback. This supports the fact that feedback should be given constructively, taking into account both the good and the problematic issues and building up the feedback in a way that students know where there is room for improvement, and where they have succeeded (Preston et al. 1985, Frey and Fisher 2011). According to the students, 72% (67/93) agree with the statement that feedback should be positive, the percentage for negative feedback being 46% (43/93). Positive feedback had indeed been proven to be effective by researchers (see for example Reitbauer et al. 2013). A surprisingly large amount of people chose not to have a specific opinion about negative feedback (39%, 36/93), and the people with no opinion on positive feedback was 26% (24/93). Only 2% (2/93) totally disagreed that oral feedback should be positive, and the percentage when asked the same about negative feedback was 16% (15/93). One could assume that more people would prefer not to get negative feedback. However, in this study the students are all in upper secondary school, and thus may have already learnt the importance of negative feedback as well as positive. Moreover, one must remember that the term negative feedback does not mean that the teacher should give negative feedback about everything, including the student's personal features, but focus only on the assignment and language learning. Thus, it is possible that the participants have slightly understood the term negative feedback differently. One can conclude that the most popular form of oral feedback when it comes to positive and negative feedback is the combination of both, followed with positive feedback and negative feedback on their own.

An important factor to take into consideration is the error correction during oral feedback. It has been stated that the best way to provide feedback to the students is to let them correct the errors

themselves, with the help from the teacher. There are indeed different ways to correct errors (see for example Lyster and Ranta 1997). The statements in the questionnaire asked whether the oral feedback should point out the error immediately, or whether oral feedback helps the students to conclude the right answer on their own (see table 30 below).

Table 30. Opinions on whether oral feedback points out the error or helps students to conclude the right answer

Statement	Totally disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree	Totally agree	Total %
Points out where the error was made.	0.0	0.0	5.0	45.0	50.0	100.0
Helps me to conclude the right answer.	0.0	2.0	9.0	48.0	41.0	100.0

Table 31. Correlation between the statements about error correction and concluding the right answer.

Statement			Correlation
	Oral feedback points out where the error was made.	Oral feedback helps me to conclude the right answer.	.614

Rather interestingly, there were no significant differences between the two statements. It seems that students both want the oral feedback to point out the error, and to help them conclude the answer. This is controversial, and it is difficult to say why the answers are so similar. Almost everyone, altogether 95% (88/93) of the students want their errors pointed out to them during oral feedback. Only 5% (5/93) had no specific opinion and no one disagreed. With concluding the error, 89% (83/93) agreed that this is how oral feedback should be provided. 9% (8/93) had no opinion, and only 2% (2/93) slightly disagreed. What this means is that the teacher should both tell the student the right answer but at the same time not to reveal it at once. Moreover, it is rather alarming that not a single student disagreed with the statement that oral feedback should point out the errors. However, even though the purpose of the first statement "oral feedback points out where the error was made" was meant to be understood in a way that teacher does the work for the students by telling them the right answer, one must acknowledge that this particular statement can be understood in different ways. In fact, this statement could also mean that the teacher in some way points out the error, but does not reveal the right answer, and leaves it for the students to conclude

the right answer. If this is the case, the results are not controversial, and indeed seem rather consistent. Because of the nature of the study, it is impossible to know how the participants interpreted the question, and one must realize that these is one of the possible problems with questionnaire use. However, several corrective feedback researchers emphasize that teachers should not reveal the correct answer to the student, but rather use different ways to help the student understand the issue himself/herself (Lyster and Ranta 1997, Frey and Fisher 2011). However, the students are probably used to the system where they are being told what is wrong and what is right, and might not realize that the teacher may sometimes use ways of providing corrective feedback so that the student himself/herself has to come up with the correct answer. The correlation between the above statements in table 29 is also relatively significant, .614 (see table 31 above), showing that there indeed is a relatively strong relationship between the two statements. Moreover, a study by Lyster and Saito (2010) pointed out that explicit correction can have positive effects on students learning as well. In addition, the whole school system has shown to the students that correcting mistakes and errors is important, which is why they find it to be essential also when provided with oral feedback. The evaluation system is simple, but often allows no errors, and the grades can be worse if there are errors in the test, for example. In any case, it is worrying that so many people would want the feedback to point out the error. At the same time, it is still somewhat unburdening that many students still also want the oral feedback to be the kind that helps them draw conclusions with the help of the feedback.

As students' perception about the use of oral feedback in an English class in upper secondary school were of the main interest in this study, it was essential to examine the role of oral feedback from different angles. Next, in the table 32 below, students' opinion about oral feedback were investigated concerning how explicit feedback should be, if it is important that oral feedback helps them to develop, if feedback should motivate, and, finally, if oral feedback should be though-provoking. These are all factors that are important according to Brookhart (2008) Moss and Brookhart (2009) who have studied the use of feedback extensively.

Table 32. Qualities of oral feedback

Statement	Totally disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree	Totally agree	Total %

Helps me to develop.	0.0	1.0	7.0	31.0	61.0	100.0
Is thought-provoking.	1.0	0.0	19.0	37.0	43.0	100.0
Is explicit.	0.0	2.0	4.0	31.0	62.0	100.0
Motivates	0.0	1.0	9.0	32.0	59.0	100.0

As a standing point, it was assumed that the majority of the participants would find the abovementioned features somewhat or essentially important, and this holds true for all of the statements. 80% (74/93) or more people quite or totally agreed with every statement, proving that oral feedback should be versatile and include many features, not just for example error correction, which proved to be important to the students. The percentages for the option "slightly disagree" and "totally disagree" were extremely small, at the most only 2% (2/93).

Table 33. Gender differences on how thought- provoking oral feedback should be

Feedback is thought- provoking.	Totally or slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite or totally agree	Total %	Correlation
Boys	3.0	25.0	72.0	100.0	
Girls	0.0	13.0	87.0	100.0	.984

The statement "oral feedback is thought-provoking" seemed to divide opinions the most, since the smallest amount of the participants (43%, 40/93) totally agreed with that, and the most people did not have a special opinion (19%, 18/93). This statement also divided the opinion of boys compared to girls the most relating to the other statements in the table 32 above, even though the differences were not major (see table 33 above). In this case, a larger amount of the boys, as seen in other examples above as well, again had no particular opinion compared to the girls (25%, 9/36, and 13%, 7/54). Thus, a larger amount of the girls also agreed that feedback should be thought-provoking (87%, 47/54) than the boys (72%, 26/36). The reasons for this are of course difficult to know, since the students were not asked to specify their answers, but one reason for this could be that students do not feel the need to think of the tasks or feedback any further, it is enough for them that they know what they have done right and where there is still room for improvement. On the other hand, if this is the case, it is slightly worrying that they would not be interested in learning

and developing their knowledge any further with the help of oral feedback, especially since though-provoking feedback is one of the ways to provide proper feedback and it relates closely to formative assessment as well (Hattie and Timperley 2007). Moreover, this is naturally only one possible reason, and there might be other completely different solutions to this if the students were asked to explain their choices further. It is also strange that more people find it extremely important that oral feedback helps them to develop than they do for it to provoke thoughts. There is also a high positive correlation (.984). Overall, the fact that oral feedback both motivates, is explicit, is thought-provoking and helps students to develop all prove to be important factors to the students of English in upper secondary school.

The amount of time used to provide oral feedback often depends on the situation, and most importantly, on the resources. For example, teacher simply cannot spend 30 minutes with every student if there are 30 people taking the course. According to Brookhart (2009), timing of the feedback is an important issue to consider when providing feedback: one has to give it at the right time, preferably during or right after the task, and also consider how often feedback is needed. Moreover, as stated above (table 17), students also would prefer to receive the feedback during the class rather than during their free time. It was examined if students prefer brief feedback, or if they agree with the fact that oral feedback can take time (see table 34 below).

Table 34. Oral feedback and time

Statement	Totally disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Quite agree	Totally agree	Total %
Is brief.	1.0	3.0	48.0	33.0	14.0	100.0
Can take time.	2.0	18.0	47.0	23.0	10.0	100.0

The amount of the participants that chose the option "neither agree nor disagree" was relatively high in both the statements, 48% (45/93) with the statement that oral feedback is brief and 47% (44/93) with the statement that it can last longer. Perhaps this signals that students do not have a special preference when it comes to the time oral feedback takes. In addition, the amount of time used for receiving feedback is often not planned beforehand precisely, and, moreover, it can be assumed that they have not had extremely long feedback sessions during their upper secondary

school experience due to the abovementioned recourse- factor. Researchers also point out that it always depends on the situation and task, whether feedback should be given briefly, or be paid more attention to (Connie and Brookhart 2009). However, 47% (44/93) of the students agree with the statement that oral feedback should be brief, and the same percentage for the fact that it can take time is 33% (31/93). Thus, people rather have quick feedback if they have the choice. Participants disagreeing that feedback should be brief were very few, only 4% (4/93), and the amount was higher when asked if oral feedback should take more time (20%, 19/93). In conclusion, the students have slightly more direct opinion about the fact that oral feedback should not take too much of their time, but still almost half of them agreed to some extend that it can also last longer.

5.4 Students' additional thoughts on the usefulness of oral feedback and on oral feedback overall

In addition to the statements in the questionnaire, two open-ended questions were also added at the end of the questionnaire to enable students to write down their opinions on oral feedback more freely. In the first question, the participants were asked to simply circle between the two options "I want to get oral feedback" and "I do not want to get oral feedback", and justify their choice. The second question asked whether the participant has any additional thoughts or comments about oral feedback.

15 people left both of the open-ended questions blank: altogether 78 people answered the first question. Out of those 78 participants, five people only circled the choice "I want to get oral feedback" but left the justifications blank, thus 73 people out of 93 answered to the first question in writing. The second question about any additional thoughts on oral feedback received less answers: only 17 people out of 93 chose to comment something more on oral feedback.

The first question about whether oral feedback is wanted or not, and why, is studied first, followed with the analysis on the second question about the additional comments on oral feedback. Table 35, below, shows the percentages on the question whether students want oral feedback or not.

Table 35. Oral feedback: yes, or no

Statement	Total
I want to receive oral feedback.	96.0
I do not want to receive oral feedback.	4.0
	100.0

First of all, as one can see in the table 35 above, it is clear that most people chose to want oral feedback (96%, 75/78), and only a small minority answered that they do not wish to receive oral feedback (4%, 2/78). Moreover, this supports the fact that already in tables 1, 17, 18, 19 and 22 above, the participants clearly expressed that oral feedback is much appreciated among the students. Oral feedback indeed suits well in many situations, because it is given naturally, instantly and frequently (Clarke 2003). In the open- ended question, there were several different reasons for the choice to receive oral feedback. In the table 36 below, the reasons behind the choices are divided, and the percentages for each reason are shown.

Table 36. Reasons why oral feedback is a positive issue, according to the students:

Errors, improvement	Motivating	Useful	Personal	Developing	Understandable	Effective, better	Total
30.0	9.0	14.0	9.0	27.0	7.0	4.0	100.0

The open-ended questions were analyzed and then divided into groups according to the answers. First of all, quite often the answers mentioned error, error correction, or the possibility for improvement when getting oral feedback, and 30% (22/73) of the participants justified this to be the reason they want to be provided with oral feedback. Here are some examples of the answers:

> Example 1.
>
> "I want to know where I make errors, and where I am good at"
>
> "haluan tietää, missä teen virheitä ja missä olen hyvä"
>
> Example 2.
>
> "with the help of it one can easily correct one's errors"
>
> "sen avulla pystyy helposti korjaamaan omat virheet"

The first example clearly points out the need to know where the errors were made. Evidently, the student in question feels that oral feedback helps to achieve that. The student also implied that he/she wants to know where he/she is good at. In other words, the student wants to get both negative and positive feedback. Error correction was already studied, and examples seen for example in the table 20 show that it is important for the students to get their errors corrected. The second example continues with the theme of errors, but here the focus is on error correction. The participant comments that it is easy to correct one's errors with the help of oral feedback. This is, of course, a positive issue, since the student feels that oral feedback helps to do that. Moreover, the teachers should strive towards an atmosphere where the students themselves have the chance to correct their errors, instead of the teacher pointing them out to the students (Harmer 2004).

The second most popular reason in table 36 above was that oral feedback somehow helps the students to develop. 27% (20/73) of the participants commented something related to this theme in their answers. An example below demonstrates this:

> Example 3.
>
> "I want it, because it helps me to develop myself"
>
> "Haluan, koska sen avulla voin kehittää itseäni"

Many other comments also simply state that oral feedback helps them to develop, which is in fact a quality everyone should strive towards, when giving or receiving feedback (Moss and Brookhart 2009). In this example, the participant comments that "it helps to develop myself", in other words the student in question feels that the oral feedback not only develops the use of language, but also the student himself/herself. Then again, it is always slightly difficult to analyze the sentences without the possibility to confirm thoughts from the student that wrote this. Overall, the fact that almost one third of all the students feel that oral feedback helps them to develop either their use of language or themselves is a positive issue, and need to be taken into consideration also in the future when planning on giving feedback, or trying to choose between written and oral feedback. At least this shows that oral feedback enables to achieve great results. In addition, the fact that the students feel that oral feedback helps them to develop also shows that teachers, when providing oral feedback, provide it in a proper way. It is the teacher who decides when and in which way to provide oral feedback, and if students have positive thoughts about it, it must have been done well.

Third of all, oral feedback was said to be useful in some ways by 14% (10/73) of the participants that answered the question. Here is an example:

> Example 4.
>
> "it is useful, but not always necessary"
>
> "se on hyödyllistä, mutta ei aina välttämätöntä"

Here, even if the student implies that oral feedback is useful, he/she then continues that getting oral feedback is not always necessary. Perhaps this shows that oral feedback has many positive effects on learning, but still not all students find it to be necessary in every situation. As some students also commented (see later), oral feedback is considered to be "a plus". In addition, it often also depends on the situation whether oral feedback is given or even needed, so in this way the students comment above also makes perfect sense (Hargreaves et al. 2000, Brookhart 2008). Nevertheless, it is a positive sign that students find oral feedback to be useful.

Fourth of all, nine percent of the students wrote that oral feedback helps to motivate them, and the same amount (9%, 7/73) wrote it is personal. Example 5 shows an example of the motivating factor of oral feedback, and example 6 focuses on the personal influence.

> Example 5.
>
> " It motivates and inspires to learn/awakens a thought: this is where I am good at!"
>
> "Se motivoi ja innostaa opiskelemaan/herättää ajatusta: tässä olen hyvä!"
>
> Example 6.
>
> "one understands where one needs practice and makes a connection with the teacher and the teacher with the student"
>
> "siinä ymmärtää missä tarvitsee harjoitusta ja saa yhteyden opettajaan ja opettaja oppilaaseen"

The first example about the motivating factor of oral feedback clearly shows that with the help of motivation, the student in question gets inspiration for learning and studying. Motivation is indeed a crucial part of learning: if the learner is not motivated, learning feels much more difficult and even pointless. In this case, the student feels that oral feedback helps him/her to find the motivation needed to study. The influence of motivation has been proven to be essential also by previous researchers (see for example Brookhart 2008). The same student then continues that not only does oral feedback motivate, but also awakens a thought that this is something I am indeed good at.

Needless to say, thoughts like this of course have a positive effect on learning, so oral feedback should definitely be used in the teaching more extensively. Example 6 brings forward the personal feature that oral feedback also can have. First, the student writes that with the help of oral feedback one understands where one still needs practice, and then continues that oral feedback is a way of connecting with the teacher, and even the teacher can connect with the student. This clearly indicates that the students also need to find a connection with the teacher in order for the feedback to be effective for them. The student in this case understands that oral feedback, at its best, is communication between the two people, the feedback provided and the feedback receiver. This quality is also one of the positive aspects of oral feedback (Clarke 2003).

Fifth of all, seven percent (5/73) of the people wrote oral feedback to be easily understandable or just simply easy. Example 7 below demonstrates that feature.

> Example 7.
> ”oral feedback is easier to go through”
> “suullista palautetta on helpompi käydä läpi”

In this case, the student seems to be comparing the use of oral feedback to other types of feedback, because the form ”easier” is used when written about oral feedback. The participant in question finds it easier to go through the feedback if it is given orally. Perhaps what is meant with this is that it is convenient to for example ask more questions from the teacher if needed, or process the information when it is given orally and personally. When the student says “going through feedback”, something else is clearly meant than when going through for example written feedback. One can look at the markings when one wants, but with oral feedback one has to go through the feedback in one’s mind, unless one has made notes. In any case, oral feedback is found to be positive, and easier to process than other types of feedback.

Finally, the minority of the people (4%, 3/73) wrote that oral feedback is effective or simply better. Example 8 below gives an insight of this feature.

> Example 8.
> “se on tehokkaampaa kuin kirjallinen palaute”
> “it is more effective than written feedback”

Again, the participant here makes a comparison to written feedback when he/she writes that oral feedback is more effective. Unfortunately, the student does not continue by explaining why it is more effective, so it is difficult to know exactly what is meant with this statement. However, the effectiveness of oral feedback in certain situations has been studied before, and there is clear evidence that it holds true (see for example Brookhart 2008, Moss and Brookhart 2009).

There were only four percent (3/78) of the people that answered not wanting to get oral feedback. It is, however, still essential to examine some of the reasons behind this choice, so example 9 below shows a glimpse of the possible reasons why oral feedback is not wanted.

> Example 9.
> "one cannot remember the whole feedback from memory"
> "koko palautetta ei voi muistaa ulkoa"

This particular participant finds oral feedback to be a negative issue most of all because one cannot remember everything if it is not written down. He/she is concerned that something will be forgotten if the feedback is given orally. Naturally, there is always a chance that one cannot remember every single thing that is presented, if feedback is only in oral form. With the help of written notes, one can return to the feedback when needed. The question is, however, how many students actually do revisit the written feedback later. Moreover, this statement also contradicts with the reasons that some of the participants gave later when they had the chance to write any additional thoughts they might have relating to oral feedback (see later). In addition, the truth is that one can never satisfy everyone, and thus it is essential to try and use different ways of giving feedback in English language learning in upper secondary school, even though oral feedback is clearly appreciated among students.

As stated above, the second open-ended question received only 17 answers, but is still a significant question to take into account in the analysis. The low reply percentage for this question may be due to the fact that the participants did not have anything additional they wanted to bring forward. Another option is that since they had already been filling in the questionnaire for almost 15 minutes, they simply did not have the motivation to think of the issue of oral feedback in greater depth. The answers received, however, reveal interesting facts about the use of oral feedback. The answers were again divided into different subgroups, and one can see the division and the percentages for each group in table 37 below.

Table 37. Others issues related to oral feedback:

More of oral feedback	Oral feedback is important/good	Oral feedback is easier to remember	Other comments	Total
35.0	18.0	12.0	35.0	100.0

Interestingly, 35% (6/17) of the participants answering to the second question wanted to bring forward their wish of getting more oral feedback. This issue was already covered in the statements before the open-ended questions, but since several students wanted to mention this also is their written comments, it seems that it is something some of the students clearly find important. Example 10 below gives a glimpse of the answers relating to the amount of oral feedback.

Example 10.

"there should be more of it and also given to good students"

"pitäisi olla enemmän ja myös hyville oppilaille"

This written wish points out an important fact: the writer hopes to get more oral feedback, but also that oral feedback should be given to "good students". Apparently, in this case the student feels that oral feedback is in fact given, but maybe the students that already perform well are missing out. Moreover, this should never be the case. It is essential for the gifted students to receive feedback as well as it is essential for everyone else. Perhaps it sometimes is the case that teacher spends more time focusing on struggling students in order to help them, and then ignores the gifted students because they seem to be performing so well. As proven by research as well (Osler 2010), feedback should be given equally to everyone, no matter what their level of knowledge in language learning is.

Some comments that were rather difficult to place in any group were placed under the category "other comments", consisting of 35% (6/17) of the answers. This group retains comments on oral feedback overall, on teachers' behavior when giving oral feedback, on whether it should be positive or negative, and on the influence of oral feedback to self-esteem. Below one can see two examples from this group, examples 11 and 12.

Example 11.

"The need for feedback varies between students, I think."

"Palautteen tarve vaihtelee oppilaittain, luulisin."

Example 12.

" But I don't want feedback to lower self-esteem"

"Mutta en halua että palaute alentaa itsetuntoa"

One student wrote about the need of feedback in overall, saying that it can vary between students. This is an important observation, and surely also holds true. Every student is an individual, and some people might need more feedback than others. It stays unclear what the student feels himself/herself: whether he/she would like to get more or less of oral feedback or whether the amount of feedback is satisfying at the moment. In addition, the amount of feedback needed can vary according to the day or task type: one does not always necessarily need as much feedback as during a tricky task or writing assignment, for example. Example 12 points out that even though the student in question does want to be provided with oral feedback, it should not be given in a way that lowers students' self-esteem. This issue of self-esteem was already covered in table 18, where it was asked whether oral feedback makes students feel anxious or makes students feel pressure to perform well. 20% answered that it does make them feel the pressure to perform well, and 7% answered that oral feedback makes them feel anxious. Anxiousness and pressure can also lower students' self-esteem, so it would be critical to give oral feedback in a way that the student/students in question would feel encouraged and positive after the feedback. This students' notion, thus, holds perfectly true, and every teacher should keep this in mind when providing oral feedback to their students. Above all, oral feedback should be motivating and thought-provoking, not in any way threatening.

18% (3/17) of the students responding to the second open-ended question wrote that oral feedback is important to them or simply "good". Example 13 below demonstrates this group of students.

Example 13.

"Good in tasks."

"Tehtävissä hyvä."

This notion focuses on the positive signs of oral feedback especially in different tasks. The student in question feels the need to mention that with tasks, oral feedback works well. Perhaps this student

wants oral feedback related to the tasks done in the classroom, or on assignments done at home. Which one is the case, it is difficult to say, but nevertheless oral feedback is still appreciated. Oral feedback can, indeed, be provided before, during or after the task, and the choice between those options is the teachers (Mendez and Cruz 2012).

Finally, the smallest group of people wrote that oral feedback is easier to remember (12%, 2/17). This contradicts with the notion of a student commenting that one cannot remember everything a teacher says, and thus oral feedback is not wanted. However, example 14. below shows an answer relating to the memorization of oral feedback.

> Example 14.
> "I remember better what has been said to me, rather than written down, it is also forgotten quickly on paper."
> "Itse muistan paremmin, mitä minulle on sanottu, kuin laitettu paperille, se myös unohtuu nopeasti paperilta."

This particular student finds oral feedback to be easier to remember than written feedback. When something is said out loud, it stays on the student's mind for a longer time, rather than written text that according to this student is quickly forgotten. This definitely is true, since some people do remember issues better if they hear them. On the other hand, one cannot say that the student who earlier pointed out that oral feedback is difficult to remember, is wrong. One must acknowledge that both opinions are justified, and that in this issue, as in any other issue relating to oral feedback, there are as many opinion as there are students. Perhaps it would be wise to figure out beforehand what kind of feedback the students prefer, and try to provide everyone with the feedback they find to be the most profitable. This, of course, is not always and every time possible, because of time limits.

6 Conclusion and discussion

This research aimed to find out students' perceptions about the use of oral feedback in EFL classrooms in upper secondary schools. Next, the results of the study and possible implications and

applications are discussed in greater depth. Moreover, the success of the study, along with the suggestions for future research, are considered.

In the first part of the questionnaire, students' overall feelings towards receiving feedback were studied, and the results show that students clearly want to receive feedback in the classroom. Oral feedback was respected slightly more than written feedback, even though there were no major differences between the two feedback types. Peer feedback, however, divided opinions, and several students agreed that peer feedback is not useful for them. The usefulness of corrective feedback was studied as well, dividing opinions, even though a larger percentage of the students agreed to have received it orally rather than in written form. Moreover, this reveals that students do appreciate the feedback they are provided with, and that teachers must provide feedback also in the future when teaching English. Feedback is, and will be, an essential part of teaching and learning, without doubt (Moss and Brookhart 2009:44, Hattie and Timperley 2007:81). It guides the students in the right direction, and as pointed out above, oral feedback and other types of feedback, such a written feedback are all appreciated and proven useful among students. The divided opinions with peer feedback, however, reveal a possible problem in the schools: students do not find it to be as profitable as for example oral feedback. This may be due to the fact that they have not been taught how to give and receive to each other, or possibly because peer feedback is not used in schools. However, peer feedback can be a valuable part of the feedback process in the classrooms, especially in upper secondary schools, where the students often have knowledge about several issues considering language learning, and are motivated to learn more. Thus, teachers should use it in the classrooms, and guide the students to provide feedback to each other. This would enable the use of both teacher feedback and student feedback, which would increase the amount of feedback being provided and enrichen the learning experience for the students.

The second part of the study aimed to clarify the current oral feedback practices in English classes in upper secondary school. Logically, the most common place to receive oral feedback was the classroom, but a notable amount of the students also agreed to have received feedback outside the classroom. Thus, it seems that both teachers and students are willing to provide and receive feedback also outside the classroom territory, if needed. When asked about the different topics students receive feedback about, it was a rather positive sign that all topics of language learning were supported with oral feedback, according to the students. Most oral feedback was received on

tests and writing. Moreover, this points out the focus that many schools still have on tests and grading: oral feedback was provided about the tests the most. It cannot be ignored that the current school system focuses on grading and tests more than many feel is necessary, so the fact that even oral feedback is given most on that topic is not surprising. However, if the oral feedback is provided only after the test, and not before it, it does not forward the learning of the students to a great extent. Fortunately, oral feedback was received on other topics as well, so it would seem that it is being received rather widely. In the future, I would recommend that some of that oral feedback given on tests should be transferred into other areas of language learning, such as feedback about the task or feedback about students' overall performance in classrooms.

Oral feedback was most given to the students by going around in the class and to the whole class at the time, the least to a group of students and at the teacher's desk to a single student. These results reveal that teachers indeed spend time in the classrooms by going around helping and guiding the students when needed. This is essential, since the old- fashioned way of teaching by talking in the front and then letting the students work on exercises alone and quietly at their desks is clearly something the current school practices must leave in the history (Askew and Gipps 2000). Oral feedback given to a whole class is also quite logical, since often the class has been going through the same issues or tasks, and it is natural for the teacher to address all of them at once. However, the study also revealed that most students, especially girls, would like to receive more personal feedback. Indeed, the more time teacher has to focus on individuals, the better the results often are. It is no surprise that the students wish to receive more of personal oral feedback, since it is impossible to provide it in every class. However, as this study points out, it would be essential to plan the course or the classes in a way that there would be some time for personal feedback as well. It is a positive sign that oral feedback is given to the students in many different ways, but especially personal feedback would be appreciated, and thus should be included in every course in upper secondary schools to some extent. Moreover, to make this possible, the teachers should take this into account already when planning the course timetable, or individual lessons. One could, for example, mark the amount of oral feedback given to each individual in a notebook or wherever it would feel comfortable, and then check these notes every once in a while to make sure everyone has been provided feedback equally.

The least amount of oral feedback, according to the students, was given at the beginning of the class, then at the end of the class, and the most oral feedback was received in the middle of the class. It seems natural that most oral feedback is received during the class, and this also supports students' learning, since the teacher focuses on feedback not only at the end, when the class is about to end and students perhaps are not the most receptive. However, when asked about the use of oral feedback in tasks, the least amount was received during the task. This is slightly worrying, since for the learning to be effective, feedback should be given even before that actual task, but mostly during it (Hattie and Timperley 2007). If feedback is only provided after the task, students cannot receive the information they might need while doing something, but instead have to return to the problematic parts of the task after finishing it already. Moreover, it would be essential to take this into account already in teacher training in the universities, so that it would be made certain that all teachers are aware of this issue. The role of feedback in overall is relatively poorly addressed in the training, and instead the focus is, for example, on lesson planning and grading. For feedback to be the most profitable and useful for both the teachers and the students, the role of it needs to be taken into account right from the beginning of the teaching career and teacher training.

Several positive signs were found when studied the use of oral feedback in English classes in upper secondary schools. For example, the large majority of the students agreed that oral feedback is not hard to understand, but instead explicit, and that it often supports their learning. This is a positive sign, and shows that oral feedback has been used correctly. One of the most important qualities of feedback, indeed, is that it should support and help the students to develop their language use. However, when asked about the equality of feedback, there is still room for improvement. A proportion the students thought that oral feedback is not always given equally to everyone in the classroom, and that some students receive more oral feedback than the others. It is self- evident that the amount of oral feedback is quite impossible to divide exactly evenly between every student, but if there is a feeling amongst the students that the teacher is not being fair when providing oral feedback, it can weaken the classroom atmosphere and, moreover, the learning motivation for some students. It is essential as a teacher to try and treat everyone as equally as possible, not only when it comes to oral feedback, but in overall. However, this brings out the problem that many teachers face: often there are weaker and stronger students in the classroom, and it would be important to help especially those who struggle the most. However, one should not forget the gifted students

either, so the teachers' work can sometimes be a real struggle. Information about this issue should be provided in the teacher training, and especially focus on equality and personal feedback in the training sessions, when the future teachers are teaching classes with the help and guidance from the teachers, before graduating and starting their own career.

The third part of the current study, and the third part of the questionnaire, focused on the hopes and wishes of the students about the use of oral feedback in English classes in upper secondary schools. Earlier it was fortunately found out that students do indeed receive oral feedback on several issues. When asked what topics the students would especially want to receive oral feedback on, they chose writing and grammar. Writing was one of the most popular topics the teacher already proved feedback on, and oral feedback on grammar also received quite good results. Thus, it is a positive sign that the students do receive feedback on topics they would like to receive it on. The fact that oral feedback on grammar was one of the most popular topics on language learning was no surprise, since the previous literature already supports the fact that students often want feedback on grammatical issues (see for example Harmer 2004). Moreover, oral feedback wanted on written assignments is something one can understand well: oral feedback can often feel relatively more personal than written comments. In addition, when providing oral feedback, the student can participate actively and for example ask questions about the feedback if needed. Unfortunately, time is an enemy for the teachers when it comes to giving oral feedback on written assignments. Oral feedback without doubt takes more time in the classroom than written feedback. However, if it is taken into account already when planning the course, it can and definitely should be done at least every once in a while. Moreover, quite many of the students were also willing to use some of their free time for receiving oral feedback, so not all the oral feedback has to be given in the classroom. Teachers could, for example, decide already before a course begins, to provide oral feedback to everyone individually on one certain issue, if not several.

The students were asked whether oral feedback is a gift from the teacher, because that is how it often was perceived in the earlier times, when the role of the teacher and the roles of the students were something very different than what they should be, and are, now (Askew and Gipps 2000). Before the teacher was the one in charge of everything, and the students' responsibility was only to obey, listen, and work hard. Thus, it was fortunate that oral feedback was not seen as a gift by the students. The future teaching and learning strives towards an atmosphere where the teaching

often works in collaboration with students and teacher is seen as a guide, not a leader (ibid.). In addition, this means that the role of the teacher and the students are getting more equal, and the students have a chance to express their opinions and take active part in teaching and learning in the classroom. Moreover, the students thought it was important that oral feedback is motivating, thought-provoking, explicit and developing. This is something that can only be made possible with collaboration with the teacher and the students. The teacher must also pay attention to the role of oral feedback, because as one can see, it has many possible positive outcomes. For example, oral feedback has an essential role in motivating students (Brookhart 2008). A simple "good job" is needed sometimes, even though purely praising the students does not lead to developing language use, but needs to be accompanied with reasons behind the success. Improvement and development were also brought forward in the open-ended questions, when asked why students want to receive oral feedback.

Positive oral feedback was seen as important by many of the students participating in the study, but surprisingly, almost half of the students also wanted to receive negative feedback. This shows not only that they have learned to appreciate constructive feedback, but also that the students in question are mature enough to understand why negative feedback is such an important part of learning. If this question was asked from elementary school pupils, the answers would have probably been rather different. Moreover, the most feedback was still wanted both on positive and negative issues, pointing out the importance of positive feedback as well. The combination of both can help to boost self- esteem and improve motivation for learning (Preston et al. 1985). Related to the issue of positive and negative feedback, students in the current study also agreed that oral feedback helps to correct the errors they may have made. One third of the students also agree with the fact that oral feedback should focus on errors. This supports the results where students wanted feedback especially on grammar. There was also slight misunderstanding with the fact whether oral feedback should point out the error, or help to conclude the error. In fact, both the options received high percentages from the students agreeing with the statements, and pointing out was slightly more popular than concluding the error. This in unfortunate, since many researchers have already pointed out that pointing out the error is something the teachers should avoid doing, and instead the teachers should help the students in different ways to conclude the errors themselves (Harmer 2004). Students, however, seem to disagree. Perhaps especially in upper secondary school they feel the pressure to perform well, and thus they find it important to be told where they have

made an error. Maybe the students did not quite understand the option of concluding the error themselves, because they of course would get help and support from the teacher in this options. In the open ended- questions, errors were also pointed out often, so they are indeed one of the most important part of oral feedback, especially from the students' perspectives. All in all, one must pay attention to the way one provided feedback, so that it is given not only equally and at the right time, but also in the right way. Schools should discuss the use of oral feedback and teachers should work together, so that the right ways of providing feedback can be used. Oral feedback could for example be a topic for some of the teacher meetings during the school year.

The previous research points out that oral feedback should focus on one issue at the time (Brookhart 2008), so it was rather surprising to see that the students would rather want oral feedback to focus on several issues at the time. There were, however, some differences with the answers here: boys did, in fact, more often want the oral feedback to focus on one issue than girls. It would seem reasonable to only focus on certain issues at the time to avoid too much information or the feeling of overwhelming or confusion with the students. This, of course, depends on the assignment or the task as well. For example, if the students are asked to write a cohesive text, then perhaps it would be natural to focus on the structure of the text, instead of grammatical features. On the other hand, the students wanting to get feedback on several issues probably want it, because they want to know in which areas they performed well and where there is still room for improvement. Thus, it is again important as a teacher to take into account the students perceptions, along with the information learned in the teacher training and through experience, and provide oral feedback according to those guidelines. Moreover, the amount of time seemed not to be an issue for the students: when asked whether oral feedback should be brief or take time, many of the students chose the option to neither agree nor disagree. Thus, it often depends on the task and the situation how much time it takes to both provide proper oral feedback and to receive it.

The students were asked about the possible negative effects of oral feedback, and the results reveal that the large majority of the students do not find oral feedback to be negative. This supports the findings that students wish to receive oral feedback, and that it helps to motivate them. However, it was pointed out that students would rather receive oral feedback in private, not when the rest of the class is listening. This seems natural, since in private the students do not have to feel threatened and can ask questions in confidence. A place outside the classroom is often also more peaceful,

and makes it easier to pay attention to the feedback. Thus, teachers should be able to provide oral feedback to the students in a way that it does not offend the students in any way, and thus plan it possibly in advance, so that there is a place they can go to discuss about the student's work. In overall, it is clear that the students in upper secondary school studying English do want to get oral feedback and feedback as a whole from the teacher. They also want it on several topics, especially on writing and grammar- related issues. They see oral feedback as motivating and developing, and would like to receive it especially on errors, and both positive and negative issues should be considered. In the open ended questions students also wished to receive more of oral feedback. There were some gender differences as well: girls were often more critical than boys in all the sections of the questionnaire. Boys, on the other hand, had no specific opinion more often than the girls.

As already mentioned above, these results point out many positive effects of oral feedback use, but also a need for changes, starting from the teaching training, all the way to individual teachers and schools and the National core curriculum for basic education. First of all, one must learn to appreciate feedback right from the beginning of the teacher training, and the future teacher need to become acquainted with the essential role of feedback and oral feedback especially on language classrooms. Practical guidance and concrete examples and discussion is definitely needed in order to spread the knowledge to everyone. Second of all, it is not only the teachers who need guidance and help, but also the students. The more oral feedback is used, the more familiar students are with it and probably the more effective it becomes. Teachers need to explain the importance of feedback to the students and help students to provide it to each other and to the teacher. One simply cannot assume that teachers always know the best, but instead we must realize the endless possibilities the classroom environment and students provide. By working together, discussing, questioning and even arguing one can truly make use of oral feedback and thus start reaching the goals feedback can at the best provide. Finally, feedback definitely needs to be tailored to every individual, making sure students actually feel empowered, motivated and more confident after the feedback. As mentioned before, everyone needs and deserves feedback, but not everyone feels supported by the same type of feedback. Teachers should discuss with the students and create an atmosphere where everyone feels positive and eager to receive and provide feedback and especially oral feedback to each other. Hopefully this study helps teachers and students in finding the right path towards motivating and successful learning.

The study succeeded in answering the research questions relatively well. It provided important insights about the perceptions of the current use of oral feedback in upper secondary schools, and, in addition, offered information on the students wishes for the use of oral feedback. Moreover, the questionnaire was well formed, and did answer all of the questions this study aimed to find out answers to. However, it could have been useful to ask the students to number the topics they most would like to receive oral feedback about. Now, the study revealed that students do want to get oral feedback on all the topics related to English language learning, but it remains unknown, which issue would have been the most essential in their opinion. In addition, the open-ended questions did not receive as many answers as the statements before them, so it is more difficult to generalize the results of those questions. The study is rather small- scale in a larger picture of feedback studies, so the results in overall cannot be extrapolated to hold true in every country or even every school. However, for the Finnish upper secondary schools this study brings important answers when considering the use of feedback and especially oral feedback in the English classes.

In the future, it would be interesting to study this phenomenon in a larger scale, forming the data from multiple schools or even several countries. This way one could compare the current results with the results gained from the future studies, and form more generalizable results, that hold true in several countries, not only in Finland. Moreover, it would be important to find out to a larger extent what the students' perceptions about the use of oral feedback are, so an interview could be used to enable the students to explain their choices in greater depth. Observing classrooms and combining this field of research with a questionnaire or interviews would also provide a more truthful picture of the current use of oral feedback in schools. In addition, if one would like to compare the opinions of both teachers and students, one could take the roles of both of them into consideration and study the use of oral feedback by interviewing or questioning students and teachers from the same schools.

Bibliography

Abukhadrah, Q. A. (2012). *Arab male students' preferences for oral corrective feedback: A case study.* Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences.

Askew, S. (2000). *Feedback for learning.* London; New York: Routledge/Falmer.

Askew, S. and Lodge, C. (2000). Gifts, ping-pong and loops – linking feedback and learning. In Askew, S. (editor). *Feedback for learning.* London; New York: Routledge/Falmer

Auld, G., Ridgway, A. and Williams, J. (2013). Digital oral feedback on written assignments as professional learning for teacher educators: A collaborative self-study. *Studying Teacher Education* 9 (1), 31-44.

Bitchener, J., Young, S. and Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 14 (3), 191-205.

Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to give effective feedback to your students.* Alexandria Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M. G. (1993*). In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms.* Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brown, H.D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. White Plains: Longman.

Carnell, E. (2000). Dialogue, discussion and feedback – views on secondary school students on how others help their learning. In S. Askew (editor). *Feedback for learning*. London/ New York: Routledge Falmer. (46-61).

Chen, Y., Thompson M.S., Kromney J.D and Chang G.H. (2011). Relations of student perceptions of teacher oral feedback with teacher expectancies and student self-concept. *The Journal or Experimental Education* (79-4), 452-477.

Clarke, S. (2003). *Enriching feedback in the primary classroom: Oral and written feedback from teachers and children.* London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Dean, C. B., Hubbell, E. R., Pitler, H. and Stone, Bj. (2012). Classroom instruction that works: research- based strategies for increasing student achievement (2nd edition). ASCD: Alexandria, VA.

Deirdre, B. (2010). *Giving students effective written feedback*. England: Open University Press.

Dufva, H. (2011). Ei kysyvä tieltä eksy; kuinka tutkia kielten oppimista ja oppimista haastattelun avulla. In Kalaja, Alanen and Dufva (eds.): *Kieltä tutkimassa: tutkielman laatijan opas*. Finn Lectura: Tampere. (131-145).

Dörnyei, Z. with Taguchi, T. (2010). *Questionnaires in Second Language Research. Construction, Administration, and Processing* (2nd edition). New York: Routledge.

Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland and F. Hyland (eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81-104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Finnish National Board of Education: Amendments and Additions to the National Core Curriculum for Basic Education. 21.10.2015. http://www.oph.fi/download/132551_amendments_and_additions_to_national_core_curriculum_basic_education.pdf.

Finnish National Board of Education: Core curriculum for basic education 2004, 20.10.2015. http://www.oph.fi/english/curricula_and_qualifications/basic_education.

Finnish National Board of Education: Curriculum reform in Finland. 20.10.2015. http://www.oph.fi/download/151294_ops2016_curriculum_reform_in_finland.pdf.

Frey, N., and Fisher, D. (2011). *The formative assessment action plan: Practical steps to more successful teaching and learning.* Alexandria Va.:ASCD.

Gardner, J., Harlen, W. and Hayward, L. (2010). *Developing teacher assessment*. New York: McGraw-Hill Professional publishing.

Glossary of education reform. 2.3.2016. http://edglossary.org/

Gray, P.S., Williamsson J.B., Karp D.A. and Dalphin J.R. (2007). *The research imagination. An introduction to qualitative and quantitative methods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gurzynski-Weiss, L. and Révész, A. (2012). Tasks, Teacher Feedback, and Learner Modified Output in Naturally Occurring Classroom Interaction. In *Language Learning.* University of Michigan: Language Learning Research Club. (62:3) (851–879).

Hargrieves, E., McCallum, B. and Gipps, C. (2000). Teacher feedback strategies in primary classrooms – new evidence. In S. Askew (editor). *Feedback for learning*. London; New York: Routledge/Falmer. (21-31).

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

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing.* Harlow: Longman.

Hattie, J. and Timperley, H. (2007). *The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research*. CA: Teller Road, Thousand Oaks. Vol. 77, No. 1 (Mar., 2007) (81-112).

Hirsjärvi, S., Remes, P. and Sajavaara, P. (2009). *Tutki ja kirjoita*. Hämeenlinna: Kariston kirjapaino Oy.

Iwashita, N. and Li, H. L. (2012). Patterns of corrective feedback in a task-based adult EFL classroom setting in China. In A. Shehadeh and C.A. Coombe (editors). *Task-based language teaching in foreign language contexts: research and implementation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. (137-161).

Jackson, R. R. (2009). *Never work harder than your students & other principles of great teaching.* Alexandria VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kamiya, N. *The relationship between stated beliefs, classroom practices, and reading research studies of oral corrective feedback in four ESL teachers.* Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences.

Krych-Appelbaum, M. and Musial, J. (2007). Students' perception of value of interactive oral communication as part of writing course papers. *Journal of Instructional Psychology.* 34 (3), 131-136.

Lochtman, K. (2002). Oral corrective feedback in the foreign language classroom: How it affects interaction in analytic foreign language teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research* 37(3), 271-283.

Luoma, S. (2004). *Assessing speaking.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: a counterbalanced approach.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lyster, R. and Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in second language acquisition.* 0(1), 37-66.

Lyster, R. and Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 32 (2), 265-302.

Marcelo, M. B. (2003). Teacher feedback and learners' uptake. *Linguagem em (Dis)curso.* 4(1), 81-96.

Mendez, E. H. and Cruz, M. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile Issues in Teachers` Professional Development.* 14(2), 63-75.

Merriam-Webster Dictionary. 20.10.2015. http://www.merriam-webster.com/.

Moss, C. M. and Brookhart, S. M. (2009). *Advancing formative assessment in every classroom: A guide for instructional leaders.* Alexandria Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Osler, A. (2010). *Students' perspectives on schooling*. England: Open University Press.

Pehkonen, M. (2008). *Teachers' evaluative turns in Finnish CLIL classrooms.* Master's Thesis, University of Jyväskylä. 4.5.2016. https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/18442/URN_NBN_fi_jyu-200804011310.pdf?sequence=1.

Preston, T. L. and Todd-Mancillas, W. R. (1985). *A grounded ethnographic inquiry into teacher oral feedback*. Denver/Colorado: U.S Department of Education.

Profozic, M. N. (2013). *The effectiveness of corrective feedback and the role of individual differences in language learning: A classroom study.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften.

Reed, J. and Stoll, L. (2000). Promoting organizational learning in schools – the role of feedback. In Askew, S. (editor). *Feedback for learning*. London; New York: Routledge/Falmer.

Reitbauer, M., Campbell, N. and Mercer, S. (2013). *Feedback matters: Current feedback practices in the EFL classroom.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang AG.

Reitbauer, M. and Vaupetitsch, R. (2013). Corrective feedback in the constructivist classroom. In M. Reitbauer, N. Campbell and S. Mercer (eds.). *Feedback matters: Current feedback practices in the EFL classroom.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang AG. (37-54).

Santos, M., López-Serrano, S. and Manchón, R.M. (2010). The Differential Effect of Two Types of Direct Written Corrective Feedback on Noticing and Uptake: Reformulation vs. Error Correction. *International Journal of English Studies* 170, 131-154.

Smith, N. (2004). *Chomsky: Ideas and Ideals* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spendlove, David (2009). *Putting assessment for learning into practice*. , London/New York: Continuum International Pub Group.

Surakka, K. (2007). *Corrective feedback and learner uptake in an EFL classroom*. Master's Thesis, University of Jyväskylä.

Tainio (toim.) (2007). Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa: näkökulmana keskustelunanalyysi. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Taras, Maddalena (2013). Feedback on feedback: Uncrossing wires across sectors. In S. Merry, M. Price, D. Carless and M. Taras (editors*). Reconceptualising feedback in higher education: Developing dialogue with students*. New York: Routledge.

Telceker, H. and Akcan, S. (2010). The effect of oral and written teacher feedback on students' revisions in a process-oriented EFL writing class. *TESL Reporter* 43 (1), 31-49.

Tuomi, J. and Sarajärvi, A. (2004). *Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi*. Jyväskylä: Gummerus Kirjapaino Oy.

Usó-Juan, E. and Ruiz-Madrid M.N. (2006). *Pedagogical reflections on learning languages in instructed settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Westberg, J. and Hilliard, J. 2001. *Fostering reflection and providing feedback: Helping others learn from experience*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Yoshida, R. (2009). *Learners in Japanese language classrooms: Overt and covert participation.* London/New York: Continuum.

YoyngHee, Sheen (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. SAGE, *Language Teaching Research*. 8(3), 263-300.

Opettajan antama suullinen palaute englannin kielen oppitunneilla lukiossa

Tutkimuksen tekijä: Noora Pirhonen (noora.p.pirhonen@jyu.fi).

Tällä kyselyllä halutaan selvittää, *millaista suullista palautetta oppilaat saavat englannin kielen tunneilla lukiossa, sekä mitä oppilaat itse ajattelevat suullisesta palautteesta*. Kysely muodostaa tutkimusaineiston Jyväskylän yliopistossa tehtävälle tutkimukselle. *Kysymyksiin ei ole olemassa oikeita tai vääriä vastauksia*. Kysely on nimetön ja ehdottoman luottamuksellinen.

Kysely koostuu väittämistä, sekä muutamasta avoimesta kysymyksestä. Vastaa kysymyksiin miettien kokemuksiasi nimenomaan LUKION englannin kielen tunneilla. Ruksaa väittämiin parhaiten sopiva vaihtoehto, ja vastaa avoimiin kysymyksiin lyhyesti.

OSA 1: PALAUTE OSANA ENGLANNIN KIELEN OPETUSTA LUKIOSSA

Ruksaa sopivin vaihtoehto.

	Täysin samaa mieltä	Melko samaa mieltä	En samaa enkä eri mieltä	Hieman eri mieltä	Täysin eri mieltä
Palautteen saaminen on minulle tärkeää.					
Suullinen palaute on hyödyllisempää kuin kirjallinen palaute.					
Saan mieluummin kirjallista palautetta kuin suullista palautetta.					
Muilta oppilailta saatu suullinen palaute on hyödyllistä.					
Kirjallinen palaute muilta oppilailta on hyödyllistä.					
Palaute muilta oppilailta auttaa oppimistani.					
Saan korjaavaa palautetta (=opettaja osoittaa jollain tavalla, että olen tehnyt virheen) suullisesti enemmän kuin kirjallisesti.					
Saan korjaavaa palautetta useimmiten kirjallisesti.					

OSA 2: MILLOIN JA MITEN SUULLISTA PALAUTETTA ANNETAAN?

Olen saanut suullista palautetta englannin kielestä opettajalta:

	Usein	Melko usein	Joskus	Melko harvoin	En koskaan
Luokkahuoneessa					
Luokkahuoneen ulkopuolella					
Välitunnilla					
Kouluajan ulkopuolella					

Opettaja antaa suullista palautetta englannin kielestä luokassa:

	Usein	Melko usein	Joskus	Melko harvoin	Ei koskaan
Spontaanisti					
Ennalta sovitusti					
Luokassa kiertäen					
Työpöydän ääressä yksittäisille oppilaille					
Koko luokalle kerralla					
Tunnin alussa					
Tunnin aikana					
Tunnin lopussa					
Minulle henkilökohtaisesti					
Ryhmälle oppilaita (ei koko luokalle)					
Koko luokalle					

Olen saanut suullista palautetta englannin kielestä seuraavista aiheista:

	Usein	Melko usein	Joskus	Melko harvoin	En koskaan
Kotitehtävät					
Kielioppi					
Sanasto					
Puhuminen ja ääntäminen					
Kirjoittaminen					
Kuunteleminen					
Kokeet					
Muu: mikä?					

Opettajan antama suullinen palaute englannin kielestä:

	Usein	Melko usein	Joskus	Melko harvoin	Ei koskaan
On selkeää					
On vaikea ymmärtää					
Tukee oppimistani					
On oikea-aikaista (= saan palautetta silloin, kun tarvitsen)					
Liittyy henkilökohtaisiin ominaisuuksiini					
Liittyy tehtävään					
Annetaan tehtävän teon aikana					
Annetaan tehtävän teon jälkeen					
Annetaan kaikille tasapuolisesti					
Annetaan niin, että toiset saavat enemmän palautetta kuin toiset					

OSA 3: MILLAINEN SUULLINEN PALAUTE ENGLANNIN KIELEN TUNNEILLA LUKIOSSA ON SINUSTA HYÖDYLLISTÄ?

Vastaa seuraaviin väittämiin.

	Täysin samaa mieltä	Melko samaa mieltä	En samaa enkä eri mieltä	Hieman eri mieltä	Täysin eri mieltä
Olen valmis käyttämään osan välitunnista tai vapaa-ajastani suullisen palautteen saamiseen.					
Haluan saada suullisen palautteen tunnin aikana.					
Negatiivinen suullinen palaute loukkaa minua.					
En koe suullista palautetta hyödylliseksi.					
En halua saada suullista palautetta muiden kuullen.					
Koen painetta suoriutua hyvin saamani suullisen palautteen perusteella.					
Saamani suullinen palaute ahdistaa minua.					
Mahdolliset virheet on helppo korjata suullisen palautteen jälkeen.					

	Täysin samaa mieltä	Melko samaa mieltä	En samaa enkä eri mieltä	Hieman eri mieltä	Täysin eri mieltä
Suullinen palaute ei auta minua oppimaan.					
Suullinen palaute on lahja opettajalta.					
Haluan saada enemmän suullista palautetta.					
Palautteen tulisi keskittyä virheisiin.					
Koko ryhmälle annettu suullinen palaute on hyödyllistä.					
Haluan saada henkilökohtaista palautetta.					

Haluan saada suullista palautetta englannin kielestä:

	Täysin samaa mieltä	Melko samaa mieltä	En samaa enkä eri mieltä	Hieman eri mieltä	Täysin eri mieltä
Kirjoitustehtävistä					
Sanastosta					
Puhe- ja ääntämistehtävistä					
Kieliopista					
Kuuntelusta					
Kokeesta					
Muusta, mistä?					

Hyvä suullinen palaute englannin kielestä:

	Täysin samaa mieltä	Melko samaa mieltä	En samaa enkä eri mieltä	Hieman eri mieltä	Täysin eri mieltä
Keskittyy yhteen asiaan					
Keskittyy moneen asiaan					
On positiivista					
On negatiivista					
On sekä positiivista että negatiivista					
Kertoo, missä tein virheen					
Auttaa päättelemään oikean vastauksen					
Auttaa kehittymään					
Herättää ajatuksia					
On lyhyttä					
Voi viedä aikaa					
On selkeää					
Motivoi					

Haluan suullista palautetta/ en halua suullista palautetta (ympyröi toinen), koska:

Muita mietteitä suulliseen palautteeseen liittyen?

Sukupuoli: Mies □ Nainen □   En halua kertoa □

Ikä: 15-16 □   17-18 □   19 tai enemmän □

Teen kaksoistutkintoa   □

Kuinka monetta vuotta opiskelet lukiossa (ympyröi):

1.   2.   3.   4.   5.

Kiitos vastauksista!

.