University of Pardubice

Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Feedback in English Language Teaching

Nicole Přindová

Bachelor's Thesis

2022

Univerzita Pardubice

Fakulta filozofická
Akademický rok: 2019/2020

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

(projektu, uměleckého díla, uměleckého výkonu)

Jméno a příjmení: **Nicole Přindová**
Osobní číslo: **H18096**
Studijní program: **B7507 Specializace v pedagogice**
Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk – specializace v pedagogice**
Téma práce: **Zpětná vazba ve výuce anglického jazyka**
Zadávající katedra: **Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Zásady pro vypracování

Cílem této práce je zjistit, prostřednictvím jakých technik lze realizovat poskytování zpětné vazby ve výuce anglického jazyka na 2. stupni vzdělávání.

V teoretické části práce bude bakalantka definovat zpětnou vazbu a techniky formativního hodnocení ve vztahu k procesům osvojování anglického jazyka, zejména možnosti zprostředkování zpětné vazby v rámci rozvoje komunikačních jazykových kompetencí. V praktické části práce pak bude zjišťovat především prostřednictvím pozorování, jakým způsobem učitelé anglického jazyka poskytují žákům zpětnou vazbu, zda a jaké techniky formativního hodnocení používají a jakých aspektů komunikační kompetence se tato zpětná vazba a formativní hodnocení týká.

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:
Rozsah grafických prací:
Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**
Jazyk zpracování: **Angličtina**

Seznam doporučené literatury:

Gavora, Peter. 2005. *Učitel a žáci v komunikaci*. Brno: Paido.

Harmer, Jeremy. 2004. *How to teach writing.* Harlow: Pearson Education.

Hattie, John. 2012. *Visible learning for teachers: maximizing impact on learning*. London: Routledge.
Kelly, Gerald. 2004. *How to teach pronunciation.* Harlow: Pearson Education.

Kolář Zdeněk, Šikulová Renata. 2009. *Hodnocení žáků*. Praha: Portál.

Košťálová Hana, Miková Šárka, and Stang Jiřina. 2008. *Školní hodnocení žáků a studentů: se zaměřením na slovní hodnocení*. Praha: Portál.

Mackey, Alison. 2012. *Input, interaction, and corrective feedback in L2 learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Mareš Jiří, Křivohlavý Jaro. 1995. *Komunikace ve škole*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Nelešovská, Alena. 2002. *Pedagogická komunikace*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého.

Slavík, Jan. 1999. *Hodnocení v současné škole: východiska a nové metody pro praxi*. Praha: Portál.
Šeďová, Klára. 2009. *Co víme o výukovém dialogu?* Studia paedagogica.

Šeďová, Klára, Švaříček, Roman and Šalamounová, Zuzana. 2012. *Komunikace ve školní třídě.* Praha:

Portál.

Švaříček Roman, Šeďová Klára. 2007. *Kvalitativní výzkum v pedagogických vědách*. Praha: Portál.
Švaříček Roman, Šeďová Klára. 2010. *Zamlčené hodnocení: zpětná vazba ve výukové komunikaci na druhém stupni základní školy.* Studia paedagogica. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Thornbury, Scott. 2004. *How to teach vocabulary.* Harlow: Pearson Education.
Vybíral, Zbyněk. 2000. *Psychologie lidské komunikace*. Praha: Portál.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce:	**Mgr. Irena Reimannová, Ph.D.** Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky
Datum zadání bakalářské práce:	**30. dubna 2020**
Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce:	**31. března 2021**

doc. Mgr. Jiří Kubeš, Ph.D.	**Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D.**
děkan	vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2022

Prohlašuji:

Práci s názvem Feedback in English Language Teaching jsem vypracovala samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využila, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.

Byla jsem seznámena s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Beru na vědomí, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb., o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, a směrnicí Univerzity Pardubice č. 7/2019 Pravidla pro odevzdávání, zveřejňování a formální úpravu závěrečných prací, ve znění pozdějších dodatků, bude práce zveřejněna prostřednictvím Digitální knihovny Univerzity Pardubice.

V Pardubicích dne 25.11. 2022   Nicole Přindová

Annotation:

This thesis deals with the use of feedback techniques in English Language Teaching at the lower-secondary level of education. The theoretical part of the thesis defines what feedback is and how it may help develop learners' communicative competences. The theoretical part also defines formative assessment and techniques of providing it to learners together with corrective feedback techniques. The theoretical part serves as a basis for the practical part, which tried to find out what techniques can be used to provide learners in the lower-secondary level of education with feedback and what aspects of linguistic competences are developed while giving that feedback.

Anotace:

Tato práce se zabývá technikami poskytování zpětné vazby ve výuce anglického jazyka na druhém stupni vzdělávání. Teoretická část definuje zpětnou vazbu a to, jak může poskytování zpětné vazby pomáhat rozvíjet komunikační kompetence žáků. V teoretické části je také definováno formativní hodnocení a techniky poskytování formativního hodnocení žákům společně s technikami korektivní zpětné vazby. Teoretická část slouží jako základ k části praktické, ve které bylo zjišťováno, jaké techniky mohou být využívány k tomu, aby žákům na druhém stupni vzdělávání mohla být zprostředkována zpětná vazba a jakých aspektů komunikační kompetence jsou pomocí této zpětné vazby u žáků rozvíjeny.

Klíčová slova:

Zpětná vazba, techniky poskytování zpětné vazby, formativní hodnocení, techniky korektivní zpětné vazby, komunikační kompetence, výuka anglického jazyka

Table of Contents

List of abbreviations

BICS – Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills

CALP – Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency

ELT – English Language Teaching

ESL – English as a Second Language

SLA – Second Language Acquisition

Introduction:

Nowadays, feedback is considered a natural part of human communication, as well as of pedagogical communication (Šeďová, 2010, 66-68). As teachers, it is vital to know how to provide feedback to learners because it may strongly influence their future performances together with their self-esteem. This work, which consists of a theoretical and practical part, tries to define what feedback is, how it can be provided in English as a Second Language (ESL) together with formative assessment techniques, and how it helps develop communicative competences in the English language. For that reason, this bachelor's thesis tried to answer the following question. What techniques do teachers use to provide learners with feedback in English Language Teaching at the lower-secondary level of education? To specify it more, two extension questions were set as well. Do teachers use techniques of formative assessment? If so, what are they? And what aspects of communicative competences are included in the feedback provided?

The first chapter in the theoretical part called 'Feedback' opens with an explanation how feedback is connected to pedagogical communication (why it all starts right there), continuing with definition of feedback itself and its function. Then this work goes through negative feedback and feedback types. The second chapter tries to define what the CEFR is together with the definition of communicative competence and how it is intertwined with lesson aims and with aims of the individual activities in lessons. The theoretical part ends with the third chapter, where the concept of mistakes in ELT is explained together with corrective feedback in ELT. The attention was paid mainly to the fact how corrective feedback is connected to formative assessment and how it supports and enhances the learners' future performances. The practical part, then, represents research on techniques of formative assessment in lessons together with corrective feedback techniques and their occurrence. The main goal of this research was to find out if techniques of formative assessment occur in the lessons and if so, which exactly are used and how, and what aspects of communicative competences are covered in these techniques.

THEORETICAL PART

1 General Introduction to Feedback Issues:

To start with, according to Šeďová, feedback is something directly connected to pedagogical communication (2010, 66 – 68). To explain this claim, an explanation of what the term "pedagogical communication" is about and how it is different from the ordinary term "communication" is needed. Furthermore, communication is simply about understanding what other people say because its original meaning is "to inform" or "information exchange" (Gavora, 2007, 7). Mareš and Křivohlavý add that communication is directly connected to interpersonal relationships. Because without meeting other people, there could not be any kind of human communication (1995, 11). But the main difference between communication and pedagogical communication lies in the fact that in pedagogical communication, teachers do not only communicate with their learners (passing some information on them), but they also follow some educational goals. Moreover, through pedagogical communication, it is possible for teachers to educate their learners and form their personalities (Nelešovská, 2005, 26).

Furthermore, it should further be explained what pedagogical communication is good for and who are its members. As suggested above, pedagogical communication is useful when it comes to upbringing and education, but its other benefit is in the mediation of human relationships, mainly between a teacher and a learner. This is important to mention because a teacher and a learner are two crucial members of pedagogical communication (Nelešovská, 2005, 28). Gavora adds that whatever classroom one would be in, one would find there a teacher, usually speaking about something, and learners, listening to the teacher. These roles may be changed throughout the lesson. And during this process of pedagogical communication, the teacher and the learners form certain relationships among themselves. So he agrees that pedagogical communication is crucial for creating and developing any kind of human relationship (2007, 28). And Angeles Clements in Harmer (1991) adds that when teaching, the whole speech is about something deeper than just talking to the students. That is the reason why students all around the world still attend teachers' classes (1991, 75).

1.1 Feedback Definition:

Having spoken about feedback, it should be made clear what this term means and how it differs from another similar term - evaluation. The online source of University of Wisconsin-Madison says it is important to emphasise that there is a difference between feedback and evaluation, although, as this online source admits, these two terms might sound similar. The webpage further says that feedback is an activity where a person consciously tries to enhance one's performance and this activity should allow the learners to participate in it. Feedback should provide learners with formative information to let them thrive in their knowledge (University of Wisconsin-Madison 2022).

On the other hand, evaluation is an activity that provides learners with summative information and is perceived as a simple judgment. It means that evaluation usually does not try to change anything about one's performance. (University of Wisconsin-Madison 2022) The authors Kolář and Šikulová (2009, 11–12) add that evaluation is something which is ever-present in one's life. Because not only do people evaluate at school as teachers, but one can evaluate (make judgments about our performances) in almost every part of our lives, very often without realising it. Moreover, Slavík (1999, 22–23) describes evaluation as an activity when comparing one thing to another or when trying to distinguish what is better and what is worse. So basically, evaluation is more about making judgments rather than trying to immediately improve one's performance.

1.2 Function of Feedback:

The question remains why learners need feedback, either in verbal or non-verbal communication. The reason is described by Šeďová (1995, 121), where she says that if a teacher asks a question and learners answer correctly, it is relatively easy for the teacher to provide them with feedback because the outcome is positive. So feedback is needed to let the learners know how they get on with the tasks and how well they are doing. But an issue appears when learners' answer is wrong or when a particular learner tries to say such an answer which would amuse other classmates, for example. According to Šeďová and Švaříček (2010, 68-70), such situations, when negative feedback is required, are often unpleasant for teachers and such

moments may represent a certain block for teachers and may lead to their irritation or frustration.

1.3 Negative Feedback:

As suggested above, feedback provided to learners may be either positive or negative. In negative feedback, a teacher usually wants to let the learners know that they have made a mistake and seeks the mistake to be corrected (Šeďová, Švaříček, and Šalamounová, 1995, 112). Manuel London adds that giving negative feedback may make people (teachers included) often nervous, so it can be problematic sometimes (London, 2015, 60). But because this work focuses mainly on formative assessment together with working with the learners' mistakes, i.e. on corrective feedback techniques, only negative feedback will be briefly described in this sub-chapter. Because as Sheen says, the term "corrective feedback" covers not only terms like "error treatment" or "error correction", but it covers the term "negative feedback" as well. (Sheen, 2011, 1).

Mareš and Křivohlavý divide negative feedback into the following sections:

Negative feedback:

- Error/Slip detection: A teacher makes it clear to a learner that their answer is not correct
- Error/Slip identification: A teacher specifies the incorrect detail(s) in the learner's answer
- Error/Slip interpretation: A teacher provides the learner with an explanation of how the error occurred
- Error/Slip correction: A teacher himself says the right answer, instead of the learner (Mareš and Křivohlavý, 97-98, 1995)

As briefly mentioned above, it can be suggested that teachers might find it very difficult and unpleasant to deliver negative news about one's performance. London says that the point is not to get too depressed about it and not to be afraid that their feedback is not clear enough or too vague. The important thing here is to focus one's mind on the specificity and clarity of the feedback and make sure that people (learners) truly understood one's words (London, 2015, 60).

1.4 Feedback Types:

There are two basic feedback types – verbal and non-verbal (Open Library 2022). According to Hattie and Timperley (2007, 90), verbal feedback can be further divided into four groups as follows:

1.4.1 Verbal Feedback:

Hattie and Timperley (2007) in Šeďová (1995, 112) divide verbal feedback types as follows:

1) Task or outcome-focused feedback: This kind of feedback tries to determine if the learner's performance was wrong or right.
2) Process-focused feedback: Here, the (right) outcome is expected from learners so this kind of feedback should inform the learners if they are proceeding correctly and if not, how to modify their process to improve.
3) Self-regulation-focused feedback: Here, a teacher tries to motivate the learners to manage the task on their own and to do self-assessment.
4) Personality-focused feedback: This is the kind of feedback that tells learners information about their personalities.

Hattie and Timperley in Šeďová (1995, 113) state, according to various research, that each of the four types of feedback may vary in their effectiveness, but what they value the most of all four types is process-focused feedback. The reason is that this feedback usually promotes a deeper understanding of learners. And on the contrary, if there is a type of feedback that they like least, it is personality-focused feedback because it may be considered as that type that has directly nothing to do with a learner's performance and says very little about it. The webpage The International Educator also says that in general, if feedback comments on a task, process, or self-regulation of the learners' performance, it is usually more beneficial for learners than when the teacher simply just comments on the fact whether the learners' answer was right or wrong (The International Educator 2022).

1.4.2 Non-verbal Feedback:

Having spoken about pedagogical communication and human relationships above (how these two things are connected), another important type of feedback that may be associated with these both is non-verbal feedback as a part of non-verbal communication. It may not seem important, but through non-verbal communication can be delivered quite a big amount of information, which can also influence the relationship between a teacher and a learner. So in general, it could be suggested that through non-verbal communication can be provided feedback. Because for example, Mareš and Křivohlavý (1995, 107 – 112) say that feedback may be provided even through eye contact. The participants of pedagogical communication (a teacher and learners) usually watch one another and only one look can often say a lot about their relationship, especially when looking directly face to face. But there are more ways to deliver feedback through non-verbal communication, such as one's movements or gestures. The way a teacher's hands, legs, or head are positioned can tell learners whether the teacher's attitude towards them is friendly or if the teacher wants to express disagreement, for instance. Furthermore, Nelešovská (2005, 46) adds that not only eyes but also facial expressions in a teacher's face can provide various amounts of emotions, through which can be delivered feedback to learners. She claims that thanks to facial expressions, learners can easily recognise if the teacher is upset, happy, sad, surprised, or satisfied, for example. So as suggested above, feedback can be delivered not only verbally, but even without words.

2   The CEFR and Educational Goals:

To follow the aim of the work and state which communicative competences are covered in the feedback provided in the practical part of this thesis, it is crucial to explain what communicative competences are. The CEFR can help with this as it describes them in detail, even though it is not the only document that defines communicative competence. Some other authors will be mentioned as well to compare their views with this document.

To be able to focus on communicative competences as a specific part of the CEFR, an explanation of what the CEFR deals with in general will firstly be provided.

2.1   Purpose of The CEFR:

The CEFR is a tool through which the language curriculum can be created together with curriculum guidelines, language books, syllabuses for exams, planning of language learning programs, etc. in Europe. Its aim is to support and simplify the cooperation among all organisations that devote themselves to education and to unify the educational programs for all people who are connected to the educational system. The CEFR also contains a description of what language learners should learn to be able to communicate in a foreign language and it defines the language levels and divides them into six categories, as follows: A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2. Furthermore, the A categories are referred to as "Basic users", the B categories are called "Independent users" and the last C levels are considered "Proficient users". As partly mentioned above, this division should contribute to a better orientation of the language level between the particular speakers. (Council of Europe, 2001, 1 – 6).

2.2   Definition of Communicative Competence:

As Dell Hymes says, communicative competence is our ability to transform information and pass them on to other people (Hymes 1983, 9). In fact, he was the first one to use this term and reacted to the statement of Noam Chomsky (1965), when he said that Chomsky's explanation of communicative competence was not detailed enough (Brown, 2000, 246). Hymes' claim was later supported by Savignon (1983) when he said that communicative competence is dependent on people's interaction and that it is variable, it does not stay the same. For that reason, such an interaction is not only about one person, but, on the contrary, it needs at least two people who participate in the communication process to be considered effective (Savignon in Brown, 2000, 246).

Hymes (1967) and Paulston (1974) conducted research where they pointed out a difference between linguistic and communicative competence. The purpose of this research was to emphasise the distinction between "knowledge *about* the language" and such knowledge that "enables a person to communicate functionally and interactively" (Brown, 2000, 246). A similar distinction was made by James Cummins (1979, 1980) between "cognitive/academic language proficiency" (CALP) and "basic interpersonal communicative skills" (BICS). "CALP" is about the aspect of a language that focuses on form in classes (linguistic

competence). Whereas "BICS" deals with a language from its very beginning, e.g. what children need to be able to communicate (communicative competence) (Communis in Brown, 2000, 246).

2.3 Communicative Competence and its Division:

The CEFR distinguishes two main groups of competences: General Competences and Communicative Language Competences (2001, 101 – 108).

They are further divided into subgroups as follows:

1) General competences:

- Declarative knowledge
- Skills and know-how
- Existential competence
- Ability to learn (Council of Europe, 2001, 101 – 108)

2) Communicative language competences:

- Linguistic competence
- Sociolinguistic competence
- Pragmatic competence (Council of Europe, 2001, 108 – 130)

But as The CEFR says, these three communicative language competences are always dependent on one another and they cannot be separated. For a better understanding of why they cannot stand individually, a descriptor of what each communicative language competence contains is provided below:

- **Linguistic competence:** General linguistic range, vocabulary range, vocabulary control, grammatical accuracy, phonological control, and orthographic control
- **Sociolinguistic competence:** Sociolinguistic appropriateness
- **Pragmatic competence:** Flexibility, turn-taking, thematic development, coherence, and cohesion, spoken fluency, and propositional precision (Council of Europe, 2001: 108 – 130)

2.4 Definition of Linguistic Competence:

As mentioned earlier, this thesis deals mainly with spoken English, especially with accuracy and fluency. As already stated, accuracy includes mainly aspects like vocabulary range, grammar, or pronunciation, e.g. linguistic competences. For that reason, mainly linguistic competences will be defined in this sub-chapter.

According to The CEFR, the following linguistic competences are divided and defined as follows:

- Lexical competence: The knowledge of using vocabulary in terms of both lexical and grammatical elements. Lexical elements include fixed phrases, phrasal idioms, phrasal verbs, sentential formulae (e.g. greetings or proverbs), single-word forms, collocations, and more. Grammatical elements include articles, quantifiers, pronouns, auxiliary verbs, conjunctions, particles, etc. (Council of Europe, 2001, 111).

- Grammatical competence: It could be defined as the ability not only to use but also to understand and express the grammatical aspects of a language. It covers "recognising and producing well-formed phrases and sentences in accordance with these principles" (Council of Europe, 2001, 112 – 113). Morphology (the science of word formation) and Syntax (the science of word order in a sentence) are covered here, together with sub-classes as elements, categories, classes, structures, processes, and relations. For more detailed information, see the CEFR, 2001, pages 113 – 114 (Council of Europe, 2001, 113 – 114).

- Semantic competence: It deals with the organisation of meaning and the learners' understanding of it, their awareness, and control. It covers "relation of word to general context (reference, connotation, exponence of general specific notions)", and "interlexical relations (synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, part-whole relations)" and more (Council of Europe, 2001, 115).

- Phonological competence: The knowledge, skill, and perception of the sound units (phonemes), allophones, the phonetic features which distinguish phonemes (voicing, rounding..), the phonetic composition of words (syllable structure, the sequence

of phonemes, word stress, word tones), sentence phonetics, and phonetic reduction. Again, for more information, see the CEFR, 2001, pages 116 – 117 (Council of Europe, 2001, 116 – 117).

- Orthographic competence: It involves "the knowledge and skill in the perception and production of the symbols of which written texts are composed" (Council of Europe, 2001, 117). It covers: "the form of letters in printed and cursive forms in both upper and lower case, the proper spelling of words, including recognised contracted forms, punctuation marks and their conventions of use, typographical conventions and varieties of font, etc., logographic signs in common use (e.g. @, &, $, etc.)" (Council of Europe, 2001, 117).

- Orthoepic competence: This competence deals mainly with the correct pronunciation when reading a prepared text or reading and correctly pronouncing such words that the learners first saw only in their written form. This further involves: "the knowledge of spelling conventions, the ability to consult a dictionary and knowledge of the patterns used there for the representation of pronunciation, the knowledge of the implications of written forms, particularly punctuation marks, for phrasing and intonation, the ability to resolve ambiguity (homonyms, syntactic ambiguities, etc.) in the light of the context" (Council of Europe, 2001, 117 – 118).

2.5 Communicative Competences in Alignment with Aims:

For this thesis, mainly lesson and activity aims in alignment with communicative competences will be discussed. Because to determine if the activity aims at the accuracy of the language and thus on linguistic competences (see chapter 3.2), then it is crucial to know the aim of the lesson itself (Scrivener, 1994, 299). To illustrate an example of such an aim, one of Harmer's aims will be shown. If the aim is stated like this: "To enable students to talk about what people have done wrong in the past, using the should (not) have + done construction" (Harmer, 1991, 371), then, according to The CEFR (see the detailed description above), it is possible to determine which communicative competences are covered there. In this case, they are most likely phonological competence because of the word "talk" and grammatical competence according to the phrase should (not) have + done (Council of Europe, 2001, 111 – 118).

In fact, the more precise the aim is, the more effective the activities would be. It is therefore important for teachers, before going to the class, to think of what exactly the learners would learn from that lesson and the activities and what the teacher himself wants to achieve (Scrivener, 1994, 109). These smaller aims are dependent on the general educational goals. Only if the goals are known can one move to the smaller aims (Starý et al., 2016, 40). Therefore, in this sub-chapter, two documents that can help with stating the educational goals and how they should be formulated will be mentioned.

2.5.1 The Bloom's Taxonomy:

When it comes to educational goals in ELT, the Bloom's Taxonomy is one of the best-known tools. The first variation of Bloom's Taxonomy is said to have been created in the year 1956 in New York and the authors were Benjamin S. Bloom with his colleagues. Aims in Bloom's Taxonomy are organized into the following hierarchical categories, according to the complexity of cognitive processes: *Remember, Understand, Apply, Analyse, Evaluate, and Create* (Krathwohl and Anderson, 2001, 5). The University of Central Florida says that these cognitive processes are displayed in a table and are lined up from lower-thinking to higher-order thinking. If a teacher starts with lower-level cognitive skills, then it would lead his learners to higher-order thought. This is something that every teacher should see as his goal when using Bloom's Taxonomy (University of Central Florida 2022). To complete the information about Bloom's Taxonomy, it should be explained that originally, it focused only on the knowledge domain (University of Central Florida 2022) But later, it was extended, and nowadays, four different knowledge types are distinguished in the Taxonomy, according to Krathwohl and Anderson: *Factual, Conceptual, Procedural* and *Metacognitive* (Krathwohl and Anderson, 2001, 5).

2.5.2 Educational Goals in RVP:

Educational goals basically describe what the learners are supposed to learn. In "Rámcový vzdělávací plán pro základní vzdělávání" (RVP – ZV), there is, except for other subjects and their educational goals, a detailed description of the language goals at the primary and lower-secondary level of education. All the areas (speaking, writing, listening, and reading) of the first foreign language (it is usually English because English is a mandatory subject from the 3rd grade of primary school in the Czech Republic) are taken into consideration there (RVP – ZV, 2021, 25-28). And if the attention is moved away from such goals that are the most

general, one can get to smaller, more concrete aims of thematic units, then from thematic units to concrete aims of individual lessons, and lastly, from lessons to every single activity, which has its own aim as well (Starý et al., 2016, 40).

As suggested above, every lesson or activity aim should be concentrated on a learner. Firstly because the class profile is important – it informs the teachers about the learners, their abilities, and what they can or cannot do (Harmer, 1991, 371). But if teachers only express the theme of the lesson, it is still far away from the right formulation of the aim. Therefore, both lesson and activity aims should always describe what the learner will be able to do at the end of the lesson or activity. To provide an example sentence, the aims should be written as follows: "At the end of the lesson/activity, the learner will be able to.." (+description of the particular activity). That indicates that each aim should be described in such a way that it would be possible to find out if it was achieved or not (Starý et al., 2016, 40 – 41).

3   Corrective Feedback in Relation to Formative Assessment:

Techniques of corrective feedback may be considered a part of formative assessment. The reason is the aim of the individual activities. Any kind of feedback that tries to enhance a learner's future performance might be considered a part of formative assessment and corrective feedback tries to do that as well. Both formative assessment and corrective feedback try to stick to the aim of the activities and lead the learners to the correct answers (ResearchGate 2022). That is the reason why corrective feedback techniques are covered in this thesis as well because it does belong to formative assessment and feedback techniques, too.

3.1   Definition of Formative Assessment:

To make clear what formative assessment is, closer attention should be paid to the term itself. The adjective "formative" is based on the word "form" or "to form", which, in the field of education, is mainly related to the child's personality. It is a long-term process of human development, whether in the field of self-knowledge or behaviour (Starý et al., 2016, 11). Furthermore, formative assessment is based on providing learners with such feedback that enables them to improve their performance effectively. Because this form of assessment is usually concentrated on finding mistakes and shortcomings in one's performance and provides the learners with a piece of advice on how to get better in the future (Kolář and Šikulová, 2009, 33). And as Brown agrees, formative assessment is even a piece of advice of a teacher towards

a learner and it should support the learners in their process of knowledge development (2004, 6). Sadly, the research shows that nowadays, formative assessment is still not so common at schools and it would take a great deal of time and courage for teachers to implement this kind of assessment into the common practice (Brown, 2004, 2 – 3). Starý et. al. say that it might sound relatively easy but applying formative assessment into the common practice is rather difficult. And it could be suggested that even nowadays, effective feedback, and so effective formative assessment, is still rather rare in education (Starý et al., 2016, 12).

The reason might be that there are several aspects of the teacher's behaviour that this term covers and it may often be difficult to manage to cover all of them in lessons. William and Leahy describe what these aspects are. It covers such teachers' behaviour as that the aim of the lesson is stated at the beginning of the class, the criteria for tasks are explained and learners can also participate in creating the criteria, the teacher sticks to the criteria and assesses accordingly, the learners are provided with comments on their strengths and weaknesses, they are asked to do self-assessment or give peer-feedback. (William and Leahy, 2015, 3 – 4). Starý et. al. continues to explain that a successful formative assessment may be best recognized in such a situation when the learners truly understand what the teacher told them. Because only then can they use the teacher's information to their future progress (Starý et al., 2016, 20).

3.2 Feedback on Oral Work in ELT:

Having spoken about formative assessment and how it can influence the learners' knowledge development, more attention should be paid to feedback that deals specifically with oral work in ELT. It should be clarified that this theoretical part deals mainly with formative assessment and feedback in spoken English. The reason is that the following research is focused mainly on spoken English in lessons as well. And because both assessment and correction are a part of feedback (Harmer, 1991, 142), they are intertwined in this thesis.

A careful distinction needs to be made between accuracy and fluency when providing learners with feedback on oral work (Edge, 1989, 23). Teachers need to decide whether they want their learners to speak accurately (in terms of grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary) or if they want the learners' language to be as flowing as possible. (Harmer, 1991, 142).

- Feedback on Accuracy: This kind of correction includes two phases. The first is to show that a mistake has occurred. The second is to help the learners correct it, if necessary.

This kind of feedback mostly aims at developing linguistic competences as it works either with grammatical, pronunciation, or vocabulary mistakes (Harmer, 1991, 144 – 145).

- Feedback on Fluency: When giving feedback on fluency in spoken language, the teachers should bear in mind that content should be commented on first, and only then could they comment on some language mistakes. It is because the learners should not be discouraged from speaking, which might happen if teachers commented exclusively on language mistakes. (Harmer, 1991, 145).

It may be also stated that when a learner is speaking, the teacher's response to their performance may strongly influence them, both in the particular moment when speaking but also in their future performances. Such influence may be either positive or negative, it depends on the way the feedback is mediated (Harmer, 1991, 145). That is why it is important for teachers to proceed cautiously when giving oral feedback to individuals, but there are also some benefits to individual feedback, too. For instance, one of them might be that such feedback can be adapted to each individual learner, considering their specific abilities. Therefore, the information contained in that kind of feedback would be highly enriching and useful for each learner (Brookhart, 2008, 48). But Scrivener also adds that there are activities where the teacher covers both accuracy and fluency relatively equally, but in many more activities one outbalances the other. For that reason, it is crucial that the teacher is clear enough about what he is aiming for in the activities chosen, otherwise, the feedback provided might be on something else than previously intended (Harmer, 1991, 160).

3.3 The Concept of a Mistake in ELT:

Having spoken about various feedback types/techniques together with how they affect working with a learner's mistake, it should be also stated what a mistake is. For this work, especially what is a mistake in ELT classes.

To start with, in the second half of the 20th century, a strong belief was put in such learning where students were given a chance to practice correct reactions to questions. If their reaction was not correct, then corrective feedback was provided. But at that time, the focus was merely on error prevention than error treatment. In the last 20 years, though, the role of error treatment

has become more significant in SLA. Some experts have concentrated their minds on the process of how the human brain works when learning new stuff. They have started to see a learner as "an essentially autonomous individual". The reason is that despite the social environment, the one who decides how the learning/acquisition process will eventually look is always the learner himself (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012, 4).

To specify mistakes more and state who can correct them, Julian Edge says that mistakes may be divided into three basic categories:

- Slips: A learner's mistake, which can be corrected, if the teacher points it out.
- Errors: Mistakes that learners are not capable to correct, even if they are pointed out to them. So such mistakes need a further explanation.
- Attempts: They occur when learners try to say something without knowing how to do it yet (Edge, 1989, 9 – 10).

When working with the mistakes mentioned above, they can be corrected by both teachers and learners. And if learners are supposed to correct themselves, it can be either in a form of self-correction or peer-correction (Edge, 1989, 23 – 24).

3.3.1 Self-Correction:

This is considered the best of all correction techniques. It is because if one can correct himself, there is a bigger chance that this person will remember the correct form. So in these cases, the teacher should give the learner enough space to correct himself instead of saying the correct answer instead of the learner. Because, as already indicated above, if the learner can correct himself, without the help of others, just a slip has occurred. (Edge, 1989, 24).

3.3.2 Self-Assessment:

A step further from self-correction might be self-assessment. What these two techniques have in common is that they both are about the autonomy of an individual, leaving the teacher slightly in the background. But not completely as the teacher takes the role of 'an organizer' in such situations and their task is to help the learners understand their own cognitive learning processes. But this process also depends on the individual abilities of individual learners. The point of self-assessment is that schools should support learners in it in order to make them ready for making decisions in real life. Because by supporting learners' autonomy in self-

assessment, a teacher may enhance their self-esteem, psychological resilience, and mainly responsibility for their own actions (Slavík, 1999, 28). In ELT lessons, there are several ways a teacher can get students to self-assessment. One of the best ways is to ask the learners at the end of a coursebook unit to say what they now can do. Because then, the learners think of each skill separately and should be able to determine what they are capable of. Unlike self-correction, where the learners correct themselves, but do not assess their own performance (Harmer, 1991, 140).

3.3.3 Peer Correction and Peer Feedback:

When peer-correction is needed, an error must have occurred, unlike in self-correction. Because if the learner cannot correct himself, the teacher usually asks the rest of the class to do so. Such a technique gives the teacher valuable information about his learners – Are they capable to recognize when an error occurs and are they capable to correct it? Another advantage may be that this technique also can make the learners rely more on themselves rather than just on the teacher and thus improve their cooperative skills when working in groups (Edge, 1989, 26), as when they provide peer feedback. Penny Ur continues to explain this benefit when peer feedback is applied. Because in such cases, learners need to cooperate and learn how to get on with other people with different opinions. On the other hand, it might be suggested that when it comes to group work where is a higher number of students discussing the task and then providing feedback to one another, it may be more difficult to organize for the teacher because it often involves increased movement of learners and sometimes it is necessary to move even their chairs and desks. One of the biggest traps for a teacher is to apply group work with an undisciplined class as it may be very difficult for a teacher to handle it. It is even louder during group work then when pair work is applied. Because pair work, on the contrary, is easier for organization as learners usually sit in pairs by their desks and simply share their feedback. So it is not necessary to move them anywhere, they can just turn around and talk to their partner. It is therefore more appropriate for less difficult tasks, like sharing and discussing answers from their textbooks, for instance (2012, 233).

3.3.4 Teacher's Correction:

This technique may come in handy in such situations when an error occurs and neither the learner who said it nor the rest of the class is capable to recognize and correct it. But that

still does not mean that the teacher should say the correct answer instead of the learners. The point is that the more the learners are involved in the correction process, the more they need to think about the language and potentially come up with the right form (Edge, 1989, 27). That is why teachers have come up with such correction techniques that do not provide the learners with the right answer straight away but give the learners an opportunity to come up with it themselves (Scrivener, 1994, 298).

3.4 Why Learners Should Be Involved into the Feedback Process:

The reason why learners themselves started to be engaged in the process of error correction and feedback giving is because feedback from teachers might not be accepted well by all learners. Whereas peer feedback is much more comprehensible to learners because it comes directly from them. Therefore it is more likely to increase their zeal and attentiveness, so it is believed that peer feedback is more powerful in many ways than feedback coming from teachers (Brookhart, 2008, 60). On the other hand, it is also vital for every class/lesson to find a balance between how much the teachers lead the lessons and how much learners are allowed to contribute to this process (Weimer, 2002, 21 – 23). It is important to make clear that it is not about making a learner the only one who would provide feedback to their peers and assess them. That would not be possible and may lead to decreased quality of the teaching and learning process. On the other hand, neither the teacher should be the only one who assesses and provide feedback, leaving the learners behind. The point is to compromise the role of a teacher and a learner in the feedback and assessment process. In fact, peer feedback is one of the crucial parts of the teaching and learning process, accompanying the teachers' feedback and assessment and it is also a part of educational goals. Therefore, schools ought to teach learners how to provide peer feedback but also self-assessment. For teachers, that means accepting the fact that learners are, together with them, a part of the feedback process and formative assessment (Kolář and Šikulová, 2009, 137 – 198).

3.5   Corrective Feedback in ELT:

Corrective feedback is a teacher's tool through which they can determine learners' mistakes and help them correct them if needed (Brookhart, 2008, 4). Ur says that corrective feedback is considered a natural part of the teaching and learning process (2012, 88). It is mostly about such a reaction of a teacher that clearly indicates that a mistake has occurred and seeks the mistake to be corrected (Sheen, 2011, 1). There are some advantages and disadvantages to this kind of feedback and as Ur says, this topic has been controversial for a long period of time (2012, 88).

3.5.1 Disadvantages of Corrective Feedback:

Opponents of corrective feedback, among them Krashen (1981) or Truscott (1999), for instance, claimed that error correction causes only stress to learners and is harmful and that it slows down the learning process (Truscott in Rezaei, 2011, 13). Krashen also believed that corrective feedback is not good for learners as it might cause trouble to the learners when trying to communicate in a foreign language (Krashen and Truscott in Rezaei, 2011, 13).

The other disadvantage might be the fact that this process is often kind of slow and requires time to produce results. There may be several reasons why this happens. As Ur suggests, it can be because the learners who are already fluent in their mother tongue might have got used to a wrong word form in the other language because they have mixed up these two languages and do not know how to change it. Therefore, the correction does not usually bring immediate results, but it takes time for the learners to realise and change their habits (Ur, 2012, 89). Edge agrees with this suggestion, that learners are often influenced by their first language in SLA and thus it complicates their learning. The other possible causes of mistakes in SLA he sees in not knowing enough about the grammatical rules and so repeating the same mistakes. Or it might the case that the learner uses a wrong form even though he/she knows it is not correct but it is still the only possible way to express their thoughts. Or mistakes can occur just because the learner is in a hurry and does not have enough time to think carefully about what they are going to say. In all these cases, it is time for corrective feedback to let the learners know it is not correct and that the right form is needed. But the general disadvantage of corrective feedback, apart from that the whole process is rather slow, is that teachers can think of many

various causes of such mistakes, but when it comes to identifying what really causes the particular mistake, it is hardly possible to be 100% sure about it. Therefore, it is often difficult to choose an adequate technique of corrective feedback (1989, 7 – 8).

3.5.2 Advantages of Corrective Feedback:

Even though there are some disadvantages of corrective feedback that should be taken into consideration, many people advocate this kind of feedback (Ur, 2012, 88). Those who agreed with error correction are Lee (1990), and Bailey and Celce-Murcia (1979), for example. They proposed the opinion that corrective feedback is crucial for learners to make progress in SLA (Lee (1990), and Bailey and Celce-Murcia (1979) in Rezaei, 2011, 13). According to Penny Ur, when it comes to ELT, corrective feedback is vital because it can prevent the learners from getting used to the wrong forms of words and language in general when both speaking and writing (2012, 89). Moreover, Sheen says that there is certain research that proved that learners want to be corrected to be able to avoid the error next time (Sheen, 2011, 39). Similar research was done by Penny Ur who found out that students prefer the teacher to tell them what the correct answer is to find it out themselves, especially during oral work (2012, 88).

According to the authors above, especially Penny Ur, corrective feedback is strongly believed to be effective nowadays. And even though the disadvantages are taken into consideration (that this process is slower and it might be often difficult to identify the exact causes of the mistakes), corrective feedback is still considered to be desirable by both teachers and students (2012, 88). Edge continues to explain that the whole process of correction should be perceived positively. It is because the learners' mistakes should be seen as "learning steps" instead of seeing them as something negative that should be eliminated. He says that correction only helps the learners and leads them to the correct answers so it tries to enhance the learners' future performances (1989, 17).

3.6 Corrective Feedback Techniques:

For those who want to apply corrective feedback in classes, there are several techniques that can be used. According to Penny Ur, they are divided into the following classes:

1. Recast: The correct answer is directly delivered to the learner, without any explanation.

An example:

Student: I reading a book.

Teacher: I *am* reading a book. (Ur, 2012, 95)

2. Elicitation: If the teacher thinks that the learner is capable to come up with the right answer himself, he tries to encourage him to do so.

An example:

Student: I reading a book.

Teacher: Can you correct that?

Student: I am reading a book. (Ur, 2012, 95)

3. Clarification request: The teacher wants the learner to clarify his answer.

An example:

Student: I reading a book.

Teacher: I didn't understand, can you tell me more clearly? (Ur, 2012, 95)

4. Metalinguistic feedback: The right answer is indicated in explaining the grammatical rules that are needed.

An example:

Student: I reading a book.

Teacher: In the present continuous you need the verb 'be' before the - ing form of the verb.. (Ur, 2012, 95)

5. Explicit correction. Similarly to recast, in this technique, the teacher also immediately says a mistake has occurred together with the right answer.

An example:

Student: I reading a book.

Teacher: No, that is incorrect. You should have said.. (Ur, 2012, 95)

6. Repetition. The wrong answer is repeated, with a doubtful look and question to indicate that a mistake has occurred.

An example:

Student: I reading a book.

Teacher: I reading a book?? (Ur, 2012, 95)

3.7 A Comparison of Effectiveness of the Individual Corrective Feedback Techniques:

Recast is one of the most used techniques, but also one of the least effective regarding the student's progress. Teachers use it because it takes minimum time and does not interrupt the learners too much when speaking. But the problem is that the learners often do not notice that the teacher has just corrected them and sometimes might even simply think that the teacher just confirmed their answer (Ur, 2012, 95). Whereas either elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, repetition, or even clarification request, where learners are asked to think again about what they have just said and think of the correct answer, are much more appropriate to use than recast (Lyster 2004 in Ur, 2012, 95 – 96).

3.8 When to Use Corrective Feedback?

It may be suggested that the teachers' tolerance for language and grammar errors might be higher when the learner is speaking than in any other activities, like written tasks or similar. But the question is still when to correct. Teachers should think carefully about what they intend to correct and if the learners would understand. Otherwise, it might slow down the learning process and do more harm than good (Scrivener, 1994, 299). Teachers can choose, however, if they interrupt the learners when speaking and correct their errors or if they do it at the end of the speech. The situation when the teacher intervenes in the learners is called 'Gentle

correction'. The teacher's intervention may come in handy when the learner suddenly stops talking, not knowing what else to say. Or another similar situation might be when the learner does not know at all what to say, so the teacher may just try to help by suggesting the right words/word forms (Harmer, 1991, 145 – 146).

Other ways of giving individual feedback may be rather informally when a teacher asks a student to come to their desk and talk to them there, it can be provided also quietly, when a teacher comes to a learner's desk and whispers it while the rest of class is busy or it can be done even separately, after school in a scheduled time (Brookhart, 2008, 48).

When it comes to correcting a learner's performance when they finish talking, there are two methods how to do it, according to Harmer:

- **Recording mistakes**: It is quite usual that teachers watch the students carefully and listen to them before giving their feedback. The issue might be that the teacher forgets what was said. Therefore, some teachers may prefer to make notes during a learner's speech or even use charts or tables to mark the errors (Harmer, 1991, 147).

- **After the event**: Another possibility, when a teacher wants to give feedback at the end of learners' performance, is to discuss it with the whole class. However, it needs to be done gently, otherwise, particular learners may feel embarrassed in front of their all classmates. But what teachers can do is mark the mistakes that they have heard more than once and then write them on the board, for example. Then have the learners correct it (Harmer, 1991, 147).

3.9 Corrective Feedback in Alignment with Aims:

One of the most important things when using corrective feedback is the goal/aim. Because, as mentioned above, the purpose of error correction is to make sure that errors in SLA do not become a habit. So when teachers use corrective feedback techniques, they try to let the learners know that an error has occurred and what the right form would be so that the learner will not make the same error next time. This process focuses more on thinking about how the language works (accuracy) than on using it only/just as a communicative tool (fluency) (Ur, 2012, 89). And as Scrivener adds, it is vital to also realise the aim of the activity, where corrective feedback is intended to use. Because if accuracy is taken into account in that activity, then corrective

feedback is appropriate. But if fluency is the main focus of such an activity, then corrective feedback would only complicate the whole process of teaching and learning (Scrivener, 1994, 299).

PRACTICAL PART:

4 Research:

In the practical part of this thesis, the research is introduced together with the procedure, background information, and data analysis. Firstly, the term "pedagogical communication" was described in the text, as it is vital for the teaching and learning process and also for providing feedback to learners. It was followed by the explanation of formative assessment and its techniques, and corrective feedback techniques together with the work with a learner error as a part of formative assessment. So these two aspects are intertwined in the research. Therefore, the research focused on the way feedback is provided to learners at the lower secondary school by the teachers chosen. The focus was also placed on the fact whether there are any techniques of formative assessment used by the teachers, and if so, what aspects of communicative competence are covered in that feedback.

4.1 Research Aim:

The overall aim of this research was to find out how teachers provide their learners with feedback, what techniques of formative assessment they use (if any), and what aspects of communicative competences are covered in this feedback.

Basic research questions had been stated before the research began. The questions were formulated in the following way:

Main Question:

- What techniques do teachers use to provide learners with feedback in English Language Teaching at the lower-secondary level of education?

Extension Questions:

- Do teachers use techniques of formative assessment? If so, what are they?

- What aspects of communicative competences are included in the feedback provided?

4.2   Research Methods and Tools:

The research for the practical part of this thesis might be considered empirical research falling under the quantitative research category. The empirical research is usually based on learning about pedagogical practice and uses such methods that support this recognition. (Čábalová 2011, 97). She further explains that there are many types of pedagogical research methods and the main focus is mostly on the phenomenon and processes in the area of upbringing and education. Pedagogical research also deals with the analysis of the results of pedagogical research. The first method described in her book is the observation method, divided into other sub-categories, such as direct and indirect observation together with structured and unstructured methods. (Čábalová 2011, 100 – 101). Gavora adds that the observation method is about watching people's activities, describing these activities, and their analysis and evaluation (2010, 76).

Furthermore, the quantitative research category was chosen for this research because I concentrated on the amount and number of individual feedback techniques, specifically on techniques of formative assessment (if there are any). And as Čábalová says, the quantitative research method deals with numerical data. It reconnoitres the quantity, extent, and frequency of the phenomenon (2011, 97 – 98).

For this research, the observation method was chosen as the most suitable method, specifically the direct structured observation method. As a result, three types of observation sheets were created in order to collect the data precisely. Observation sheets are a part of observation systems. Observation systems are comprehensive tools that help the observer record the data. They consist of a detailed description of the phenomenon category, the way of their identification, recording, and evaluation. A list of a teacher or student activities is considered the basis of the observation sheet (Gavora 2010, 76 - 77).

But as Gavora further explains, for the right choice of research method, the right representative group must be chosen as well. Again, there are several possibilities for how to choose the representative group. Random choice or deliberate selection, for instance (Gavora 2010, 58-69). For this kind of research, deliberate selection was chosen as the most appropriate possibility. The reason was the aim of this research - the lower secondary school was chosen

because feedback provided at this level of education may be more complex than at the primary level of education.

4.3 School Choice:

The research took place in September 2022. It tried to explore how teachers provide learners with feedback when teaching English in the Czech educational system and if they use any techniques of formative assessment. Four teachers were in main focus during that research, teaching children aged 12-15 years old at the lower-secondary level of education. The research was conducted at the primary school Tomáše Garrigua Masaryka.

4.4 Research Outline:

As mentioned above, the research for this thesis consists of observation of fifteen English classes at the lower-secondary school overall, together with four English teachers. Moreover, there had been two extra lessons to observe before the main research began. These two extra lessons were here to test if it would be possible to record the data as field notes. But after observing the classes, my supervisor and I agreed on creating new observation sheets to make it easier for me to record the data. Three new sheets were created then, as I needed to record the numbers of the particular feedback techniques mainly. So individual teachers' actions that might be signs of formative assessment were pre-described in order to just mark if such signs appeared in the classes or not. Then the research could begin. See the original plan of the research:

- Choice of school: June 2022
- Creating the observation sheet for field notes: 10th – 11th September 2022
- Piloting the observation sheet: 14th – 15th September 2022
- Creating the three new observation sheets: 16th – 18th September 2022
- Main research: 19th – 23rd September 2022
- Data analysis – 30th September 2022 – 2nd October 2022

But no sooner than the main research began did I find out that one of the teachers that I should have observed is ill. So I had no choice but to attend the class taught by the substitute teacher. These two teachers normally had the whole class divided into two halves for the English classes,

but now these two groups had to be brought together again. A few other changes had to be done during the week and the classes of the ill teacher had to be postponed as follows:

- Main research: 19th – 23rd September 2022 + two classes on the 27th September 2022

4.5 Introductory Information about Observations:

As already mentioned above, the observations were conducted at the school of my own choice. One teacher was chosen as 'the head' of the research procedure by the headmaster of the school, the rest of the teachers to observe were up to me to arrange the lessons for observations with them. There were fifteen English lessons observed in the main research together with two lessons as pilotage. There were two different teachers for these two pilotage lessons. But for the purposes of this thesis, only the main research and its analysis will be considered. So as for the main research, the number of lessons taught by individual teachers was, in the end, as follows: teacher 1: 8 lessons, teacher 2: 3 lessons, teacher 3: 2 lessons, and teacher 4: 2 lessons. Due to unexpected illness and changes in the teachers' schedules, the number of lessons was not possible to divide any other way.

Many different activities and exercises where teachers could provide learners with feedback were possible for me to observe during the fifteen lessons. All four classes at the lower-secondary level of education were observed, the specific number of lessons in each class is as follows: the 6th grade: 6 lessons, 7th grade: 4 lessons, 8th grade: 3 lessons, 9th grade: 2 lessons. The observations were structured, which means that the observation sheets were prepared beforehand and only the specific aspects of the teaching and learning process were observed (see later in this chapter). Some of the lessons I had the opportunity to observe were consecutive, some of them, on the other hand, were of the same content, only in a different part of the class (eg. 7.A and 7.B). But it was still possible for me to see some small changes in the teachers' approach during such lessons.

One lesson was slightly different from the rest as we had to spend this lesson in the area of a school club (a place where children go before or after school when their parents are at work). We were in a room full of toys and kids' furniture, with a large carpet on the floor. So this lesson was mainly about playing English-themed games with the pupils, but in my view, it was an interesting experience as well, even though it was more difficult for the teacher to watch over the children and attract their attention. But feedback occurred here as in any other classes,

so I decided to cover this lesson in the research as well, even though I had the opportunity to choose some other lesson with a "normal" duration.

4.6 Observed Aspects of Teaching:

As mentioned in the previous text, only selected aspects of teaching and learning processes were observed. The three observation sheets recorded three different aspects of formative assessment. Signs of teachers' behaviour in the classes that might lead to formative assessment were described in the first observation sheet. The second sheet contained information about learners – if they are asked to do self-assessment and peer feedback in lessons. The last sheet was about corrective feedback techniques – all the techniques (recast, elicitation, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, and repetition) were marked in that sheet. All these three sheets were equally important to me.

4.7 Data Analysis and Interpretation:

As for the data analysis and interpretation, I tried to follow Gavora's procedure for content analysis in quantitative research. He states that certain steps need to be done in order to make it possible to analyse the data precisely (2010, 118). Some of the steps I have made for the data analysis were already mentioned in this work, but in this sub-chapter, I would like to keep it consistent so for that reason, some of the steps will be repeated or further explained here.

1. As already stated, the right representative group had to be chosen to collect the data needed. The lower-secondary level of education was chosen because of the aim of this thesis. If the data were collected at the primary level of education, it might not have been so relevant as at the lower-secondary school in terms of the language level that the pupils are supposed to learn. Such factors as age, the way of teaching the language, or the fact that English is not an obligatory subject for the 1st and 2nd class at primary school were taken into consideration, too.

2. Then key words had to be chosen. Because the aim of this work is to find out through which techniques the provision of feedback can be realized, words like "formative assessment" or "corrective feedback techniques" were determined.

3. The observation sheets with analytical categories were created afterward. Signs of such teachers' behaviour that might have led to formative assessment were pre-described into columns so that I could mark it easily if such signs were possible to spot during the lessons. I tried not to exclude the learners from this process either, so a separate sheet was created for such teachers' behaviour that would indicate that the learners are not omitted in the feedback process. The last sheet was about all the corrective feedback techniques and their explanations so that it was possible to easily determine and mark which technique the teacher just used. All three completed observation sheets are covered in the appendix.

4. When the research was finished, it was much easier for me to analyse the data thanks to the previous steps. As previously explained, the quantitative research category was chosen. At this point, it was important to determine the frequency of given analytical categories. As Gavora says, the frequency of the data is usually sorted into tables or it can be written down in a chart (2010, 120). I chose the table and it can be found in the appendix together with the observation sheets. All the numbers (the frequency of the individual techniques) are put together.

5. The last point of the research is to describe in words the quantitative data. It must be explained and interpreted so that it is possible to understand what it is supposed to mean in the research (Gavora 2010, 120).

5   Findings and Discussion:

To find out whether teachers use formative assessment in lessons, I created the first observation sheet where I wrote eight signs of such teachers' behaviour that might suggest that they do. I continued the same procedure with the second sheet, the only difference was that this one was concentrated on how much learners are involved in the process of giving feedback. In the last sheet, there are techniques of corrective feedback, which can be considered a part of formative assessment (see chapter 3).

The individual techniques of formative assessment and corrective feedback techniques from the three observation sheets are described as follows:

5.1 Techniques of Formative Assessment:

5.1.1 The Aim of the Lesson Is Stated:

During the fifteen lessons I had the opportunity to observe, the topics of the lessons were stated thirteen times. The problem was that the teachers presented the topics as aims but did not formulate them that way (to see how aims should be formulated, see chapter 2.5.2 in the theoretical part).

The topics of the lessons that were stated explicitly were as follows:

Repetition of present simple and present continuous (2x), working with the word 'can', vocabulary + repetition of the phrase 'what has he got?', the English alphabet (2x), creation and usage of present tenses, spelling names (working with the English alphabet again), future tenses, present tenses practice, the usage of phrases 'how much / how many' (2x), 'some, any a/an'

Because there were two topics that were not stated explicitly, I tried to guess them from the activities done during the lessons. So it might be as follows:

Present simple practice, prepositions of place

In fact, no one aim was defined as it should be. For that reason, it should be suggested that aims as such were never mentioned during the fifteen lessons.

5.1.2 The Aim and Criteria of the Activity Is Explained:

Similarly like the aims of the lessons, the aims of the individual activities were never stated. Only twice did I hear the teacher express the purpose of the activity, and why the learners need to do and learn it properly.

On the contrary, I noticed fifteen times during the lessons that teachers explained the criteria of the tasks.

The tasks, where the criteria were explained, were of the following content:

A vocabulary game 3x, vocabulary test 2x, homework check (about present tenses), presenting homework (about present tenses), the teacher spells names and learners write them down,

forming letters to words, reading those words, testing names of places in a town, pronouncing of words + listening, self-assessment at the end of the lesson (learners write it down on a paper and hand it in to their teacher, then they can leave), working on a tablet (an exercise focused on how much/many), homework check (how much/many)

So even though the aims of these tasks were not stated, the teachers' feedback might have been focused on the following competences, according to the content of the tasks:

Lexical, grammatical, phonological, orthographic, and orthoepic competence.

5.1.3 The Teacher Sticks to the Criteria and Assesses Accordingly:

If the tasks were assessed in the lessons straight away, they were often with the teacher's comments about how well the learners did. They stuck to the criteria that they explained and provided the learners with feedback accordingly. I noticed such teachers' behaviour twelve times during the lessons.

Such activities, that were assessed during the lessons immediately, were of these themes:

Vocabulary games, homework check, presenting homework in front of the class, listening the teacher dictate the English alphabet and the learners wrote the letters into their exercise books, putting letters into words, reading the words created, the alphabet – listening to a recording, creating cards with self-assessment at the end of the class

So aspects of communicative competences covered in these activities and in the following feedback might have been:

In general, the competence covered was linguistic competence again, and then specifically, it was probably grammatical, lexical, phonological, orthographic, and orthoepic competence according to the themes and duration of the activities. But because the aims of the activities were not stated, the competences that were probably included in the teachers' feedback cannot be defined 100%.

5.1.4 Learners Are Involved into the Process of Creating the Criteria:

During the fifteen lessons, I never noticed that learners would cooperate with the teachers when creating the criteria for the activities. It cannot be generalized, the learners might have been involved in this process in other lessons, but my view was limited by the number of lessons observed.

5.1.5 Learners Are Provided with Feedback that Comments on their Strengths/Weaknesses and Tries to Enhance their Future Performance:

To start with, probably the most interesting thing about commenting on learners' strengths and weaknesses is that during the classes I had the opportunity to observe, only one teacher did this. The learners were informed about their strengths eight times during the fifteen lessons and eleven times about their weaknesses.

To avoid repeating that most of the feedback provided by the teacher aimed at linguistic competences, I decided to state that here in advance. Only the aspects of the linguistic competences are slightly different each time, so they are explained with each comment on learners' strengths/weaknesses separately.

The same situation is with the individual aims of the activities. Because the aims were not expressed, I will try to guess them from the content of the activity and mention them with each activity separately. But because I did not know the exact aims, it was very difficult for me to guess what aspects of communicative competences were covered in the teacher's feedback.

- The first time when the teacher commented on learners' weaknesses was at the very first lesson when the learners were asked to answer a question 'what do you like?' with simple sentences, like e.g. 'I like a banana' or 'I like meat'. So as the content of this activity suggests, the aim might have been that at the end of the activity, the learners should be able to correctly use the articles with countable and uncountable nouns.

  As halfway expected, the problem was most of the learners forgot to add the indefinite articles in front of the countable nouns so the teacher needed to comment on it to make sure that they will remember it next time.

It could be suggested that the aspect of communicative competences covered in that feedback was probably lexical competence mainly as the pronunciation of those words was not the focus of feedback this time.

- A similar problem was at the beginning of the second lesson when the teacher asked the pupils to write on small pieces of paper when we use "some, any, and a/an".

  The aim was probably that at the end of the activity, the learners should be able to correctly use this grammatical aspect because, as the teacher said, it was already explained to them in the previous lessons.

  The teacher let the pupils write and walked through the class to monitor them. Once they finished, the teacher asked them individually and wrote their answers on the board. Even though they had gone through the rules of the usage of these words in the previous lesson, quite a lot of learners either had mistakes in what they've written or did not write a full explanation so the teacher needed to provide them with feedback on those weaknesses again.

  The aspect of communicative competence probably remains the same as above, it might have been lexical competence that the teacher's feedback commented on.

- Next time, the pupils were supposed to make pairs and write on the board when "some, any, and a/an" are used with countable and uncountable nouns again, so even the aim may be the same as with the activity described above (but neither this aim was expressed explicitly).

  When they finished, the teacher listened to all the groups and their explanations. Then the teacher herself commented on the good things together with such things that needed improvement and asked the learners to write the correct information into their exercise books.

  The lexical competence was probably in focus here again as it was the same task as the one above.

- The next activity where it was possible for me to hear the teacher comment on learners' weaknesses (together with recommendations on how to improve them) was from the learners' homework focused on future tenses. The aim could have been that at the end of the activity, the learners would be able to use the future tenses correctly.

The teacher had chosen a few sentences that she did not like presented them on the interactive whiteboard and before she started providing the learners with feedback, she asked the learners themselves if they can come up with the right answers. Some of them could and then she told them what to work on next time. Grammatical competence was probably the main focus here because the whole task was about future tenses only.

- The next activity I had the opportunity to see was a bit different from the rest. It was in the 9th grade and it was their first "challenge of the year" (Their teacher set these challenges to make sure each student manages the subject matter they were supposed to manage at a certain period of time of the year. See an example in the appendix.) This time, it was about the English alphabet and the learners were supposed to listen to a recording and write down all letters they hear. (It was about English names and they were: SEAMAS, MITCHELL, MARJORIE, and WINIFRED). The aim of this activity might have been that learners would be able to understand the recording and write down the individual letters correctly.
When the learners finished, the teacher checked them all individually and every single learner got feedback on his own performance, what is good and what to work on.
In this case, the aspects of the linguistic competences in the teacher's focus were probably phonological and orthographic competence as the learners first listened to the recording and then (if they understood the recording) correctly wrote the letters (names) down into their exercise books.

- In the other task, the learners made pairs again and each group was supposed to write down rules for creating present simple and present continuous. The aim then probably was to correctly use this grammatical aspect.
The learners consulted the rules with each other in the groups, then wrote down what they had come up with. At the end of the activity, the teacher gradually asked each group to share their answers with the rest of the class.
Again, grammatical competence was probably in focus here as the whole task was about present tenses.

- The next activity was the challenge of the year once more and it was about the English alphabet again. It was also about similar activities – the lessons started with the teacher

dictating the learners four English names and the learners were supposed to write them down again. (The names were this time: ABIGAIL, GEOFFREY, JOCELYN, and GERMAINE). So the aim was probably the same as the first activity regarding the English alphabet, which is described above (the learners would be able to understand the recording and write down the individual letters correctly).

But this time, there was enough time for both the teacher and the learners to finish the other two activities. Once the learners finished writing down the letters and the teacher checked all the work, then those learners who've passed this first half of the challenge (they needed to reach a certain percentage to pass it) could go on the carpet in the class and try to do the second half of the challenge. It was about finding letters and forming them into words (see an example in the appendix). Then they were supposed to read them and the teacher listened to their pronunciation (of both letters and words). All those activities were followed by the teacher's feedback on the learners' strengths, weaknesses, and her recommendations.

This time, as the description above suggests, there were more aspects of linguistic competence covered in the teacher's feedback – there was probably phonological, orthographic, and orthoepic competence in the teacher's focus.

- The last activities I had the opportunity to see the teacher comment on the learners' strengths and weaknesses were concentrated on present tenses again. Firstly, the learners were supposed to hand in their homework and then present it in front of their classmates. There were two or three pupils presenting their homework, so when they all finished, the teacher again commented on the good aspects together with the mistakes.

Then the learners were supposed to make pairs again and discuss the rules for creating present simple and present continuous. After that, they were all asked to share their answers with one another and the teacher provided them with feedback on their performance again. The aim of this activity, then, might have been about correctly using present tenses once more.

Mainly grammatical competence was probably in focus here again because both the homework and the next activity were about present tenses. But the teacher commented also on the learners' pronunciation of some words when they were presenting their homework so the phonological competence was covered in that feedback as well. It cannot be stated if pronunciation was a part of the aim as the aim was not expressed again.

5.1.6 Learners Are Asked to Do Self-Assessment:

The matter of learners' self-assessment could be seen twelve times over the fifteen lessons. In such cases, the learners were asked at the end of the activities how they felt about their own performances. There were various techniques that the teachers used to do so. For instance, the learners were asked to show with their fingers how well/badly they think they did during the lesson. The more fingers they showed, the more satisfied they were with themselves. Sometimes the learners expressed their satisfaction with hand gestures as well.

The other technique of self-assessment was based directly on formative assessment – the traffic light technique. I noticed that the learners were either asked in which colour group they think they are (green, yellow, or red) or they got cards of the same colours and were asked to show such a colour that would fit best to their own performance (see a picture in the appendix).

5.1.7 Learners Are Asked to Give Peer Feedback:

In comparison with self-assessment, peer feedback almost never appeared during the lessons. Only four times did I see that the teacher asked the rest of the class when a pupil who was supposed to answer the teacher's question did not know what the correct answer was. In these cases, the teacher either gave the opportunity to someone else or asked the pupil's classmates to help him/her. But I never saw that the learners would work in pairs/groups and then they were asked to give peer feedback instead of the teacher's comment.

5.2 Corrective Feedback Techniques:

Unlike techniques of formative assessment which are different each time and thus needed an explanation, it is clear from the theoretical part what individual corrective feedback techniques mean (see chapter 3.6). For that reason, I decided to sort these corrective feedback techniques into groups according to the aspects of the communicative competences that they may include and express them in numbers here.

5.2.1 Recast:

The first technique of corrective feedback is probably the least focused on formative assessment, even though it was used quite often in the lessons. The reason was probably the time limit because as I could see, not always did the teachers have enough time to lead the learners to the right answer step by step, even though they tried to do so as often as possible. But the teachers' intention was always the same, no matter what technique was used to do so: "push" the learners to the correct answer. Recast was used forty times over the lessons observed.

Recast focused on pronunciation (phonological competence):

7x

The aims of activities where recast focused on pronunciation appeared were apparently focused on a different aspect of communicative competence. I judge so by the content of these two activities, which were either about working in pairs and practising present simple or about picture description of how many things the learners can name from that picture. So even though teachers corrected the learners' pronunciation, the aims of the activities might have been focused on grammar (grammatical competence) in the first case, and on vocabulary (lexical competence) in the second case. But it cannot be stated for sure because the aims of the activities were not stated.

Recast focused on grammar (grammatical competence):

19x

The content of these activities, where recast on grammar appeared, was all about practising tenses, forming questions, working with the word "can", working with irregular verbs (recalling or using them correctly), or working with phrases "have got x has got". It should be stated that in these cases, recast was used to lead the learners to the right answer as quickly as possible. But to say if the feedback was in alignment with aims is not possible in these cases as the aims were not expressed.

Recast focused on listening (phonological and orthographic competence):

4x

In these tasks, the learners were supposed either to listen to a song and catch the words in it or listen to a recording about the English alphabet, catch the letters mentioned and write them down. But again, the aims of these activities were not stated so it is not possible to say if only phonological competence was in focus in these tasks.

Recast focused on vocabulary (lexical competence):

10x

Such tasks, where recast focused on vocabulary appeared, were about recalling certain vocabulary, testing vocabulary, vocabulary games, or working with prepositions.

As already mentioned, recast might have been used in lessons mainly for the lack of time the teachers had. The problem here is that the aims were never expressed, so it was hard for me to say if the feedback of these activities focused on aspects of communicative competence that the teachers intended.

5.2.2 Elicitation:

Starting with elicitation, it was the most frequently used technique throughout the whole research. And apart from recast, the rest of the corrective feedback techniques tried to lead the learners to the right answer step by step instead of saying it explicitly instead of the learners. The Elicitation technique was used forty-five times during the fifteen lessons.

Elicitation focused on pronunciation (phonological and orthoepic competence):

11x

Elicitation focused on pronunciation was very likely used in activities aiming at the same communicative competence. I guess so because the content of such activities was either to read the letters of the English alphabet, spell names, or pick cards with letters of the English alphabet and read them. But to state that properly, the aims of the individual activities would have to be stated.

Elicitation focused on listening (phonological and orthographic competence):

1x

Elicitation focused on listening was used in such an activity where the teacher dictated letters from the English alphabet and the learners were supposed to write them down (it was a part of the challenge of the year).

Given the content of the activity, the aim of this task might have been that at the end, the learners should be able to understand the letters and write them down correctly. If that was the aim, then the teacher's feedback probably aimed at phonological and orthographic competence. But it cannot be claimed with certainty again as the aim was not specified.

Elicitation focused on grammar (grammatical competence):

26x

Elicitation focused on grammatical competence was the most frequent one. In such activities, the learners were supposed to practise present tenses, come up with rules for using present tenses, form questions in present tenses, practise the phrase "have got x has got", practise future tenses, or work with the irregular verbs.

The aims of these all activities were not expressed again, but the content of all the tasks suggests that the activities were mostly about grammar, which is why I suspect that grammatical competence was in main focus here.

Elicitation focused on vocabulary (lexical competence):

7x

The content of such tasks was either to play a vocabulary game, go through a vocabulary test together with the teacher, practise directions, practise various phrases regarding age, colours, places, practise "some, any a/an", practise prepositions of place, practise articles, or a picture description was covered (with a question "how many things can you name?").

Whenever a learner had made a mistake/an error, they were asked if they can correct themselves. Sometimes they could, so it was just a mistake/a slip. But sometimes they could not, so an error occurred and the teacher asked a different learner/the rest of the class to say it correctly.

The aims were not expressed again but the main focus might have been on lexical competence here given the content of the tasks.

5.2.3 Clarification Request:

Clarification request occurred only three times during the whole research. As far as I could notice, the question "sorry, I didn't understand, can you tell me more clearly?" (or similar) was never really asked because the teacher could not hear the pupil, but with an intention behind it – make the learner come up with the correct answer himself.

Clarification request focused on grammar (grammatical competence):

2x

Both activities where this corrective feedback technique appeared focused probably on grammar usage. The aims were not said, but the first task was a homework check of present tenses and the second one was a game focused on present simple. That is why it can be suggested that the teacher's feedback was aimed at grammatical competence in these cases.

Clarification request focused on pronunciation (phonological competence):

1x

Clarification request focused on pronunciation appeared only once. The aims were unknown to me again, but the activity was about the English alphabet and the learners were supposed to pronounce the individual letters correctly. So phonological competence was probably in focus here. The teacher used this technique when she wanted to lead the learner to the correct pronunciation of the letter without her saying it instead of him.

5.2.4 Metalinguistic Feedback:

Metalinguistic feedback was the second most frequent technique of all in the whole research. Overall, it appeared forty-three times. There was always an explanation for why there had been a mistake but the teacher never said the correct answer instead of the learners.

Metalinguistic feedback focused on grammar (grammatical competence):

33x

The content of such tasks where this technique appeared was to practise present tenses, use and create questions in present tenses, describe a picture in present continuous, work with the phrases "have got/has got", or use future tenses.

When practising the usage of the phrase "have got/has got", the teacher probably once commented on a different aspect of the grammatical competence. Instead of commenting on the usage of the phrase have got / has got, the teacher rather commented on word order (that the word "home" must be placed at the end of the sentence and not in the middle), so it could be suggested then that the feedback here was not in alignment with the aim of the activity as the content of the activity very likely aimed at a different aspect of the grammatical competence. But it cannot be stated with certainty because the aim of the activity was not stated.

Given the content of the activities, the teacher's feedback might have been aimed at grammatical competence in these cases. For more detailed specifications of communicative competence, I would need to know the aim of the tasks.

Metalinguistic feedback focused on vocabulary (lexical competence):

6x

The content of these activities was to work with various phrases focused on age, colours, etc., use "some, any, a/an", and use prepositions of place.

Judged by the content of the tasks, the teacher's feedback might have aimed at lexical competence in these cases, but it cannot be stated with 100% certainty as the aims were unknown to me once more.

5.2.5 Explicit Correction:

Explicit correction was used fourteen times over the fifteen lessons. This technique was quite interesting to watch because not only did the teacher explicitly say that there has been a mistake/an error and said the correct form/answer, but such a statement was very often followed by the explanation of why it must be the way that the teacher said. So even though the teachers were the ones who said the correct answer here, it may be appreciated

that whenever possible, they always did not forget to at least inform the learners why their answer was wrong and why the correct answer is different.

Explicit correction focused on grammar (grammatical competence):

6x

Explicit correction focused on grammar always reacted to the learners' answers during the tasks which were focused probably on grammar as well. Even though the aims were not expressed, the tasks were about using and creating questions in present tenses, describing a picture (practising present tenses), and about learners correcting their own mistakes in their homework focused on future tenses. For that reason, mainly grammatical competence was probably in focus here.

Explicit correction focused on vocabulary (lexical competence):

3x

The content of the activity, where this technique appeared, was about working with "any, some, a/an". The aim of the task was not expressed, though, so it is not possible to say for sure if the teacher's feedback aimed at the competence that it was intended to.

Explicit correction focused on pronunciation (phonological and orthoepic competence):

5x

Explicit correction focused on pronunciation appeared only in one lesson. The aims remained unknown once more, but the content of that lesson aimed at repeating the English alphabet and spelling. The two activities where this technique was used were either about picking cards with letters of the English alphabet and reading them or playing pairs (pictures with letters and the learners were supposed to find two identical letters and come up with a word starting with the letter that they picked up, e.g. Q = Queen). See an example in the appendix.

Whenever an erroneous utterance appeared, the teacher immediately reacted. They corrected the learner, explained why he/she was wrong, and waited until the learner agreed with them or showed that he/she understood. But if that feedback was in alignment with the aim of the activity cannot be stated.

5.2.6 Repetition:

Repetition techniques appeared only three times in the research again. It was used mainly to suggest that a mistake had occurred and to give the learners a chance to correct themselves.

Repetition focused on grammar (grammatical competence):

1x

The content of such an activity was to correct the learners' homework about future tenses (the learners saw their own sentences on the whiteboard and were supposed to correct them).

Each time a teacher asked this doubtful question, e.g. "are you sure?", the learners immediately knew they had made a mistake and tried to correct it. But again, it was not possible for me to say if the teacher's feedback followed the aim of the activity because it was not stated.

Repetition focused on vocabulary (lexical competence):

2x

The content of these activities was to complete an exercise about using "some, any, and a/an" (there were two tasks focused on this aspect of communicative competence).

The aims were not expressed again so it cannot be stated 100% if the teacher stuck to the aim and provided feedback accordingly.

Because the aims of the activities were never explicitly expressed, it was impossible to say if all these corrective feedback techniques and techniques of formative assessment commented on aspects that they were intended to.

As additional information, it can be stated here that from the point of view of the CEFR, grammatical competence was the most frequently commented on (87x), while in the entire research, the teachers commented least on orthographic competence (5x).

6   Conclusion of the Practical Part:

The research tried to find out what techniques teachers use to provide learners at the lower-secondary level of education with feedback. The questions introduced at the beginning of the research were as follows:

Main Question:

What techniques do teachers use to provide learners with feedback in English Language Teaching at the lower-secondary level of education?

Extension Questions:

Do teachers use techniques of formative assessment? If so, what are they?

What aspects of communicative competences are included in the feedback provided?

Corrective feedback techniques in relation to formative assessment were the main focus of this research. After analysing the data, it was possible to reveal the following findings. Teachers at the lower-secondary level of education did use techniques of formative assessment together with corrective feedback techniques that are explained in the theoretical part of this thesis. The research helped reveal that there were differences in the occurrence of individual feedback techniques. The most frequently used technique was Elicitation, which was used forty-five times over the lessons observed. Whereas Clarification request and Repetition were used only three times (each) during the research.

Aspects of communicative competences that might have been included in that feedback were as follows: Mainly linguistic competence was covered in the lessons and the particular competences were probably lexical, grammatical, phonological, orthographic, and orthoepic.

Although teachers did try to incorporate and use techniques of formative assessment in the lessons observed, the whole situation was complicated by the fact that the teachers did not express the aims of the individual lessons and activities. Because of that, it was not possible for me to say which aspects of communicative competences were exactly covered in the teachers' feedback.

Conclusion of the Thesis:

In conclusion, this thesis deals with feedback techniques at the lower-secondary level of education. The aim of this work was to find out what feedback techniques teachers use to provide learners with feedback at the lower-secondary level of education. The thesis is divided into theoretical and practical part. The theoretical part forms a basis for the practical part and the research because its intention was to introduce the issue of feedback, formative assessment, and corrective feedback techniques in relation to formative assessment.

The purpose of the research was to find out what techniques teachers use to provide learners with feedback at the lower-secondary level of education. Specifically, if they use techniques of formative assessment and if so, what the techniques are, and what aspects of communicative competence are covered in that feedback. Despite the limitations, the research helped reveal quite significant results about the techniques the teachers used. Because even though they did use techniques of formative assessment together with corrective feedback techniques, they did not specify the aims of both individual lessons and activities. Because of that, it was not possible for me to specify what aspects of communicative competences exactly were covered in the teachers' feedback. This is not a positive outcome, because without stating the exact aims, it may be very difficult, even for the teachers themselves, to know exactly what communicative competence they want to develop in their learners and so provide the feedback accordingly.

To react to the research results, the following outcome could be suggested: The first two questions (What techniques do teachers use to provide learners with feedback in English Language Teaching at the lower-secondary level of education? Do teachers use techniques of formative assessment? If so, what are they?) could be answered positively. It was possible to define what feedback techniques the teachers used and thanks to this fact, I found out that they truly did use techniques of formative assessment. But the last question (What aspects of communicative competences are included in the feedback provided?) could not be answered so easily. Because the aims of the lessons and activities were not known to me (and neither to the learners), it was not possible to say what aspects of communicative competence were exactly covered in that feedback. They could be only guessed from the content of the activities. The suggestion, then, could be that the aims are crucial for formative assessment and so should be specified at the beginning of every lesson/activity. Only then would the teachers know what skills exactly they want to develop in their learners and so would be able to apply formative assessment.

Resumé:

Zpětná vazba patří mezi kategorii témat, která zůstávají aktuální navzdory postupu času a měnícím se trendům ve vzdělávání. Co se týče výuky cizích jazyků, v tomto případě zejména výuky angličtiny, hraje zpětná vazba nezastupitelnou roli, pokud učitelé chtějí dovést žáky k určitému cíli, který si stanovili. Kromě toho mohou učitelé, pomocí správně podané zpětné vazby, u žáků kromě jiného rozvíjet komunikační kompetence a učit je v daném jazyce komunikovat nejen správně, ale i vhodně. Učitel je tím pádem pravděpodobně nejdůležitější činitel v poskytování zpětné vazby, i když ne jediný. Kromě něj mohou zpětnou vazbu poskytovat také žáci sami sobě navzájem, ale každý žák sám se může naučit sebehodnocení a kriticky přemýšlet o svém vlastním výkonu, pakliže k tomu dostane prostor. Je zejména na učiteli, zda se rozhodne takové jednání u žáků podporovat. Pokud však ano, je právě pro učitele nezbytné uvědomit si cíle výuky spolu s cíli jednotlivých hodin i aktivit, aby mohl aplikovat efektivní techniky formativního hodnocení u svých žáků. A právě technikami zpětné vazby a formativního hodnocení se tato práce zabývá. Jejím úkolem bylo zjistit, prostřednictvím jakých technik lze realizovat poskytování zpětné vazby ve výuce anglického jazyka na druhém stupni vzdělávání. Práce je rozdělena do dvou částí, přičemž teoretická část je základem části praktické a jejího výzkumu. V teoretické části jsou vysvětleny veškeré termíny, které jsou klíčové k porozumění tématu a následného výzkumu. Tyto dvě části na sebe tedy přímo navazují.

První kapitola teoretické části se snaží zasadit zpětnou vazbu do kontextu pedagogické komunikace a také vysvětluje fakt, jak spolu tyto faktory souvisí. Dále definuje samotný termín „zpětná vazba", objasňuje, k čemu zpětnou vazbu ve výuce (nejen) anglického jazyka potřebujeme a v neposlední řadě popisuje termín „negativní zpětná vazba" spolu se základními typy zpětné vazby.

Druhá kapitola se poté věnuje komunikačním kompetencím a modelu CEFRu (Společný Evropský Referenční Rámec pro Výuku Jazyků). Jako první je zde vysvětleno, k čemu CEFR slouží a čím se zabývá. Dále následuje definice komunikační kompetence a jejich rozdělení. V následující podkapitole je již definována lingvistická kompetence a jsou zde popsány její podkategorie (lexikální, gramatická, sémantická, fonologická, ortografická a ortoepická). Následuje propojení komunikačních kompetencí s cíli a vysvětlení, proč je zapotřebí přesně nadefinovaný cíl k tomu, aby učitel mohl přesně stanovit, které komunikační kompetence chce a bude u žáků rozvíjet. Na základě toho poté může sestavovat náplň hodiny a jejích aktivit. K pochopení toho, co cíle jsou a k čemu slouží, jsou v této kapitole uvedeny dva modely,

které s tím mohou pomoci. Jako první je představena Bloomova taxonomie, která je strukturována a řadí cíle od nižší úrovně učení se po vyšší. Jinými slovy, učení se na vyšší úrovni je přímo závislé na vědomostech či schopnostech nižší úrovně. Druhý model představuje Rámcový vzdělávací program pro základní vzdělávání (RVP – ZV), který mimo jiné popisuje, jak má vypadat správně nadefinovaný cíl hodiny či aktivity a proč.

Třetí kapitola, závěrečná kapitola teoretické části s názvem „Korektivní zpětná vazba ve vztahu k formativnímu hodnocení", začíná vymezením faktu, jak korektivní zpětná vazba s formativním hodnocením souvisí. Následuje definice formativního hodnocení a vysvětlení principu, na kterém se toto hodnocení zakládá. Další podkapitola pojednává o zpětné vazbě na ústní projev žáka ve výuce anglického jazyka a jsou zde uvedeny dvě hlavní rozdělení, dle kterých by měla být zpětná vazba přizpůsobována – přesnost a plynulost. Následuje podkapitola s vysvětlením pojetí chyby ve výuce anglického jazyka, do které spadá definice sebekorekce, sebehodnocení, zpětné vazby či přímé opravy chyb mezi žáky navzájem a v neposlední řadě učitelova korekce žákovy chyby. Následná kapitola vysvětluje, proč by žáci měli být zapojováni do procesu poskytování zpětné vazby. Další oddíl se již zabývá přímo definicí korektivní zpětné vazby, jejími výhodami a nevýhodami, přičemž se snaží korektivní zpětnou vazbu obhájit jakožto účinný nástroj v práci s chybou žáka. Následuje výčet technik korektivní zpětné vazby s definicí toho, k čemu každá technika slouží s následným porovnáním jejich efektivity. Třetí kapitola se uzavírá objasněním toho, kdy by se korektivní zpětná vazba (ne)měla používat a také toho, jak samotná korektivní zpětná vazba souvisí s cíli vzdělávání.

Praktická část poté obsahuje výzkum, který je rozdělen na dvě kapitoly (celkově čtvrtou a pátou). Byl proveden na základní škole Tomáše Garrigue Masaryka v Sušici. Čtvrtá kapitola tedy popisuje samotný výzkum, jeho metodologii a analýzu dat. Data byla sesbírána pomocí observačních archů, na základě kterých byla posléze analyzována. První a druhý arch byl věnován formativnímu hodnocení, zatímco třetí arch byl věnován korektivní zpětné vazbě. Všechny archy byly rozčleněny do sloupců pro snadnější záznam dat. Zajímal mne především výzkum jednotlivých technik zpětné vazby a jejich četnost. Hlavním předmětem zkoumání bylo, jaké techniky poskytování zpětné vazby učitelé používají, zda používají techniky formativního hodnocení a pokud ano, jaké. Následuje tedy interpretace dat a diskuse.

V páté kapitole tedy následuje vyhodnocení četnosti daných technik a bylo zjištěno, že existují rozdíly mezi používáním různých technik zpětné vazby. Následuje tedy popis, na základě jakého chování učitelů v hodinách mohlo být usouzeno, že se snaží o formativní hodnocení spolu s popisem technik korektivní zpětné vazby. Nejvíce využívaná byla Elicitation (celkově

45x), zatímco nejméně se ve výzkumu objevily techniky Clarification Request (3x), Repetition (3x) a bylo také zjištěno, že žáci nikdy nebyli zapojeni do procesu vytváření kritérií u aktivit v hodinách a i to, že nikdy nebyly zmíněny ani cíle hodin (pouze témata, které učitelé prezentovali jako cíle), ani aktivit. Z hlediska CEFRu pak byla nejvíce komentována gramatická kompetence, zatímco nejméně učitelé u žáků komentovali ortografickou kompetenci.

V závěru praktické části pak shrnuji daná zjištění a je zde okomentován fakt, že přesto, že učitelé používají techniky formativního hodnocení spolu s technikami korektivní zpětné vazby, nedefinují cíle hodin ani aktivit. S ohledem na tento fakt pro mne bylo nemožné přesně definovat, na jaké aspekty komunikační kompetence ona zpětná vazba učitelů cílila. Z tohoto důvodu může být podotknuto, že bez správně nadefinovaných cílů nelze formativně hodnotit.

V konečném závěru pak komentuji danou problematiku a snažím se shrnout hlavní myšlenku této práce. Ta naznačuje, že pokud by zpětná vazba byla žákům poskytována s ohledem na cíle hodin/aktivit, bylo by nejen možné přesně určit, do jakých aspektů komunikační kompetence tato zpětná vazba cílí, ale mohla by je i u žáků efektivně rozvíjet. Tím pádem by se snaha učitelů o formativní hodnocení neminula účinkem. V doporučení v závěru práce tedy stojí, že učitelé by měli věnovat pozornost právě cílům hodin i dílčích aktivit, aby pro ně bylo možné zapojit do výuky formativní hodnocení.

Bibliography:

Airasian, Peter, Kathleen Cruikshank, Richard Mayer, Paul Pintrich, James Raths, Merlin Wittrock. 2013. *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing.* London: Pearson Education.

Brookhart, Susan. 2008. *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students.* Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brown, Douglas. 2004. *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices.* New York: Longman.

Brown, Douglas. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching - 4th edition.* New York: Longman.

Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Čábalová, Dagmar. 2011. *Pedagogika.* Praha: Grada.

Edge, Julian. 1989. *Mistakes and Correction.* New York: Longman.

Faltýn, Jaroslav. *Rámcový vzdělávací program pro základní vzdělávání.* 2021. Praha: MŠMT.

Gavora, Peter. 2005. *Učitel a žáci v komunikaci.* Brno: Paido.

Gavora, Peter. 2010. *Úvod do pedagogického výzkumu.* Brno: Paido.

Harmer, Jeremy. 1991. *The practice of English language teaching.* New York: Longman.

Hymes, Del. 1972. *On Communicative Competence.* In: J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds). Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Kolář Zdeněk, Šikulová Renata. 2009. *Hodnocení žáků.* Praha: Portál.

Mareš, Jiří, Jaro Křivohlavý. 1995. *Komunikace ve škole.* Brno: Masarykova Univerzita.

Nelešovská, Alena. 2005. *Pedagogická komunikace v teorii a praxi.* Praha: Grada.

Pash, Marvin, a kol, 2005. *Od vzdělávacího programu k vyučovací hodině.* Praha: Portál.

Rezaei, Saeed. 2011. *Corrective Feedback in Task-based Grammar Instruction: A Case of Recast vs. Metalinguistic Feedback.* Mauritius: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing.

Scrivener, Jim. 1994. *Learning Teaching A Guidebook for English Language Teachers.* 2nd Edition. Oxford: Macmillan Heinemann English language teaching.

Sheen, Younghee. 2011. *Corrective Feedback, Individual Differences and Second Language Learning.* Washington D.C.: American University.

Slavík, Jan. 1999. *Hodnocení v současné škole: východiska a nové metody pro praxi*. Praha: Portál.

Starý, Karel, Veronika Laufková, Jana Stará, Kateřina Novotná, Vít Šťastný, Zuzana Svobodová. 2016. *Formativní hodnocení ve výuce*. Praha: Portál.

Šeďová, Klára, Roman Švaříček, Zuzana Šalamounová. 1995. *Komunikace ve školní třídě.* Praha: Portál.

Švaříček Roman, Klára Šeďová. 2010. *Zamlčené hodnocení: zpětná vazba ve výukové komunikaci na druhém stupni základní školy*. Studia Paedagogica. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Ur, Penny. 2012. *A Course in English Language Teaching.* United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Weimer, Maryellen. 2002. *Learner-Centred Teaching Five Key Changes to Practice.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

William, Dylan, Siobhán Leahy. 2020. *Zavádění formativního hodnocení.* Praha: EDUkační LABoratoř.

Online Sources:

Ecampusontario.pressbooks.pub. 2022. Open Library. Last Modified 14 November, 2022. https://ecampusontario.pressbooks.pub/profcommsontario/chapter/using-feedback/

Fctl.ucf.edu. 2022. University of Central Florida. Last Modified November 7, 2022. https://fctl.ucf.edu/teaching-resources/course-design/blooms-taxonomy/

Hattie, John, and Helen Timperley. 2007. The Power of Feedback. Review of Educational Research. Last Modified November 14, 2022. http://www.columbia.edu/~mvp19/ETF/Feedback.pdf

Intranet.med.wisc.edu. 2022. University of Wisconsin-Madison. Last modified August 8, 2022. https://intranet.med.wisc.edu/faculty-affairs-and-development/faculty-central-resources/developing-educators/feedback-and-evaluation/

Researchgate.net. 2022. ResearchGate. Last Modified November 10, 2022. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334547623_Can_Formative_Assessment_and_Corrective_Feedback_Improve_L2_Learners'_Performance_on_English_Comparative_Forms_The_Case_of_Low-Proficiency_Level_EFL_Learners

Tieonline.com. 2022. The International Educator. Last Modified November 9, 2022. https://www.tieonline.com/article/2678/how-to-provide-effective-verbal-feedback-in-the-classroom

Appendices

Appendix A: Observation Sheet 1

Date: 19.9.2022
Lesson number: 1.

Class: 7.A
Name of teacher: Mgr. Jana Karamanová

	Learners are asked to do self-assessment.	Learners are asked to give peer-feedback.
Task 1		
Task 2	|	
Task 3		
Task 4		
Task 5	√ √ *How many words did you get?*	
Task 6		
Task 7		

Other comments: *Na konci hodiny se učitel ptal, jak by se žáci ohodnotili (samy, smalish) body — body na ruch*

Appendix C: Observation Sheet 3

Date: 19.9.2022
Lesson number: 1.

Class: 7.A.
Name of teacher: Mgr. Jana Kanaurová

	Recast: The teacher simply says the correct version of the student's erroneous utterance, without any further comment. Student: „I reading a book." Teacher: „I *am* reading a book."	Elicitation: The teacher elicits the correct form from the student (assuming that the student can in fact produce it!): Student: I reading a book. Teacher: Can you correct that? Student: I am reading a book.	Clarification request: The teacher asks for a clarification of the meaning: Student: I reading a book. Teacher: I didn't understand, can you tell me more clearly?	Metalinguistic feedback: The teacher explains using grammatical or other linguistics terminology: Student: I reading a book. Teacher: In the present continuous you need the verb 'be' before the -*ing* form of the verb..	Explicit correction: The teacher says explicitly that there has been a mistake, and what the right form is: Student: I reading a book. Teacher: No, that is incorrect. You should have said..	Repetition: The teacher repeats the incorrect utterance, with a rising intonation and a doubting expression, implying that there's something wrong with it. Student: I reading a book. Teacher: I *reading a* book??
Task 1		∪ I G		G ∪ I you should have used alam.. →		
Task 2 grammar eul: grammar	← ∪ I			I		
Task 3 Bez zpětné nasloby						
Task 4 ?u						
Task 5		∪ I G		III G an you should have had → ∪ G	∪ G
Task 6						
Task 7						

Other comments: Task 1 : Učitel píše na tabuli slovíčka, jelikož se žáci domluví a píší ananyi chyby.

Appendix D: Data Analysis Table

TECHNIQUES OF FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT:		CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK TECHNIQUES:	
The aim of the lesson is stated:	13x	Recast:	40x
The aim + criteria of the activity/task is explained:	Criteria: 15x Aim: -	Elicitation:	45x
Learners are involved into the process of creating the criteria:	-	Clarification request:	3x
The teacher sticks to the criteria and assesses accordingly:	12x	Metaliguistic feedback:	43x
Learners are provided with feedback that comments on their strengths and tries to enhance their future performance:	8x	Explicit correction:	14x
Learners are provided with feedback that comments on their weaknesses and tries to enhance their future performance:	11x	Repetition:	3x
Learners are asked to do self-assessment:	12x		
Learners are aked to give peer-feedback:	4x		

<u>Appendix E:</u> Forming Letters into Words

Appendix F: "Traffic Light" Technique (Self-Assessment)

Appendix G: Pairs