Formative Assessment in EFL Teaching:

A Grounded Theory Study on the Change of Teachers' Formative Assessment

Practices.

Inger Jorunn Helland Montgomery

May 2023

Master's Thesis

Department of Foreign Languages

University of Bergen

PREFACE WITH THANKS

This has been an interesting and challenging period, juggling the roles of being a mother of three, a teacher and a student researcher. It has certainly been busy, but also a rewarding and knowledgeable time. I would like to say thank you to my supervisor Craig Grocott for his good guidance and knowledge throughout the process. It has been very much appreciated. I would also thank my fellow students for support, and the participants of the interviews, that made this study possible to realise. Thank you very much to my supportive friends and loving family. I am looking forward to spending more time with you again.

Rennesøy, May 2023

Inger Jorunn Helland Montgomery

ABSTRACT IN NORWEGIAN

Denne masteroppgåva tar utgangspunkt i endringa av lærarane sine formative vurderingspraksisar. Problemstillinga for oppgåva er "I kva grad og korleis har engelsklærarane sine formative vurderingspraksisar endra seg i norske 5., 6. og 7. klassar i engelskfaget?" Det er stilt tre delspørsmål i samband med problemstillinga. Desse er: 1. "Har introduksjonen av kunnskapsløftet 2020 hatt nokon effekt på lærarane sine formative vurderingspraksisar?'' 2. "Kva formative vurderingspraksisar brukar engelsklærarar for å få elevane til å overføre dei munnlege eigenskapane til elevane for å utvikle seg skriftleg i engelskfaget?" og 3. "Kva formative vurderingspraksisar brukar engelsklærarane for å tette gapet mellom kva elevane veit om dei munnlege og skriftlege ferdigheitene sine i engelsk og kva dei skal lære?"

Etter implementeringa av LK20 og fokuset læreplanen har på formativ vurdering, ser eg det som nødvendig og interessant å finne ut om vurderingspraksisane til lærarar på mellomtrinnet har endra seg. Hovudteoriane som ligg til grunn for diskusjon av funna i denne oppgåva er Vygotsky (1978) sin teori om den proksimale utviklingssona, Hattie og Timperley (2005, 2007), Black og Wiliam (1998,2003, 2009) og Burner (2016, 2018, 2020) si forsking på formativ vurdering. Fullan (2016, 2018) sine teoriar om endringspraksis er og gjeldande i både LK20 og denne masteroppgåva.

Metoden som er brukt i oppgåva er kvalitativ forskning, der grounded theory er vald som design. Materialet for å innhente data er eit semi-strukturert kvalitativt intervju. Sju mellomtrinnslærarar i engelskfaget frå fire ulike fylke og sju ulike skular i Noreg deltok i forskingsprosjektet. Informantane blei vald ved purposeful sampling. To av informantane jobbar på privatdrivne skular, medan dei resterane informantane jobbar på offentlege skular.

Ifølgje denne studia har lærarane sine formative vurderingspraksisar på mellomtrinnet i engelskfaget endra seg. Vurderingspraksisane har endra seg mykje både på eit nasjonalt og internasjonalt nivå sett frå eit historisk perspektiv, der ein tidlegare hadde fokus på sluttprodukt, testar og feil elevane gjorde. Formativ vurdering fokuserer på konstruktive tilbakemeldingar. Formative vurderingspraksiar kan vere sjølv-vurdering, kvarandre-vurdering, vurdering frå lærar til elev, dialog mellom lærar og elev, prosessorientert skriving og portofolie vurdering, for å nemne dei som blir omtala i denne studia. Oppgåva indikerer at dei formative vurderingspraksisane har endra seg litt etter at den nye læreplanen, LK20 blei tatt i bruk. Nokre av lærarane seier synet deira på formativ vurdering har endra seg. Tidlegare jobba dei mot eit sluttprodukt, medan dei nå ser på resultata som eit steg på vegen, der formativ og summativ vurdering er knytta saman. Skulane har tatt i bruk digitale hjelpemiddel til alle elevar, noko som kan gjere spesielt lese- og skriveundervisinga i engelsken meir effektiv. Lærarane rapporterer at dei brukar meir prossessorierentert skriving etter elevane fekk chromebøker. Funn i oppgåva viser at lærarane brukar meir samarbeidsoppgåver nå enn før, der elevane tar meir del i undervisninga. Oppgåva viser at mange av lærarane lar elevane tenkje sjølv for å finne svar, og at dei får hjelp til å strekkje seg i den proksimale utviklingssona si (Vygotsky, 1978). Lærarane uttrykkjer at dei har behov for å strukturere dei formative vurderingspraksisane sine. Dette er i samsvar med Burner (2016) si forsking, der han meiner det er nødvendig for å få dei ulike praksisane til å fungere. Funna viser endring i vurderingspraksisar, der læraren har fokus på konstruktive tilbakemeldingar som viser eleven vegen vidare, ved å bruke "two stars and a wish", kor to positive og ei kontruktiv tilbakemelding blir gitt. Implementeringa av kvarandre-vurdering og sjølv-vurdering krev i følgje Burner (2016) instruksjonar frå læraren, slik at elevane gjennomfører vurderinga på

ein hensiktsmessig måte. Nokre, men ikkje alle lærarane rapporterer at desse vurderingsformene blir brukt i klasserommet, noko som indikerer at dette er eit felt det bør vere meir fokus på framover.

Denne masteroppgåva kan bidra til å gi informasjon til forskarar, lærarar, studentar, skuleleiarar og politikarar og andre som er interessert i skuleutvikling, om korleis lærarar på mellomtrinnet rapporterer at den formative vurderingspraksisen deira har endra seg og i kva grad. Dette er nyttig å vite med tanke på at det, ifølgje Black og Wiliam (1998) er aktivitetane som skjer i klasserommet som kan vere med på å endre læring.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AfL – Assessment for learning

CEFR – Common European Framework of References for Languages

EALTA – The European Association for Language Testing and Assessment

EFL – English as a Foreign Language

ELP - The European Language Portfolio

L1 – First Language

L2/SL – Second Language

LK20 – National Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion from 2020.

MER – The Ministry of Education and Research

NDET - The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training

NOU – Norwegian Official Report

OECD - Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

PISA – Programme for International Student Assessment

ZPD - Zone of Proximal Development

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Importance of Formative Assessment and Educational Change in English Didactics

Research shows that the effect of using formative assessment in English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching is very positive towards effective learning. According to Hattie and Timperley (2007) and Black and Wiliam (2009) formative assessment practises can make a huge impact on effective learning. According to Burner (2020) formative assessment is "all assessments with the aim of improving students' learning processes and/or the teachers' teaching procedures" (Burner, 2020, p.1). In this thesis it is the teachers' awareness of their use of formative assessment that is in focus, to help the students learning English and improve their learning processes. According to Hattie and Timperley (2007) the key to formative assessment is to teach the students how to evaluate their own learning. In order to give the students self-awareness of their own learning, the teachers need to know that this is what enables the students' progress.

For the last twenty years, formative assessment has played and still plays an important role in educational research. Black and Wiliam (1998) are key researchers within this field. In their article ''Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards Through Classroom Assessment'' they compare teaching to flying, where the students need directions to know where they are going. The classroom is looked upon as a black box, just like the box recording the flight data in an aeroplane. Black and Wiliam's point is that the feedback given needs to show the students where they are going, to be able to reach their learning aims (Black & Wiliam, 1998).

Change in educational institutions is necessary to follow the changes that take place in society. The school system is governed politically, and Pring (2015) believes that the

change in education often happens too fast. He especially criticises the British school system, where there have been multiple reviews of curricula during the last decades.

Fullan (2016) is a Canadian researcher who is considered an authority within the process of whole system change in education. He emphasises that educational change is a time-consuming process, where changes need to take place both on a micro- and macro level. It is when policy workers, school leaders and teachers work together on a systematic level over time, that change can happen in a constructive way with positive results.

1.2 Research Gap

Formative assessment has been on the agenda of educational research for the last twenty years, and is highly emphasised in the new Norwegian curriculum, LK20 (MER, 2019). There has been little to no research done on the year groups 5, 6 and 7 on formative assessment in Norway, and especially not since the new curriculum was introduced in 2020. It is with this in mind that I believe it is important to do research on this topic, to find out how and if the formative assessment practices amongst teachers have changed within the English subject in Norwegian classrooms of year groups 5, 6 and 7.

1.3 Research Questions

In this master's thesis I will investigate the following:

To what extent and how have teachers' formative assessment practices changed in Norwegian year groups 5, 6 and 7 in the English subject?

It is the teachers' formative assessment practices that will be investigated, and in addition these three sub questions will be investigated:

1.   Has the introduction of LK20 affected the teachers' formative assessment practices?

With the new curriculum LK20, the teachers are required to use formative assessment practices from the point that students begin school in year 1 (MER, 2019). There are many factors that affect how effective the learning of the English language is in a classroom and which assessment practices are getting used, such as the time aspect (how many cumulative hours have been spent learning), learning environment, the teacher's knowledge of the subject, the teacher's view of the students, the working environment of the teacher, the learning profession, the management at the school and the curriculum (Fullan, 2007; Black & Wiliam, 1998; Burner, 2018).

2.   Which formative assessment practices do English teachers report implementing to help the students transfer their oral skills in order to develop written skills in the English subject?

Cambourne and Turbill (1987) and Hudelson (1989) all claim that oral and written activities are closely linked. Integrating the two skills can help students to understand that reading and writing can be as natural and important as speaking and listening, and vice versa. Which skills are being used is dependent on both the situation and activity which is taking place.

3.   Which formative assessment practices do English teachers report implementing in order to give the students clarity regarding their level of oral and written skills in English and what they are going to achieve?

The third question is linked to learning awareness and metacognition. The students will find out what level their own ability is, and what they need help with, in order to

develop their own oral and written skills. It is the teacher's responsibility to help them with this activity.

A pragmatic approach will be used to answer these questions. In line with Postholm and Jackobsen (2018) this is a view of the world where both positivism and constructivism are considered. To use both these views when answering the questions, can make a pragmatic and wider understanding of the world.

1.4 The Aims of this Project

This master's thesis aims to investigate to what extent and how teachers' formative assessment practices have changed in Norwegian year groups 5, 6 and 7 in the English subject. The teachers' experiences and knowledge play an important part in this project, which is why in-depth interviews will be used. The core of this project is to find out how their practices have changed and if they have indeed changed over the years. Seven English teachers from around the country who teach year groups 5, 6 and 7. will be interviewed over the internet, and some in person. The questions asked are designed to find the answers to this master's thesis. The questions will be divided into themes based on the theoretical background, linked to the research question and its sub-questions which form a red thread throughout this master's thesis.

In the master's thesis, a pragmatic approach will be used to solve the research questions. Both an inductive and deductive method, where the interaction between the two, will produce the best results which will inform an answer to the research questions. According to Postholm and Jacobsen (2018), an educational researcher should be pragmatic, as unexpected experiences can prove or disapprove what is being researched. The focus on concept validity will have high priority when writing this thesis, and transparency throughout the whole project is important to show and

describe which decisions will be made and why. Ethical considerations will be taken at all stages of this master's thesis, in line with Pring (2015). It is an educational research paper involving human beings, and the respect of their integrity, freedom and co- determination will be highly valued.

This project will hopefully be a useful contribution to educational research, with an insight into how teachers' formative assessment practices of the English subject in year groups 5, 6 and 7 have changed, and if it has indeed changed. This thesis can be useful for policy makers, university lecturers, student teachers and others who are interested in educational research and formative assessment practices in the English subject.

It is important to note that this study was completed in the backdrop of the pandemic. This may have affected the findings of this research. In Norway the pandemic caused schools to close for physical lessons on 12th March 2020, lessons were organised digitaly for a longer period of time. Even after schools reopened, the organisation of lessons were affected, and many students continued to have distance learning. This will therefore be discussed in the findings of this thesis (Wolden, 2020).

It is my aim that teachers will become more aware of their own formative assessment practices by reading this master's thesis and in this way help their students improve their oral and written skills in the English subject. In line with Creswell (2012) research can help us gain more knowledge, develop practices and the results from research are often useful and constructive information in political debates. Research is important to make the educational change that is needed in society. According to Burner (2018) educational change is complex and contextual, as many parts must

work together to make it function. Burner says that education forms people, who in turn form the people around them (Burner, 2018, p.132).

1.5 Outline of the Thesis

This master's thesis is structured into five parts, where each chapter is divided into sub-sections. The first chapter has introduced the importance of formative assessment and educational change in English didactics, the research gap, the research questions and the aim of this project. Chapter two will present and discuss theory relevant to formative assessment and educational change. In the third chapter the method and material of the thesis will be presented and discussed, while the findings from the interview will be presented and discussed in chapter four. Chapter five will sum up the findings of this study and make implications for further research.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to present theory and research connected to formative assessment practices and educational change. The aim of this literature review is to create the foundation for the following chapters, where the empirical findings will be discussed in the light of the theory. The chapter is divided into the sub-chapters: Definition of terms, Research on formative assessment, Formative assessment in policy documents, Formative assessment practices, and Theory on educational change.

First the relevant terms will be explained. Formative and summative assessment, assessment for learning and assessment of learning are expressions that are of high relevance for this thesis. Language teaching, metacognition and teaching strategies are also keywords that will be described. In the literature review, the research on formative assessment and educational change will be outlined and discussed to explain the relevance to this thesis.

2.2 Definition of Terms

2.2.1 Formative and Summative Assessment

The terms *formative and summative assessment* were first introduced in 1967 by Michael Scriven, but it was D. Royce Sadler's article *"Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems"* (1989) which has been central in the development of a theoretical framework for formative assessment. This article has been referred to by many recent researchers, amongst them, Black and Wiliam. They oversaw the Assessment Reform Group, formed to focus on formative assessment and try to get out of the test regime and "teach to the test" culture for which the British school system has been criticised.

Scriven (1967) used the expressions formative and summative assessment in relation to curriculum and learning programs which were product related, while Benjamin Bloom (1969) was the first to use these terms in relation to student assessments (Popham, 2008, p.4). According to Scriven (1967) formative assessment is the assessment given during a learning process, where the aim is to develop or improve, while summative assessment focuses on the result rather than the learning process. The expressions do not refer to the assessments themselves, but the functions they have. As a result, a test can be both formative and summative (Wiliam & Leahy, 2007. p.39). The difference concerns the intention behind the assessment, not different forms of assessment (Dysthe 2008). A test or task can be used for formative assessment or as a summative assessment.

2.2.2 Assessment for Learning and Assessment of Learning

The Assessment Reform Group (henceforth ARG) used the phrase *Assessment for Learning* (henceforth AfL) to describe formative assessment while *Assessment of Learning* refers to summative assessment. Gordon Stobart (2008) introduced the term AfL to clarify the function of formative assessment. According to the ARG AfL "is the process of seeking and interpreting evidence for use by learners and their teachers to decide where the learners are in their learning, where they need to go, and how best to get there" (ARG, 2002).

The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training (henceforth NDET) looked to the ARG group in Britain and Michael Fullan's theories on educational change, which also the Scottish Assessment Is For Learning Development Programme (2000 – 2008)

is based on. NDET made AfL a four-year commitment from 2010 to 2014, which got extended to a further four-year process until 2018. The NDET published a final report in 2018 which concluded on the process of the implementation of AfL in Norwegian Schools (NDET, 2018).

2.2.3 Self-regulation, Metacognition, Motivation and Teaching Strategies

Self-regulation and metacognition are important terms within formative assessment. *Self-regulation* is the ability to take appropriate choices, to show effort and have purposeful aims. The key is to think before you act. *Metacognition* is about reflecting over your own learning and development and to be able to see your own learning process. The teacher's role is to guide the students to practice assessing themselves to achieve self-regulation and metacognition, which are both tools to support their learning.

Black and Wiliam (2012) claim that metacognition is an important dimension of learning. Wang, Haertel and Walberg (1990) conducted a study where they stated metacognition to be an important indicator of learning. Metacognition was first defined as "the knowledge about and regulations of one's cognitive activities in the learning process" (Flavell, 1979). Metacognitive awareness is according to the British Council (2008) the awareness of how you think.

Inner motivation has a huge effect on learning. According to the motivation researchers Ryan and Deci (2000) students can achieve *autonomy*, when they get the chance to say what they think, come with suggestions and make their own decisions. According to Borg (2003) autonomy in the context of foreign language learning, involves both the process of learning a foreign language and learning to learn. Little

(2009) states that "learner autonomy is the product of interactive, collaborative processes that depend on the teacher's expertise for their shape and direction" (Little, 2009). Here we can see that Vygotsky's social-constructivist theory of learning is relevant. Vygotsky's (1978) belief that learning is dependent on interaction with other peers and teachers is clear in this statement, as well as his theory of the zone of proximal development. Haukås (2012) did a study of Norwegian teachers' conception of *learning strategies* which showed that many teachers were aware of the strategies, but the lack of metacognitive strategies were present. The study revealed the missing part as the students were allowed to plan, control and evaluate their own learning. To have the ability to choose and evaluate one's strategies is a central part of learning. This is relevant for teachers to know when doing formative assessments.

2.2.4 Feedback

Feedback is an important part of the formative assessment process. According to Black and Wiliam (1998) feedback is about the quality of the student's work. In the feedback the teacher or another co-student should give advice on what to improve. It is important that the students do not compare themselves to fellow students. Hattie and Timperley (2007) wrote the article *"The Power of Feedback"* where they stated that feedback is one of the most powerful influences on learning and achievement, but they claim that feedback can be either positive or negative. It is how this assessment process is carried out that is therefore a crucial part of how teachers interact with students. According to Brookhart "feedback can be very powerful if done well" (Brookhart, 2008, p.2). If the teachers use the feedback in a constructive and good way, the students will get motivated and learn more. In the following section the research on feedback and formative assessment will be looked further into.

2.3 Research on Formative Assessment

It is the teachers' change of formative assessment practices that will be investigated in this thesis. To get an overview of the relevant research within formative assessment it is relevant to be able to have a solid theoretical foundation to argue the findings upon. Research creates knowledge, which is necessary to consider when doing empirical and educational work.

The development of assessment has gone from giving feedback on mistakes to giving feedback on positive achievements. To make mistakes is a part of learning, and when learning a new language, trying and failing is necessary to become better. Bloom (1969) emphasises the importance of looking for students' mistakes and how to correct them. Bloom's taxonomy is his famous hierarchical models on educational learning objectives. He has developed three models where the learning objectives are divided into cognitive, affective and sensory domain. The cognitive learning model has been used in educational curriculum planning.

The aim of feedback is to fill the gap between what you know and what you would like to learn, which is in line with Ramaprasad (1983). According to Sadler (1989) feedback is not effective unless it changes the students' performance. He emphasises the importance of the students having to understand what the feedback means. The teacher needs to have a system to monitor the students' progress. This is to make sure learning takes place and that the students develop their skills. Sadler outlines the difference between feedback and self-monitoring. Both are part of formative assessment and the gap between what you know and what you would like to learn needs to be closed. Feedback is external information given to the student, while self-monitoring is a process where the student can use the relevant information to improve.

The students need to understand the feedback given. The aim is for the student to go from receiving feedback to self-monitoring (Sadler, 1989).

Kluger and DeNisi (1996) did a meta-analysis of three thousand variable studies on the effects of feedback interventions on performance. They found that personal feedback had no effect on learning, while specific feedback that was task related had an enormous effect. In their research they found that feedback, which is task based, combined with clear aims on how to reach the learning targets, has an effect size of D=0.4. In educational research the digits 0.2, 0.4 and 0.6 are used to indicate small, medium and large effects. This effect size shows that it has a medium impact on the learning. If students receive specific feedback about their task, not on them as persons, Kluger and DeNisi claim that their meta-study can make the students between six and eight months ahead in their learning at school (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996).

Black and Wiliam (1998) were the lead researchers within the Assessment Reform Group. The group was founded in England in the late 1990s to conduct research on the consequences of assessment. The research project was named *"Inside the Black Box- Raising Standards through classroom assessment"*. According to ARG the educational and political system in England had treated the classroom like a black box. The politicians were interested in results, without documenting the consequences such focus on results could have for students' learning. Black and Wiliam (1998) wanted to find out what creates learning. They asked three questions. 1: Is there evidence that improving formative assessment raises standards? 2: Is there evidence that there is room for improvement? 3: Is there evidence about how to improve formative assessment? By looking through 160 research magazines from nine years

back in time, they found 580 articles on assessment. They used 250 of these sources and published an article in Assessment in Education. The sources clearly show that they could give positive answers to all three questions. 1: Systematic use of feedback that points in a forward direction, telling the students what to do, has a positive effect on learning. Low performing students benefit especially from this, which will raise the level in the class. 2: According to Black and Wiliam there is a need to improve the assessment practices in many classrooms due to several issues. Tests can tend to reward memorising and learning that only touch the surface. Questions and other methods used to assess the students are not always shared amongst the teachers. Results can be used to praise competence instead of personal development and progress. The emphasis on grades and results often has a high priority compared to analysing the information about the students' competence. 3: Black and Wiliam emphasise three main points that should be considered to improve the assessment practice in the classroom: the students' self-esteem, self-assessment and the development of effective teaching. If the focus is on ranking the students, they can aim for the best results without considering their own learning needs. Comparisons on levels can lead to negative consequences for the student's self-esteem. Black and Wiliam (1998) emphasise the importance of the students getting an overview of their own learning, what they are going to achieve. The students need to know what they need to learn, where they stand compared to what they are going to learn and what they must do to close the gap between these (Sadler, 1989, p.121). When using self-assessment and reflection of their own learning the students can get a better understanding of where they stand. Effective teaching can occur when the task in the teaching is justified by learning aims, as well as the students get involved in the planning processes of their own learning. (Black & Wiliam, 1998) In their research,

22

Black and Wiliam (1998) found the effect size of feedback to be between D=0.4 and D=0.7, that indicate a medium to large impact on learning. This illustrates how important feedback is, and the huge difference it can make to students who receive feedback and those who do not. They found that students that do not compare themselves with others, but focus on their own work, have more success.

"The Power of Feedback" was a meta study conducted by Hattie and Timperley (2007), where thousands of studies were analysed. They found an effect size of 0.96, which is a high effect size. In their research they concluded that reward, praise and punishment had little effect on learning, while reinforcement on what the student had already done well had a great effect on the learning outcome. They suggested that effective feedback should be divided into three parts: Feed up, feed back and feed forward. Feed up is to clarify the goal, where am I going? Feed back respond to the student's work, how am I going? Feed forward is to modify the instructions, where to next?

Hattie and Timperley (2007) did overview research to better understand what characterises useful, neutral, less useful and damaging feedback. They found that useful feedback is clear, selective and constructive. The timing of it is also important to have an effect, that the feedback is given not long after the task is done. The feedback must tell the student what needs done to improve. It is important to focus on the product rather than the person. According to Hattie and Timperley's research (2007), person focused feedback has little effect on students' improvement. The feedback given must be at a level where the student understands what is going to be done to improve. A good relation between the student and teacher has a huge impact

on the learning process. If the feedback is given late, it has less effect on the student's learning.

According to Wiliam and Thompson (2007) formative assessment can be divided into five different strategies. The first strategy is aiming oriented education, where clear aims and assessment criteria are being prepared. The second strategy is meaningful teaching. Here efficient classroom discussions take place and good assessment tasks for documentation of the students' skills are used. The third strategy is teacher assessment, which involves feedback that promote learning. The fourth strategy is to assess a fellow student. The students are activated as resources for one another's learning. The last strategy is self-assessment, where the student's ability to learn how to learn gets activated.

The relation between the teacher and student plays an important role on the progression of the student's learning. It is highly relevant that the teachers know the students they are teaching. In this way the students get feedback at a level they understand, and the teachers know what can be said or not, for the students to learn, not get offended and make progression with their work. Burner (2016) emphasises the importance of the students being a part of the formative assessment process. Some students have best use of written feedback, while others prefer oral feedback to be able to improve. The teacher needs to check that the students follow up the feedback, understand it and improve their work, by closing the gap of what they know and would like to learn. There is a gap between teacher and student, and between students when it comes to formative assessment. Burner asked both teachers and students about their assessment practices in his PhD. The teachers reported that they spent a lot of time on assessments, and claimed they had a good assessment practice. The

students however, said they received a lot of negative feedback from the teachers, and they were unsure of how to follow them up. Burner did observations to find out more on what they had reported. He found that the students were right. The teachers gave feedback on spelling mistakes and often focused on mistakes (Burner, 2016). Burner emphasises the importance of giving feedback on what is relevant for the student to get feedback on. It is necessary to focus on only a few points. In this way the student has a chance to adjust and be able to change the work. If there are too many corrections, the work will seem demotivating and difficult for the student to work on. A few relevant and concise points to work on, will help the student to move forward with the progress.

The way the teachers give feedback should be suitable for the students that are receiving the feedback. Students are different, and the way everyone learns, can differ from student to student. Some students prefer a lot of feedback, while others need just a little to concentrate on. If it is written or oral feedback or both also depends on the student. A good piece of advice for the teacher to make the student become a better receiver of the feedback, is to ask the students how they prefer to have the feedback presented. Students value being listened to and having the ability to influence their learning process. According to Burner (2016) , students do value formative assessment practices. High performing students adjust better to formative assessment practices, but also students who are weaker learners, profit on these practices. The teachers need to take time to give the students a chance to improve their work. When the teacher allows more focus on working on the feedback given in the classroom, the students will look at their feedback, talk to the teacher and have a better possibility to understand the feedback. It is better to focus on fewer projects to give feedback on and improve this work (Burner, 2016). Individually tailored feedback that Burner

refs to is ideal, however, teachers are not always afforded the time for this (Grocott, 2022).

2.4 Strategies to Transfer Oral Skills into Written Skills

The second sub-question in this master's thesis is "Which formative assessment practices do English teachers report implementing in order to help the students transfer their oral skills to develop written skills in the English subject." To be able to answer this question, which will be done at a later stage, in chapter four and five, theory that build upon this question will be investigated.

In Norwegian year groups 5, 6 and 7 where the English subject is being taught, most students manage to communicate in English. Many students can speak advanced English, but it does not necessarily mean that their writing is brilliant (Raaheim et al., 2005). To transfer their oral skills into written skills is a task for the teacher to facilitate, so that the students can become good writers. Both oral and written skills are important for EFL teaching and language teaching in general. Which skill is being used is dependent on the situation and the activity taking place. This is in line with Cambourne and Turbill (1987) and Hudelson (1989). According to the literacy researchers Shanahan and Shanahan (2014) the school needs to teach specialised ways to read, understand, think and write in every subject, not only English. Writing is a core skill that helps the students to learn the subject and it is used to show competence in the subject. The students need to get systematic and explicitly education of writing in different genres.

The genre pedagogy was developed in Australia, four decades ago. The aim was to give students with different school- and socio-economic backgrounds the chance to better master texts they read and write at school (Cope & Kalantzis, 2012). The circle

for education and learning is a didactical model closely related to genre pedagogical thinking. The Norwegian model is developed by the Norwegian Centre of Writing at NTNU (NTNU, 2021). The model is meant to be used to create a tight bond between education, learning and assessment. According to Angvik (2022) it must be used in a dynamic way, where the teacher can adjust the four sections; to build knowledge, to deconstruct model texts, to construct text in a community/write a text together, to write individually and become an individual writer. The teacher will adjust the stages depending on the level the students are at and what the aim of the education is. The assessment must always be an essential part of the circle model, both in the planning and the implementation of a teaching plan.

The first component in the circle for education and learning is *To Build Knowledge*. This is a pre-writing stage where the students work to develop the technical terms and relevant concepts related to the theme they are working on, to then be able to later use it in their texts. Both oral and written work, individual and co-operational ways to work will help the students to get to know the subject language in the classroom. In this way the teacher will get information on where the students are in their learning process and help them progress. At this stage it can be important to develop the writing situation together with the students in plural, for example by analysing or understanding the assignment text. To do this together as a group, all students will be assured what exactly is asked of them in the text and they will get a picture of what the working process will look like. When the assessment is an integrated part of the education, the information from the teacher, co-operative assessment and self-assessment will give the students opportunities to adjust the direction of the text. In this way they answer what the text asks for and what they get assessed at (Angvik, 2022).

The second component in the circle for education and learning is *To Deconstruct Model Texts*. To take apart or deconstruct the example texts can make the students get a better understanding of the construction of the texts they are going to create themselves. The teachers know well which components are significant for a text of good quality, but it is useful for the students to have an exploratory approach to the text. In this way they will learn a lot about how to compose their own texts. It is also useful for the students when the teacher points out for them exactly what makes an introduction to a text effective, precise, engaging or informative. This stage of the writing process involves building up an explicit and common language for how the text is put together, what the aim is of each part of the text and how the technical terms are used in the text. (NTNU, 2021)

The third component in the circle for education and learning is *To Construct Texts Together*. There are different ways of organising writing together. An example can be where the teacher models the text first and the students follow the teacher's thinking by what he or she is saying and explaining about the text on the screen (NTNU, 2021). To give the students a metalanguage is important, so that the students can use a language to talk about their own writing and learning when they assess other and their own learning to develop their writing processes (Eritsland, 2008).

The fourth component in the circle model is *Individual Writing*. When the students are going to produce their own texts, it is important that they have been through good pre-activities first. Assessment conversations throughout the duration of the course can promote learning and help the students become better writers of English. If the students get the chance to use the assessment language through self-assessment and assessing each other, it will be easier for them to look at the texts with a critical view.

To give feedback like this and to be able to produce their own texts requires teachers that are guiding them throughout the process. The aim is for the students to become independent and regulate their own learning (Angvik, 2022).

In 2003 an expert group was put together to develop national writing tests based on a new understanding of writing. Thygesen, Evensen, Berge, Vagle and Fasting (2003) were in this group, and they developed a writing wheel. This is a visual model meant to help people to see different sides of writing and what writing can be used for in society and in education. The wheel of writing has been a base for the curriculum, and it describes how we can use writing as a core skill (Berge et al., 2017).

The text triangle is a tool that can help assessing the writing of texts. The text triangle is originally inspired by the American researcher Hillocks (1997) and was brought to Norway and translated into Norwegian by Hoel (2000) (Dysthe et al, 2010). This text triangle is highly relevant to use also in the English subject. The triangle indicates which levels we are assessing at when giving feedback on writing. It illustrates the different levels of the text. The levels at the bottom of the triangle such as "spelling, punctuation and grammar", "choice of words" and "sentences" are at a local level of assessment. The levels higher up are "organising of the content" and "genre", which belong on a global level. The highest global level is "the writing situation", where the "aim, sender, social and cultural framework" is captured. According to Burner (2020), language teachers are often giving feedback on the lower local levels, while the aim is to give feedback on both local and global levels.

According to Harlen (2007) the teacher should use different methods to collect proofs on where the students are in relation to a competence aim. Harlen (2007) and Davies (2007) made a model where observation, dialogue and production of the students'

work are three ways of achieving information to find out where the students are in their learning. To combine some of these sources can also be beneficial. *Observations* can be conducted to assess reading skills, oral skills, communicative skills and co-operational work. Formative assessment can also be collected through *dialogue* such as conversations in group or pair-work in the classroom, and systematic conversations with the students. When the teacher invites the students to talk about their own learning, they think and express themselves, which is evidence for what they understand and what they know, in line with Davies (2007). Harlen (2007) claims this is a good argument for why students should give assessments to each other and self-assessment. Student work is an obvious source to draw formative assessment on, such as texts, presentations, information from project work, or national tests. Davies (2007) suggests asking these questions in connection with observations: What is the aim of this activity? What do I want to focus on in this observation? How should I collect and organise my observations in a way where they become constructive? When the teacher asks these questions, and use dialogue, observation and student's work to collect evidence to formatively assess the students, to achieve effective learning.

2.5 Metacognition

The third sub-question "Which formative assessment practices do English teachers report implementing in order to give the students clarity regarding their level of oral and written skills in English and what they are going to achieve?'' is linked to metacognition. According to Flavell (1979), who is considered the foundation researcher of the field, "Metacognition is the knowledge you have of your own cognitive process (your thinking)" (Flavell, 1979, p.906). In relation to this thesis, it is how the teachers manage to activate the students' ability to think about their own learning process in the English subject. When the teachers understand that clear aims and forward

feedback is required to reach effective learning, as well as the teachers include the students in their learning processes the students will develop an understanding of their own learning. This is in line with Hattie and Timperley (2007), Black and Wiliam (1998) and Wiliam and Thompson's (2007) research.

The formative assessment practice self-assessment especially requires metacognition, as the students must assess themselves to be aware of what choices they made in their learning processes. Both positive and negative choices made, will be a development for learning. According to the Common European Framework of References "autonomous learning can be promoted if 'learning to learn' is regarded as an integral part of language learning" (CEFR, 2007, p.141).

When the students receive feedback, either oral or written, the students must decide what to do with it. Stobart (2008) compares the feedback to a gift from the teacher, where the student needs to put an action into what to do with the feedback. The teachers cannot make sure the students learn from the feedback, but when the feedback is given at their right level, and at the right time, there is a higher chance of understanding. This is in line with Vygotsky's ZPD (1978). The teacher's job is according to Harmer (2001) to help the students reflect on the way they learn, and to give them strategies on how to deal with activities and problems that occur.

Vygotsky (1978) did research on children's social interactions with others, and how language development arises from this interaction. He observed them in interaction with both children and adults and found that: "The distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p.86). Vygotsky (1978)

describes two different levels: One level that is known and one that is unknown. The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is the name of the gap that students need assistance with, to be able to develop. The teacher's job is to assure that the students get feedback and work within their ZPD, to be able to understand and challenge themselves with a little bit of help. The teacher also needs to facilitate by using co-activities, such as group work and peer-work where students can learn from more knowledgeable students.

Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976) are credited with the term *scaffolding*. This is an essential field within language learning, where the *"adult controlling those elements of the task that are essentially beyond the learner's capacity, thus permitting him to concentrate upon and complete only those elements that are within his range of competence"* (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976, p.9). The scaffolding is the security net the teacher or another student who have higher capacity creates by helping the student. Students who get given work at their right level can successfully manage with a little help from a teacher or a fellow student who is, in this case, stronger English speakers and writers. Both by using scaffolding and Vygotsky's ZPD the students can achieve *autonomy*, which Borg (2003) describes in the context of language teaching to be connected to both the process of learning a foreign language and the learning to learn. The latter process is metacognition, which is highly relevant for the teachers to be aware of to activate the students within formative assessment practices where they must reflect on their own learning. When the students practice metacognitive activities regularly, they can become more independent in their learning in the English subject.

2.6 Formative Assessment in Policy Documents

The first sub-question in this study is: Has the introduction of LK20 affected the teachers' formative assessment practices? It is necessary to investigate the current curriculum, LK20, what it states about formative assessment, but also the education act, which is the governing act. This section is divided into the sub chapters: LK20 is influenced by international research and education is formed by policy, Traces of formative assessment in previous curricula, Formative assessment in LK20 and Formative assessment in the education act. As it is the change of formative assessment practices that is going to be investigated, I find it relevant to explain what traces of formative assessment exist in previous curricula.

2.6.1 LK20 is Influenced by International Research and Education is Formed by Policy

National curricula are policy based. The Norwegian curriculum follows international educational research, such as ARG when it comes to assessment and Fullan's theories on change and development in schools (NDET, 2018, p.7). As society and educational needs change, the importance of adjusting the curricula is continuously applicable. The parliament may require the government to establish a committee to publish a *Norwegian Official Report (NOU)*. The aim of these reports is to present and discuss the knowledge and possible achievements of strategies to develop and improve the educational system. The Ludvigsen group is an example of such an expert team for the current curriculum, LK20. They looked to the *Common European Framework of References (CEFR)* when developing the English subject for LK20. The CEFR is a framework of references for learning, teaching and assessment of foreign languages. It is developed by the Council of Europe and is used as a guideline to describe achievements of learners of foreign languages. It categorises the language

proficiencies into six levels: A1 and A2 (basic user), B1 and B2 (independent user) and C1 and C2 (proficient user) (Council of Europe, 2020).

The *European language portfolio* (ELP) which is developed by the Council of Europe, can be a useful tool to document students' language learning and reflections (Little, 1999). It is divided into three parts: a language passport, a language biography and a dossier. In the first part the students make their own profile, where they describe their proficiency in the different languages and do a self-assessment grid on their listening, reading, spoken interaction, spoken production and writing skills. The second part, the language biography, is meant to develop greater language awareness. Here the students must plan, reflect and assess on their language learning and process. The last part, the dossier is where the students collect evidence of their language learning over time. Teachers are free to use any of the parts in the ELP, depending on what needs to be assessed. It is important to adapt the forms to the context where they are used (Council of Europe, 2020).

The *Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)* is an international organisation where governments work together to improve and make standards within many fields. They work to find solutions to common challenges, develop global standards, share experiences and identify best practices to promote better policies for better lives. Education is an important area on OECD's agenda (OECD, 2022). OECD has developed the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) which has been used as an indicator to compare the education level amongst the participating countries. The subjects the PISA test covers are reading, mathematics and science. It has in recent years been criticised for how the statistics have been read. The relevance of what it is testing, both on an educational

and subject matter has also been questioned. The standard of the test changes as it tries to keep up with social and economic challenges (Pring, 2015, p.193). According to Sjøberg (2014) the PISA test is a power policy instrument, where OECD has got the power that trumps national curriculums and aims.

It is important to emphasise that this is not a test which is used as formative assessment in English as a foreign language for year groups 5, 6 and 7, and is not directly relevant towards this master's thesis, but OECD as an organisation is worth mentioning because of the power it has towards Norwegian school politics. Pring (2015) underlines that political reactions often reflects how research gets ignored to suit political positions rather than to follow evidence-based policy. Pring (2015) comments on British politics, but this is an international phenomenon, and is also relevant in Norwegian school politics.

2.6.2 Traces of Formative Assessment in the English Subject in Previous Curricula

The history of English language education in Norway has been marked by several changes in the curriculum and teaching methods. In 1939, English was an optional subject in the *Normalplan.* The cities in Norway made English compulsory, while the countryside kept it optional. In some areas, students needed basic English knowledge to get into grammar school. In 1959, English became compulsory throughout Norway in a new nine-year compulsory school system. However, the focus was on practical skills, and oral language was difficult to teach, so it was narrowed down to reading aloud from textbooks. Vocabulary tests were used to introduce new words, leading to constructed texts that lacked authenticity. The teachers were required to have good language skills, but not all did, resulting in repetitive teaching methods (Fenner, 2018).

The M 87 curriculum emphasized the communicative approach, stressing the use of language for different purposes. Making mistakes was considered an acceptable way of learning English, and students were taught correct English without knowing all the grammatical rules. This curriculum encouraged creativity in both learners and teachers and introduced local teaching material, allowing students to talk about familiar topics and learn about their own culture. Mixed-ability teaching was emphasized, with tasks suitable for individual levels. The L97 curriculum had a communicative aspect as its base, with language viewed as an instrument to communicate and understand the world around us. English was introduced from Year 1, and literature was reintroduced into the curriculum, emphasizing reading and writing in a variety of genres. Project work was a significant theme in L97, and theme and project-oriented teaching were ideal, with cross-curricular teaching desirable. Learner autonomy was introduced, with students expected to reflect on their own learning and become more independent language learners (Drew & Sørheim, 2011). The LK06 curriculum was heavily influenced by the CEFR and focused on competence aims and communication, with a higher emphasis on students developing their awareness as language learners. The curriculum did not mention teaching materials, only competence aims, with each municipality or school expected to develop its own local plan (Drew & Sørheim, 2011).

2.6.3 Formative Assessment in LK20

The current Norwegian curriculum is called the knowledge promotion of 2020 (LK20). It is structured in a core curriculum, a subject- and lesson distribution and a curriculum for each subject. These three parts are all regulations for the Education Act and are going to determine the content of the education (MER, 2019; NDET, 2017). LK20 started its implementation in primary and secondary schools in August 2020. At the end of the school year 2022-23 classes from year 1 in primary until year 3 in

upper secondary, will be entitled to follow the new curriculum. The process of developing and implementing the new curriculum is named *Fagfornyelsen*, the subject renewal. The name of the new curriculum is *Kunnskapsløftet LK20*, which means the knowledge promotion. With the current curriculum, LK20, formative assessment has been emphasised to a higher degree. It was first introduced in the Education Act of 2009, before it was revised in 2013. But in LK20 it is stated that students from year 1 and onwards are entitled to be formatively assessed (NDET, 2017; MER, 2019; The Education Act, 1998).

LK20 has brought in three interdisciplinary topics, which are health and life skills, democracy and citizenship and sustainable development. These are also relevant in the English subject, and the first two are emphasised in the English curriculum. Health and life skills in the English subject are covered by the students being able to express themselves and their feelings using their knowledge about the English language and cultural competence to build up a positive self-esteem and a safe identity. The teaching of democracy and citizenship in English emphasises cultural awareness. By learning the English language, students will be introduced to cultures other than their own, and they will develop the understanding of the world as culturally based. To learn how to communicate with people from all over the world, and get to know about different societies, the English subject is going to prevent stereotypical thinking and it will aim to prejudice (MER, 2019, p.3).

In the English subject, the curriculum, LK20, is structured into three parts. These are: *About the subject, Competence aims and assessment and Type of assessment. About the subject* covers Relevance and central values, Core elements, Interdisciplinary topics and Basic skills. The first part explains the reason why students are learning

English at school and the values of the English subject. The core elements are Communication, Language learning, and Working with texts in English. In the communications part it is stated both that "The pupils shall employ suitable strategies to communicate, both orally and in writing, in different situations and by using different types of media and sources" and "The teaching shall give the pupils the opportunity to express themselves and interact in authentic and practical situations*"* (MER, 2019, p.2). The first quote explains that the students need to learn strategies to communicate in different situations. It is the teacher's responsibility to facilitate and make sure the students get this practise and get the chance to obtain these skills. This is in line with Black and Wiliam's research (Black & Wiliam, 1998). The last quote points at the teacher's role of letting the students interact in situations that are authentic and practical. Language learning is according to LK20, language awareness and knowledge of how to develop English as a system. The ability to use language learning strategies is also emphasised. Metacognition is relevant in connection with the learning strategies, where the students become aware of their own learning processes. In the part, *Working with texts in English*, it is stated that the concept of text is used in a broad sense. By working, reflecting, interpreting and critically assessing different types of texts, the aim is to make the students seeing their own identity and others' identities in a multilingual and multicultural context. The interdisciplinary topics health and life skills and democracy and citizenship are, as already mentioned, applicable in the English subject. By learning English and handling situations where they need linguistic and cultural competence, the students can develop a positive self-image and a secure identity, which are positive health and life skills. In democracy and citizenship, the aim of learning English, and be able to communicate with people of different culture and language backgrounds can open

students' views on the world. This can help to prevent prejudices (MER, 2019, p.2-4) Formative assessment is necessary in order to be able to reach these aims.

The four basic skills in the English subject are Oral skills, Writing, Reading and Digital skills. They are the last part of the *About the subject* section. The next part is *Competence aims and assessment*, where they are specified after year 2, 4, 7,10, Vg1 vocational education programmes and Vg1 programme for general studies. The formative assessment after year 7 will be emphasised here, as they fit the year groups the research question covers. It is necessary to keep in mind the competence aims and formative assessment suitable for lower and higher levels too, as the students are required to get taught at their level, despite their age group. In LK20 it is stated that "formative assessment shall help to promote learning and develop competence in the subject" (MER, 2019, p.8). In LK20 it is stated that the teacher shall facilitate for different formative assessments. These are student participation, co-operation, dialogue between teacher and student, and self-assessment. It is emphasised that it is the teacher that shall facilitate for student participation. The students shall be able to work both on their own and together with others when learning English. The teacher is entitled to start a dialogue with the student on the student's development in English. The students shall "have the opportunity to express what they believe they have achieved and how they have improved their skills ". The teacher is also responsible for guiding the students to use their formative assessment skills to develop their basic skills in the subject (MER, 2019, p.8).

The language is clear in the curriculum, where it says shall and not can. The teachers must make sure that the formative assessment described in LK20 will be implemented in their classrooms. We can see that Hattie and Timperley (2007) and Black and

Wiliam's (1998) research are visible in the current curricula, which the four principles below state:

The four principles of formative assessment says that students and apprentices learn more and better when they 1) know what they should learn and what is expected of them 2) receive feedback on the quality of their work or achievements 3) are given advice on how they can improve 4) are involved in their own learning by assessing their own work, competencies and academic development (NDET, 2018, p.5).

2.6.4 Formative Assessment in the Education Act

The regulation of formative assessment is legally binding. It was first introduced in August 2009, and then revised in 2013. Formative- and summative assessment is included in every subject of the current curriculum of LK20. In the third chapter of the Education Act it is stated in §3-5 that year groups1-7 will be assessed without grades given.

Formative assessment was first mentioned in the regulation to the Education Act which was applicable from 1st August 2009. In the regulation to the Education Act in Norway of 2021, formative assessment is pointed out in chapter three. It is stated that students have the right to formative assessment (§3-2). The purpose of the assessment is to promote learning and help the students develop the desire to learn as they are in a learning process. The teacher must give information about the students' competence in the subject, so that the student can improve and get to know how to do so. The foundation of the assessment is the competence aims in the curriculum in the subject. The aims must be seen in the light of the text about the subject in the curriculum. (§3-3) The students have the right to have at least one conversation per half a year with the teacher about their development in the subject (§3-7) (The Education Act, 1998).

In formative assessment in subjects, students have to a) Take part in the evaluation of their own work and reflect over their own learning and the development in the subject. b) Understand what they are going to learn and what is expected of them. c) Get information about what they master. d) Get good advice on how to develop their competence. When the assessment information is used to make progress to develop learning and adapt the teaching for each student, it is called assessment for learning (The Education Act, 1998).

The students manage to learn more and better when they understand what they are going to learn and what is expected of them, (§3-1, §4-1) when the feedback tells them about the quality of their work or their achievements (§3-11,3-13, 3-14, §4-2), when they get advice on how they can improve their work (§3-11, §3-13, §3-13, §3-14, §4-2) and when the students are involved in their own work by assessing their own work, their own competence and their development in the subject. (§3-12, §4-8) (The Education Act, 1998).

The Education Act from 1998 is the one that is still applicable today, though it has been revised regularly since then. According to NDET it is has been revised more than annually since 1998. The new paragraph in the Education Act about student participation will take effect in August 2024. Handal (2023), the leader of the Norwegian teaching union, Utdanningsforbundet, commented on the suggestions the current government has presented about more student participation in the coming paragraph in the Education Act. He said to the teaching magazine, ''Utdanning'', that participation means both rights and duties, and it can only happen within a common framework. Handal (2023) empahsised that the lack of teaching competence can lead to misunderstood student participation. He said that there is no guarantee that the new

Education Act will give better student participation, but to make it functional two assumptions need to be in place: To make sure that there are teachers with teaching education in the schools and that there are greater room for action and exercise of discretion in the classroom (Handal, 2023, p.48, my translation). What Handal (2023) comments on here, is tightly linked to how formative assessment practices can be possible to perform in the future. According to NDET, the aim of the renewal is that the new Education Act will be more up to date, available and more suitable for the society we have today (Handal, 2023, p.48).

2.7 Formative Assessment Practices

In this thesis the focus is to look at the change of the teachers' formative assessment practices. It is necessary to look at the different types of formative assessment, to better understand the concept. Self-assessment, formative feedback, process writing, peer-assessment and portfolio assessment are all relevant formative assessment practices in the English lessons of year groups 5, 6 And 7. Burner (2020) points out that formative assessment is not something the teacher does in addition to the normal teaching, but as an integral part to promote learning.

2.7.1 Self-Assessment

In LK20 it is stated that students are going to be more active in their learning processes. They have got the right to take part in the assessments of their own development and to make an ownership to their own learning. This is made visual in the four principles for formative assessment in LK20. Despite this, the student survey (elevundersøkelsen) indicates that the students have a low impression of participation in the planning of their studies. According to Black and Wiliam (1998) and Hattie (2009) students at all ages can conduct self-assessment. When they assess themselves, the students are made aware of their strength and weaknesses in their learning

process. The teachers need to support the students by encouraging them for further development, and to challenge the students' reflections.

Burner (2016) compares Krashen's (1982) monitor hypothesis with the monitoring that happens when students reflect on their learning. Krashen (1982) illustrates the difference between language acquisition and language learning. The monitoring, which is the language learning, sometimes interfere with spontaneous language acquisition. When the students assess themselves, they assess their learning output, learning strategies and learning processes. Burner (2016) points out that self-assessment should be a post-classroom activity, to avoid the language monitor to interfere with spontaneous language acquisition. This is to avoid the students becoming stressed and make mistakes. The teacher needs to find the right balance for when the students should reflect over their language, and when to use it spontaneously.

In relation to *self-assessment* these questions are relevant to ask: What are you most satisfied with in your text? Give at least two examples. What did the teacher think you should improve? What did you change? What did you learn from the feedback you got? Burner emphasises the importance of asking the same questions after each work period, so that it becomes a routine. The students must look at the feedback given, and there need to be a system on how they work with their feedback. If the students are given these questions after each work section, and the teacher set of time in the lesson for them to do it, the students are made to look at and do something about the feedback given.

Burner (2020) emphasises that the purpose of self-assessment and teacher assessment of student texts is not to give the students the correct answers, but to make them

reflect and understand what is wrong and why. When correcting student texts, the teacher should pick out the most common mistakes, to guide the student how to improve these. To first make the students do this on their own, before being guided by a more capable peer, is in line with Vygotsky's theory on the Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978, p.86). The main point of self-assessment is according to Evensen (2021) to make the students more competent in English and raise the awareness of their own learning, and in this case more advanced users of the English language.

How self-assessment is used in the classroom can vary. Dysthe (2008) talks about a divide between short, intermediate and a long timespan. A short timespan can be within a lesson, the intermediate timespan can be a month and a long time- span would be a term or even a year or three. After a lesson the students can describe what they learnt or if they are more mature, and what learning strategies they used. When a longer time perspective is used, the student can take part in how they will prioritise the next terms or years in times of learning English. Evensen (2021) emphasises how important it is to consider the age of the students and how mature they are, where the youngest students work at shorter time- spans than older and more mature students. Year groups 5, 6. and 7 is a group where you find both mature and immature students. In general, they are capable of and should be taught to take more responsibility of their own learning, by being presented what is expected of them.

Hattie and Timperley (2007) point out the timing for when the students are working with self-assessment, and how it determines what the students must be aware of in the different processes. The questions naturally differs if they come in the pre-, during- or after- period of the working process. To reflect over what went well the last time they

did a similar project, can be a starting point, and they will learn by experience. Self-assessments can give the teachers an overview of how the students find their teaching. It makes the teachers aware of how the students look upon their own learning and experiences during the lessons. By using this information, the teachers can regulate their teaching to fit the student's level.

The motivation researchers Ryan and Deci (2000) outline how important the feeling of success is for learning. To focus on what the students manage to do, and what they will be able to do in the future, is a positive approach that will support learning. If students must look out for mistakes they have done, it does something with their self-esteem. In line with Evensen (2021), teachers should be aware of how self-assessments are used. If especially students that struggle with the subject, must assess themselves, having to range if they are low-middle or high performers, this will give them a focus of not being successful. It is better the teachers make them focus on their own performance rather than on what level they are. In this way the focus will be on learning. In year groups 5, 6 and 7 in Norway, the students are not given grades. This is first given in year 8. in Norway. But the use of grades has been toned down, compared to earlier years, as it was found the students did not listen to the feedback given when they were given grades. Burner (2016) has done research on this and is promoting secondary schools in Norway to use more formative assessment than grades. The focus of formative assessment has become stronger, at least at a formal level, such as the curriculum of LK20, to build the students' self-esteem and to encourage learning.

Hopfenbeck (2011) says that students can develop the ability of self-regulation through self-assessment. When the teacher supports and guides them through the

process of doing the right choices in their learning, the students will eventually know how to do this on their own. This is in line with Vygotsky's theory of the ZPD (1978). The aim is to practice with the students, to help them with what they need support on, and make them more independent in their learning processes. When the teacher works as a facilitator, the students get the chance to take a more active part in their own learning. When they are given model texts and clear instructions on what to do, it is easier for the students to navigate and to become self-regulated. This is in line with Black and Wiliam's research (1998).

Teachers should slowly introduce new learning strategies to the students. By practising them in lessons, the students can get confident using them. The teachers then introduce new strategies when the students are ready for it. Students can reflect over their choices of learning strategies and find out which strategies are smart to use in different situations. When students can evaluate their own choices, they can pick good learning strategies in other learning situations according to Evensen (2021).

2.7.2 Formative Feedback

Hattie and Timberley (2007) found that the quality of the feedback is what makes a difference if the feedback is to have any effect on improved learning. Many teachers spend hours on correcting texts, but then experience that the students still do the same mistakes over again (Lee, 2009). The English teacher and the students need to have the same understanding of what the aim of the task is, either it is a presentation or a written text. It is important the students know the criteria they get assessed at; The content, the form and the aim of doing the task. At a content level, it tells what the students are going to do. The form explains what kind of genre the students should practise. The last point is the aim of why the students are given this task. It is

46

important the teachers emphasise this, as it feels more meaningful for the students to work on a task when they understand why.

Kvithyld and Aasen (2011) have written an article where they emphasise five theses that are productive for teachers to use when giving formative feedback to students. It is emphasised that in all formative assessments, the students need to take part in the process of shaping the assessment criteria and to be fully aware of what they are before they start the projects. The five theses are: to give feedback during the writing process, the response needs to be selective, there must be a dialogue between the writer and the respondent, the response must be motivating for revision and the response need to be understandable and promote learning.

The feedback needs to be given during the process. If the feedback is going to have any effect, the students need to receive it while they are still in the learning process. The feedback can be given as oral or written feedback. It can be the English teachers, other students or the students themselves giving the formative assessment. Dysthe (2008) emphasises that the students must practise giving feedback to each other. They will then develop a metalanguage, which will make them able to reflect over their own learning and written texts in English. This is an example of in-depth learning. The quality of the text improves, the student achieve success, which will make the student able to adapt the knowledge into new learning situations. This is in line with Hattie and Timperley (2007), Black and Wiliam (1998) and the curriculum in English (ENG01-04) in LK20 (MER, 2019).

The feedback must be selective. The feedback students get need to be adjusted to the English levels the students are at. The positive feedback helps closing the gap between the level the students are at and the level they are going to achieve. It has

little or no effect to give feedback on something the student is far away from achieving. When giving feedback to students in year groups 5, 6 and 7 it is necessary to pick out some areas you want them to improve on. If the aim of the task is to practise argumentative texts, the focus on comma rules is not what needs to be the most dominant in the feedback.

The feedback must be a dialogue between the writer and the person giving the feedback. If a dialogue is made between the producer of the text and the one giving the feedback, it will make the student aware of where he or she is in the process. It can be a good idea to make an evaluation form or a log, where the students write what they are happy about, what was difficult and what needs to be worked more on. After, the student and the person giving the feedback have a conversation around these questions (Black & Wiliam, 1998;Burner, 2020, Hattie & Timperley, 2007)

The feedback must provide motivation for revision of the student's text. It is important to accept that writing is a time- consuming activity, and that texts can be improved to the better. For the students to revise their texts and improve, the feedback must give them motivation. To give constructive and good feedback, which is positive and useful, is necessary for the students to carry on. As a motivator, the teacher needs to look for the competence the student has and give clear and positive instructions on how to improve the text (Dysthe, 2008).

If the feedback is going to have any effect and promote learning, the students must understand the guidance they get. Research shows that many students do not understand the feedback they receive on their texts (Kronholm – Cederberg, 2009). There can be many reasons for this, such as lack of metalanguage or unclear feedback that is too general. Comments next to the text is easier for the students to understand,

than a general comment at the end. Also here, it is important to be clear and selective on what to comment. It is important to have a focus and give feedback on what is possible for the student to do something about, where it is at the level where the student understands what to do to improve. According to Pressley (2006), good teachers of writing, continuously create classroom conversations about writing and texts. This is done by looking at texts and discussing them. The teacher and students find out what kind of genre it is, discuss why the introduction, main part or conclusion is good or not, and why. In this way the students develop a metalanguage, and they will more easily understand feedback from others and are also more prepared to assess themselves.

2.7.3 Process Writing

Process writing is a type of formative assessment that can improve the students written skills in English. It is a process where the students write, get feedback, rewrite, revise and edit before publishing their final products. Burner (2020) points out that the teacher needs to be aware of which feedback is given at the different levels of the process. When the student has done the first draft, it is important not to be too critical and detailed, but praise what the student has managed well, and build upon this. Each level of the process writing needs adapted and differentiated feedback.

Dysthe is one of the pioneers within process writing in Norway. Process writing originated from the USA but became well known in Norwegian schools in the 1980s. Hertzberg and Dysthe (2012) have described the current process writing practices and perceptions in Norwegian schools. Some teachers claim it is old fashioned and many teachers find process writing to be very time-consuming. However, there is a high

learning potential in this way of formative assessment. Students improve their own texts by using the guidance and feedback made by teachers and learning partners. This is in line with Vygotsky's theory of ZPD (1978).

It is important that teachers give students good instructions on how to write and rewrite their texts. Also, the fact that they get time to revise. Time must be set aside to get this work done. When the students practise writing, they get better at it. Kvithyld and Aasen (2012) emphasise this and use the expression revision competence to describe the importance of the knowledge students gain by revising their texts, when the teacher's guide them in the right direction. Both Kvithyld and Aasen (2012) and Dysthe (2008) claim that feedback given to a text after the process has finished has no effect on learning. If the student is going to learn of the process, the student must be given constructive feedback that shows where the student is going, and the student must use this knowledge and revise the text.

Burner (2016) points out three ways of being time efficient regards formative assessment with process writing, cyclic writing, focus on fewer texts and peer-assessment. Hoel (2007) outlines the importance that teachers should present process writing as a cyclic understanding of writing to the students. In this way the students will be explained and understand that editing and revising are results of developing the ideas of writing. To focus on fewer texts and revise them well, is a way of becoming better at EFL writing. Research in Norwegian EFL writing shows that when students assess each other, teachers save time, and the students learn from assessing each other (Burner, 2016).

2.7.4 Peer Assessment

When students assess each other's products, it is called peer assessment. There are many positive aspects with this type of formative assessment, such as confidence, get feedback from equal learners and the learning environment becoming better as the learners feel safer when they manage to trust each other. Race (2001) mentions that students are more confident getting feedback from an equal student, rather than an adult. This could be due to the similar age the students in the class are, but it might also be related to the level the students are at, where they feel more equal with classmates than a teacher.

The learning environment in a class can become better by using peer assessment, according to Dysthe (1999). When students work together in pairs or groups in a classroom, they get to know each other in a different way to when they are out having a break together. It is the teacher that matches the pairs, and the students then get to form new relations and get to know each other in a new way. According to Burner (2020) it can be smart to put students that are on approximately the same level in English together. In every language class, there will be students of different levels. The best match is to be with somebody who is slightly better than you, as you then will learn more from that person, who is stretching your zone of proximate development (Vygotsky, 1978).

It is important that the teacher give clear instructions on how to give relevant feedback and explain to the students that the point of it is to promote learning (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Feedback on English texts should contain comments on language, content and structure. Dysthe (1999) says that students who are not aware of which feedback to give, end of praising everything the peer has done. Praise itself has little

effect on learning. This is in line with Hattie and Timperley (2007) who found that praising has little effect on progression. The clue is to direct the learner in the right direction to gain knowledge and learning to happen, which is also what Black and Wiliam (1998) found in their research.

Based on Dysthe's (2009) research, good advice to use when working with peer-assessment is when the person is writing the text, read the draft of the text out loud a few times. It can be wise to read it out loud to themselves first, before presenting it to their group. Write down all comments and questions from the group. They should not respond to the questions they get, just receive the feedback. It is natural for them to go in self-defence and argue why they have written what they have done, but for the feedback to be effective, it is time-consuming for them to just stay silent. They should ask the group if there is anything from the text they want reactions on. The person giving the response should then listen and take notes on what they are planning to comment or ask about. They should write down what they look upon as the main thought of the text. They must try to remember to give at least one positive comment about the text. Ask some questions to the text and suggest some changes the writer can do to make the text better. According to Burner (2015) the teacher should not put the students in groups without giving them directions on how to do peer-assessment. The students need a model on how peer-assessment works to be able to do it the right way. It is important that they listen to each other, take it seriously and follow the instructions given above. When the teacher presents the same questions for them after each formative assessment practice, both the teacher and the students get familiar with the situation, and they become better on formative assessment practices.

It is important to talk about formative assessment, to talk with the students what formative assessment is, why we do formative assessments and how it is done. By making the students aware of this assessment form, where they get to know it and see the use of it, will make them understand that formative assessment can be a very useful tool for learning. This is in line with Burner's research.

It can be time saving for the teacher if the students do peer assessment. If students practise giving each other peer assessment, they become better at giving structured feedback (Burner, 2015; Topping, 2003). Students can develop metacognitive learning strategies when using peer assessment, as they practise to describe learning and assessment. It can make the students aware that English oral skills and EFL writing is not something you either is good at or not, they are skills that can be developed by practising. The students also extend their language learning strategies, as they become better at self-assessing when having to peer assess, and vice versa.

2.7.5 Portfolio Assessment

Portfolio assessment is more relevant at secondary school and higher levels, as it is a folder where the formative assessment is put together to be used summative, as a result. But in the making of the texts, the process is as important as the product. The researcher has chosen to include this type of assessment in this thesis, as it can be used for year groups 5, 6. and 7 as well.

In the English subject a portfolio normally contains of texts worked on over a longer period. Portfolio assessment has process writing as a base (Klenowski & Askew, 2006). It is a systematic collection of texts that the student has produced. The texts can be both oral and written, with a digital portfolio where the oral work is recorded.

Also written texts can be used together with an oral presentation. In this way the teacher can assess the student by asking about the written text.

When formative assessment is used in relation to portfolio assessment, the teachers can encourage the students to write a *log*, where they are asked the questions: Why did you choose to submit this work to your presentation folder? How does this product tell how you have worked? Which aims have you worked towards? What are you satisfied with in particular? If the teacher uses these questions as a post activity, and repeat the activity, the students will develop this formative assessment practice.

Portfolio assessment has strongest traditions in subjects such as Arts and crafts and Norwegian, but Burner (2014) states that portfolio assessment has documented formative potentials in second and foreign language learning too. Burner (2012) advises to use parts of the European Language Portfolio, where the students do self-assessment on their language learning. In Burner's research (2012) one of the students expressed that he learnt that it is possible to improve from using process writing and portfolio assessment, which is the whole point of all kinds of formative assessments; to promote learning.

2.7.6 Tests Used as Formative Assessment
2.7.6.1 Basic Principles of Language Testing

"The challenge for Norwegian teachers is that alongside political rhetoric, and the most welcome movement toward an 'assessment for learning' practice, teachers are faced with an increasingly extensive testing regime for accountability purposes" (Birenbaum et.al, 2015, p.133).

According to Burner (2016) the dilemma in the classroom is to be able to have a good assessment practice as well as tests such as national tests that take up valuable time

54

from what is going to be covered in the English subject. The question to ask is why do I have these tests? There need to be a reason behind. What is it I want to find out? What does the students learn from this? By using the tests as a formative assessment tool, the information found in the tests can be used to better help the students in future teaching and planning.

Testing is often related to summative assessment, but it is linked with formative assessment too. There are many principles that apply to make a test work well. The European Association for Language Testing and Assessment (EALTA) go through these in their guidelines for good practice. Hasselgreen and Caudwell (2016) point at the same factors that need to be in place to make a good test; validity, reliability, good washback, fairness, practicality and doability and interest/motivation.

Validity refers to the construction of the test, that it tests what it is intended to test. According to Messick (1996) the validity concept has extended from a test just being a test, to the consideration of how it is used and the consequences of it. Formative tests must produce an outcome that tells the teacher and learner where the student is going to next. Open-ended questions often give the students an opportunity to show their knowledge better than closed questions. This will also give the teacher a better indication on what level the student is at. *Reliability* has got to do with the consistency of the test. The outside factors should not play a role on the test, such as who the examinator is, the quality of the sound on a listening test or how the test is scored. This should be approximately the same, no matter where the test is done.

If a test has *good washback,* it means that it covers widely what should be taught in the English subject and have a positive effect on the learning. If the teacher has a specific test in mind when teaching, and this only covers a narrow part of the subject,

this can have a negative washback effect on the students' learning. According to Hasselgreen and Ørevik (2018) it is important to vary the teaching to ensure the whole curriculum is covered. They point out that good washback is necessary in testing, and the signals given to the students and their parents of what is tested are important skills and competences. *Fairness* in a test makes sure that the students stand on equal ground when being tested, where no individuals or groups have disadvantages because of the design of the tasks given, such as to understand the topic used in a text.

Practicality alludes to the principle that the test is possible to perform. Here it is important to consider what needs to be assessed and do formative assessment on these areas. If you have a big class, you can focus on assessing some at the time, and not necessarily all at once (Evensen, 2021). *Doability* points at the fact that the test is doable for the students, where they have the capacity to do the test. The tasks given need to be inside the students' zone of proximal development, in line with Vygotsky's theory (1978). Cameron (2001) emphasises the importance of explaining the tasks in a language that young learners understand, and advice against giving them tasks that are too challenging. It is recommended to place harder tasks at the end of a test, and not at the start, to keep the students' motivation up. To make the tasks in a test *interesting* and *motivating* are key words to encourage the students to perform at their best. It is of high importance that the topics within the English subject are relevant for the age group, in this case that it is compatible to year groups 5, 6 and 7.

2.7.6.2 Achieving Good Testing

Tests can be used as part of formative assessment process. It is necessary for a teacher to be aware of the purpose of the test. It should also be clear and transparent for the students what the aim of the test is, to support their learning processes. This is in line

with Wiliam's five key strategies for formative assessment, which is written about in section 2.3. For the students and teacher to know what is being tested and why, is a requirement to achieve good testing.

To think through the levels being tested is also highly relevant. In most classes there will be students at different learning stages, and if they are all doing the same test, it is important to challenge and manage to capture both weaker and stronger learners. This can be done by asking open questions, where they are all able to answer at their own level. Another option is to make an easier version of the test for students who struggle with English. In this way they can achieve the learning aims at their level and keep the self-esteem up, by getting the feeling of succeeding. A downfall for some can be to feel they are not doing a proper test, as the students are aware of what level they are at, and that they are doing a different test compared with the others. According to Hasselgreen and Ørevik (2018) the teacher needs to reflect upon which questions may occur during the test, as to what can be explained well beforehand. Also, if the students need help during the test situation, the teacher can use similar tasks they have done earlier in the test to refer to.

2.8 Educational Change
2.8.1 Factors of Educational Change

This master's thesis focuses on the teachers' change of formative assessment practises. It is relevant to investigate what change theory says on how formative assessment can be implemented in an effective and useful way. Fullan's (2016) change theory and Burner's (2020) research of how to do educational change has been investigated in the light of formative assessment practices.

The Canadian researcher Fullan (2016) has been one of the lead researchers within educational change for the last three decades. His book *The New Meaning of Educational Change* has been published in five editions, since it first came out in 1982. The book introduces new and powerful ideas for formulating strategies and implementing solutions that can improve educational systems. According to Fullan (2016) changing a school culture often takes three to five years of hard work. To accept that change takes time, is relevant in this context. There are many factors that play a part to make educational change happen. Fullan (2016) talks about three levels of educational change; The first one is when new materials are introduced, such as a new curriculum or new technology. The second change is new teaching strategies or activities. The third dimension of change is the most challenging, where people's beliefs must change. Burner (2015) emphasises that these three dimensions are reliant on each other, where the new materials, teaching approaches, values and beliefs must be understood to make change take place. In this case, the new curriculum LK20, is introduced. In LK20 it is stated that all students are entitled to be formatively assessed. According to the research presented in this thesis, formative assessment creates effective learning. To make effective learning happen, teachers' formative assessment needs to change.

Dysthe (2022) points out that if educational change and improvement is going to happen, this must be done both amongst the teachers and the management. If the change is going to be successful, the support from the management is necessary. Only with this support, the work and effort the teachers have put in, will give long lasting results.

2.8.2 Implementation of Formative Assessment

Burner (2018) examined formative assessment studies that have been evaluated, to find out to what extent educational change has been successful, and what can be done to make it more effective. He concludes that "educational change initiatives need to be evaluated carefully and systematically, in order to provide insight into factors that are in the way or make change difficult and factors that lead to qualitatively more effective change*"* (Burner, 2018, p.129). He investigated four empirical studies, three from the UK and one from Norway to better understand the factors that make educational change more effective within the English subject. The factors Burner (2018) has found are many, and I will go into more detail about them in the next section.

Formative assessment practices are difficult to change (Black et al., 2003, Carless, 2005, Tierney, 2006). Over the last ten years several changes have been made in the Norwegian context regarding formative assessment (Burner, 2015, 2016; Gamlem & Smith, 2013; Havnes et al., 2012; Sandvik & Buland ,2013). According to Burner primary schools are better at using formative assessments than secondary and upper secondary schools. Change takes time and there must be a need to make changes. (Black et al., 2003; Carless, 2005; Gardner, 2010; Tierney, 2016). When changing formative assessment practices, knowledge about formative assessment is required and it is recommended to do co-operative work with colleagues, other schools and universities. In this way the teachers are committed to making a change together with others. The change can be to give more useful feedback, improve the work on peer-assessment or self-assessment for example. Schools have different priorities, where some choose to focus on formative assessment for a longer period, while others do not emphasise the topic. It is necessary to have time to reflect on the changes made. Often

changes are made without doing any assessment first. It is important to find out which formative assessment practices are already in use and find out what exactly needs changing, before change takes place. To have a collaborative and supporting work environment is necessary when working on change on formative assessment in a school. The leaders at the school are essential here to help the change work, and as important, support from the parents (Fullan, 2016; Burner, 2020).

The change of formative assessment practices has different paths and tempos of change depending on the needs in the different classrooms. The focus on formative assessment practices at a school and the change of them, does not necessarily mean that change will happen in the classroom. It takes time to make new routines. A typical scenario could be that improvement on formative assessment practices is a focus area at the school and is also practiced in the classroom. When the school move on to another theme of focus, it is easy to fall back on old habits of assessments. The change of formative assessment practices is something that needs to be worked on continuously. If change is going to take place, the knowledge of formative assessment is important, as well as a committed cooperation with colleagues, other schools and universities about changing the practice (Burner, 2018).

3.RESEARCH METHOD AND MATERIAL

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter the research method and material will be presented and discussed. This master's thesis is a qualitative study, as the aim is to find out to what extent and how teachers' formative assessment practices have changed in Norwegian year groups 5, 6 and 7 in the English subject. To be able to give sufficient answers to this question, with a focus on the teachers' perspective, in- depth interviews with a selection of teachers have been the chosen collection of data.

The chapter is structured with a general presentation of qualitative research first, before describing the method for this case study. In part 3.3 a more detailed explanation of the data material, the data collection and analysis will be drawn out. In the following chapter, the reliability and validity of this thesis is discussed and reflected upon. In chapter 3.5 the ethical considerations for this project will be discussed, before the final section where possible limitations of the method and material linked to this thesis is presented.

3.2 Method

3.2.1 Qualitative Research Method

Kvale and Brinkmann (2018) says the original definition of the word *method* means "the way to reach the goal" (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p.83, my translation). To be able to find this, the right method needs to be chosen. According to Creswell (2012) there are two main methods of research, *qualitative and quantitative research*. Pring (2015) looks upon these methods as false dualisms. He believes that the sharp divide between qualitative and quantitative methods within different traditions are based on *epistemology* and *ontology*. What view you have on knowledge and the understanding of the world, is relevant to what view you have on research. Qualitative and

quantitative research often work within different paradigms. According to Ryle (1954), the world cannot be caught in either of these paradigms, but there must be an integrated and overlapping part of these two. Pring (2015) emphasises that what is ok in everyday practice, is not necessarily transferable and accepted in research. Pring (2015) refers to Guba and Lincoln's book *Fourth Generation* (1989) who divide the evaluation of research into four parts. Pring (2015, p.62) emphasise that researchers are trying to find answers to the situation they are hoping to solve, by constructing contexts, meaning and framework. Pring (2015) wants to distance himself from this way of thinking, when he says qualitative and quantitative research are false dualisms. Pring does not look upon the two approaches as black and white.

Throughout a research process the researcher works on four different levels. The first level is *paradigm*. Each research community have their own set of rules. The second level is *methodology*, which is dependent on the paradigm it is ruled by. It is the link between the methodology and the theory of science. The third level is the *research design,* the structure of the research project. In this master's thesis a qualitative research design has been used. The last level is the *instruments/tools*, which in this case are useful resources such as articles and the interview guide. During the writing of this master's thesis, these four steps have been followed (Pring, 2015).

In this master's thesis the method used is a qualitative research design. The method was chosen because it worked best to find the answers to the research questions. As Creswell (2012) notes, the qualitative approach is the best method to studies of opinions and experiences. The key concept, idea or process in qualitative research is the phenomenon studied (Creswell, 2012, p.16). In this case it is the teachers'

formative assessment practises that have been studied. At each of the six steps of research, the qualitative studies have certain characteristics. According to Creswell, the first step is to explore a problem or develop a detailed understanding of a phenomenon. The literature review plays a minor role compared to quantitative studies, as listening to the participants to gain insight is relevant in this study. (Creswell, 2012, p.80). The theory was presented and used to support the implementations of the findings. The third step is to specify a purpose for research. The research question was formed after getting an overview of the literature on formative assessment. The collection of data is the fourth step of research. Planning and conducting interviews of seven English teachers of year group 5, 6 and 7 was carried out. The findings were analysed in part five of Creswell's qualitative research characteristics. The insights from the teachers' interviews's were interpreted in light of the theory to find the answers to the research question and sub-questions. In the sixth, and last part of Creswell's steps of research, is the reporting and evaluation of research. Here, the researcher used the implications of the findings as well as her subjective reflections on the whole research process. (Creswell, 2012, p. 16)

3.2.2 The Choice of Research Design: Grounded Theory and a Constructivist Approach

The qualitative research design contains three designs: *Grounded theory designs*, where common experiences of individuals are explored to develop a theory. *Ethnographic theory designs* are when the shared culture of a group of people are explored. *Narrative research designs* explore individual stories to describe the lives of people (Creswell, 2012, p.20). A grounded theory design has been chosen for this master's thesis, as this is found to be the suitable design that fits the research questions. In line with Creswell (2012, p.431) grounded theorists might explore a

single idea. In this case it is teachers' formative assessment practices that are being explored.

Within grounded theory there are three designs: The systematic procedure, the emergent design and the constructivist approach. *The systematic procedure* involves using predetermined categories to interrelate the categories. *The emergent design* is based on exploring a basic social process. *The constructivist approach* is a design where the focus is on the participants' subjective meanings, the researchers' values and beliefs and suggestive or tentative conclusions (Creswell, 2012, p.443). For this thesis, both the systematic procedure and the constructivist approach are suitable, as they focus on the content of the data collected. The constructivist research design has been used, as it is found to best fit to answer the research questions in this master's thesis. It is the teachers' subjective meanings that are considered, together with the literature reviewed in the theory chapter. This material, together with the researcher's values and beliefs, made the conclusions of the thesis. In line with Charmaz (1994), the founder of the constructivist approach, a narrative discussion without diagrams or figures have been used, to emphasise the participants experiences. The choice of approach is well suitable for this research, as its point is to emphasis the teachers' formative assessment practises.

3.2.3 The Pragmatic Approach used in this Master's Thesis

To have an *inductive* approach to something means to have an open mind towards what is happening. The researcher should register what is happening and not have prejudiced attitudes throughout the research process. When using an inductive method, the researcher goes out in the empiricism to find the answers to the research question. The opposite of an inductive approach is a *deductive* method, where the

researcher knows what to look for. The hypothesis and variables determine which data material is going to be collected. It is an enclosed approach that is based on theoretical material. In this thesis a *pragmatic* approach has been used. This is when there is an interaction between induction and deduction. Throughout the research process of educational research, unexpected situations can occur, and it can deny or confirm what you are researching (Postholm & Jacobsen, 2018, p.40-41).

3.3 Material

The material in this master's thesis is the teachers that have taken part in the semi-structured in-depth interviews. Their answers together with the theory chosen for the literature review create the material that have been analysed and made it possible to try and find the answers to the research questions.

3.3.1 Presentation of the Informants and the Context

In the collection of qualitiative data the researcher must choose to either observe or interview people, or do both. In this master's thesis one – to – one semi structured in-depth interviews have been used. According to Creswell (2012) there are five steps that comprise the collecting of qualitative data. The participants and sites need to be identified, access need gained, the types of data to collect need to be determined, data collection forms must be developed and the process must be administered in an ethical manner (Creswell, 2012, p.204). In this part, the informants and the context will be presented. The three latter steps will be discussed in later parts under designing the interviews, conducting the interviews and ethical considerations.

3.3.2.1 The Selection Prosess of Participants

Purposeful sampling has been used, where the participants were chosen. According to Creswell (2012, p.206) purposeful sampling is when the individuals and sites are

intentionally selected. The people selected are the once who can best help us to understand our phenomenon and develop a detailed understanding of the research question. Patton (1990, p.169) says the researchers choose these participants as they are "information rich". When purposeful sampling is being used, the researcher needs to be able to defend its strategy, as there are several qualitative sampling strategies. Some samplings occur before data collection and others after data collection has started. In this study the latter is used, called *snowball sampling*. Creswell (2012, p.209) says that this type of sampling occurs when the researcher request people to become part of the research through informal conversations. The purposeful snowball methods were used to recruit teachers of English at year groups 5, 6 and 7, who all had further education in the English subject. When the informants were selected, the focus was to find people who could give reflective and useful answers to the research questions of this master's thesis. An ideal sampling would be to get informants from various school cultures who all have further education in the English subject but are at different ages and have different teaching backgrounds. In this way a broad selection of informants would be present to desirably get a wider perspective on the answers to the research questions.

The informants have been chosen by using the network of friends, previous colleagues and acquaintances, where they have been of good help to find suitable people to interview. The informants were contacted by e-mail with a request to participate in this master's thesis. They had then already been questioned orally by a person we both have in common and responded positively to him or her. Some of the participants knew the researchers directly. By saying yes to take part in the interview, the participant shared their contacts. In this way they were contacted by e-mail, to fill

in the contract, the questions for the interview were given for preparation and they could ask necessary questions by getting in touch either by e-mail or phone.

3.3.2.2 Information about the Participants

In this thesis the informants who have been interviewed are seven teachers who all teach English at Norwegian year groups 5, 6 and 7. They represent seven different schools from four different counties in Norway. Two of the informants work in private schools, one in a Christian school and one in an international school. This is an IB school, which is an International Baccalaureate. All the interviewees have further education in English. The people interviewed vary in teaching experience. Three of the participants have taught for nearly two decades. Four of the teachers have less teaching experience, but they have still enough experience to be able to answer the questions.

A misunderstood perception in some qualitative research is the thought of the more interviewees the more scientific the research becomes. In fact, the number of informants represented does not especially improve the quality of the research study. In qualitative studies it is normal not to have too many informants. If a researcher chooses to interview only a few people, the researcher can then be more thorough. With only a few participants, the research project becomes easier to manage and it is possible to analyse and say something about a culture or a society with only a small section of the group represented (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p.148-149). In this research project seven participants were used. The number of interviewees were chosen so that there was enough variation amongst the participants to make the research project interesting but limited enough to keep a good overview of the data collected. There were people representing different school cultures, different counties

in Norway and everyone had their own saying on the topic, which will be further brought out in the data analysis.

3.3.2 Data Collection: The Interview
3.3.2.1 The Interview

In this section the data collection will be presented. The process of how the interviews were done will be described, from designing the interview guide, designing the questions to conducting the interviews.

An *interview* is literally an inter view. It comes from the French word entrevue. According to Kvale and Brinkmann the definition of an interview is ''an exchange of views between two people in a dialouge about a theme that interests them both'' (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p.22). The type of interviews used in this master's thesis were *one- to- one semi-structured in-depth interviews*. The reasons for conducting interviews with one person at a time, even though this would be more time consuming than a group-interview, were many. The participants were not in a natural cohort of knowing each other, so a one-to-one interview would be obvious. Also, the fact that the participants live at a geographical distance made it natural to focus on one teacher at the time. In this way the researcher got to talk to each teacher individually and the participants could freely give their opinions on the different topics without having to worry about other listeners throughout the interview.

Since this was a semi-structured in-depth interview, the interview guide was designed with the questions to ask, but additional questions could be asked during the interview. The primary rationale for this decision of interview style, was the freedom the researcher got to conduct the interview, where follow up questions could be asked when natural, in addition to the structural questions that were there as a foundation, to

make both the researcher and interviewee able to feel prepared for the content of the interview.

According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2018, p.137) there are seven levels of the interview research: thematization, planning, transcribing, analysing, verifying and reporting. These seven stages have been used throughout the process of working on the interviews. A pragmatic approach, where both an inductive and deductive method has merged to answer the research question, has been used in this interview process.

3.3.2.2 Designing the Interview Guide

An interview guide needs to be designed to plan the interview process properly. In this way the researcher is prepared for the interview, and will be able to ask relevant and thought through questions that best can answer the research questions. According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2018) a semi-structured interview is searching to collect describtions of the interviewes' world with the purpose on describing the phenomenons, the themes in the interview that needs covered. There will also be a suggestion for questions to ask. A semi-structured interview is designed to be open-minded towards the order and formulation of questions (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p.156).

When this interview guide was designed, the first part, the briefing, gave information about the research project. The interviewee got to know that the researcher studied English Didactics at the University of Bergen, that the interviews would be conducted in Norwegian and would last for approximately sixty minutes. The interviews would be conducted digitally and be recorded. The aim of the interviews was to ask questions that could help to answer the research questions. After, the research questions were presented to the interviewee. The interview guide was structured into

five parts, where each part contained different themes around the research questions. These were formative assessment, formative assessment and the curriculum (LK20), writing skills, metacognition and motivation. In addition to each part, information about the themes was given. In this way the informants had some background theory to build their answers around, in addition to their empirical experiences. The interview guide for this research project included a briefing and debriefing. According to Creswell (2012) the briefing is the introduction presented before the actual interview begins, while the debriefing is the rounding up of the interview, where the interviewee gets asked if there are additional information he or she would like to add, before the researcher thank the participant for taking part in the project.

3.3.2.3 Designing the Questions

According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2018), the interviewer should in addition to focusing on the thematic and dynamic aspects of the questions, try to remember the later steps such as analysing, verifying and reporting of the interviews. Researchers who know what they are asking for, and why they are asking, will during the interview try to clarify the meanings that are relevant for the project (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p.165). This was considered when designing the interview guide and the questions for the inteviews. The questions intentions are to find out the answers to the research questions.

The questions in an interview should be short and simple, according to Kvale and Brinkmann (2018). There are many types of questions to ask in an interview. Kvale and Brinkmann (2018) have made an overview with nine different categories of questions. The first question is the *introduction question*, where the person interviewed gets to describe the main phenomenon of the interview. *Follow up*

questions can be relevant to ask if the interviewee's answers are of interest to find out more about. The interviewer can say «mm» to let the person talk for longer and continue answering, or repeat key sentences from the answers given, to then produce further questions about the same topic. *Thorough questions* are when the interviewer asks to get deeper answers about the question just asked, where no specific follow up answer is asked, but the interviewee gets a chance to go more in detail about the question and give further examples about the topic. *Specifying questions* help to get more specific answers, where the interviewer asks more in detail about the topic. *Direct questions* should be asked at the end of the interview, when the person answering has described the situation or topic in his or her own words. *Indirect questions* will be to ask «How do you think he or she experienced the situation?». This is where you do not talk directly about the person being interviewed, but to put yourself in another person's situation for example. It is the interviewer's responsibility to make the person being interviewed be on track with the topic that it is relevant to find out about. *Structured questions* are helpful in this respect. If irrelevant answers are given, the interviewer can politely say that he or she would like to move on to a new theme, to make progress and keep the structure of the interview. By using *silence* in the interview situation, this can create little breaks and time for the interviewee to think and reflect to come up with more relevant information. *Interpretive questions* are useful to clarify what the interviewee wants to say. The interviewer can rephrase an answer or sum up with a few words what the interviewee expressed, such as for example: ''Is it correct that your biggest worry regarding grades is what your parents will say?'' (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p.166-167).

When the questions were designed, the main focus was to make *open questions* that would create rich answers from the participants. The first part of the interview guide,

71

had the overall theme, formative assessment. Five main questions were asked in this section. Before the questions were asked, an information part of the term formative assessment was added, where researchers such as Burner (2016), Black and Wiliam (1998) and Hattie and Timperley (2007) were used as sources. The introduction question was for the participants to define the term from their point of view. The second question asked about the interviewees' teaching background. Five specifying questions were added here, to make sure the participants covered the relevant answers the researcher was looking for. These questions were about the length of teaching in general and of teaching in the English subject. Also more detailed about the teaching education, if the participants had formal education in the English subject and if formative assessment was a part of the education. The researcher had checked that the participants had further education in English before they took part in the research, but asked the question to illustrate it for the readers. Before the third question were asked, Wiliam and Thomson's five strategies about formative assessment were presented. These are aim oriented teaching, meaningful teaching, teacher assessment, fellow-student assessment and self-assessment. In question three, the participants were asked to say a bit about how they practice formative assessment in the English subject. The sub-questions were how they structure their teaching, what documentation they use and explain what they find positive about working this way. The introduction before the fourth question, was that the aim of the national tests are ment to assess where the students are in the subject. This is a starting point in finding out what each student needs worked further with in the English subject. The fourth question asked was how the results of the national tests are followed up at the participants' school? The fifth and last question of part one, covered the pandemic and the teachers' formative assessment practises. Covid-19 and the closing of the society lead to new ways of

teaching and assessing. The participants were asked how they experienced their formative assessment practises before and after the pandemic.

In the second part of the interview, the topic was formative assessment and the curriculum (LK20). The interviewees were informed that formative assessment was first introduced in the Education Act in 2009 and were since revised in 2013. In the regulation of the Education Act, chapter three, §3-2, it is specified that students have the right to get formative assessment. According to the education act, §13-10, the school owners have the responsibility for the right to formative assessment being completed. §3-3 about assessment in subjects states

> ''The aim of assessment in subjects is to promote learning and contribute to create the desire to learn throughout the process, and to give information about competence throughout the process and at the end of the education in the subject.''

Formative assessment is in line with the curriculum 2020, required by law throughout the whole school process. In LK20 each subject has a separate part about formative assessment. After this relevant information was given, the interviewees were asked to say how this influence them as teachers. They were also asked to talk about previous assessment practises and the ones that they use today. This question is directly linked to the first sub-question in this thesis: Has the introduction of LK20 affected the teachers' formative assessment practices?

The third part of the interview covered the topic writing skills. Only one question was written here in the interview guide, and it was as follows: Which formative assessment practises do you use to get the students to use their oral skills to develop their written skills? The question is an open question, but might not be well

formulated, as the researcher found that it often had to be explained, or reformulated, for the interviewee to be able to answer the question. The second sub-question is directly linked to this question. The sub-question is: Which formative assessment practices do English teachers report implementing in order to help the students transfer their oral skills to devleop written skills in the English subject?

In the fourth part of the interview guide, the topic metacognition was in focus. First the term was defined: According to SNL (Store Norske Leksikon) metacognition is an overall consciousness and understanding of how you think and learn. You can divide between metacognitive knowledge (I can easily learn maths) and metacognitive strategies (I learn new things by first focusing on the principle). The education researcher Flavell (1979) is counted as the founder of the term metacognition. The aim of formative assessment is to be better at self-regulation and metacognition, to get support to what you later will manage on your own in the English subject. Students in year groups 5, 6 and 7. can be able to understand their learning development if they are taught to use formative assessment. After this information, the participants were asked: ''What experience do you have with this?''. The third sub-question in this thesis is: Which formative assessment practices do English teachers report implementing in order to give the students clarity regarding their level of oral and written skills in English and what they are going to achieve? This question was made with the theoretical background of formative assessment in mind. The teachers need to guide the students in their learning process, where the students must be aware of the aim of the process. The students have to be given a clear understanding of what the teachers want them to achieve. To be able to get there, the awareness of their own learning is necessary, that the students understand their own learning process. This is where metacognition is highly relevant. When the teacher guides the students to see

their own learning processes, they will after some practice be able to do more of their learning independently without as much guidance. To reach their PDZ is important to make learning happen. This is line with the research of Burner (2016), Black and Wiliam (1998), Hatie and Timperley (2007) and Vygotsky (1978).

Motivation is the fifth and last part of the interview guide. Here the question asked was ''How do you experience that your formative assessments help the students to develop and become motivated in the English subject?'' . The researcher finds motivation to be an important factor for learning, and wanted to get the participants' views on this topic, to better understand their attitude towards learning. In some of the interviews a following up question was asked, but this was ''How do you find motivation relevant to your teaching and why?'' It is not written in the interview guide, but the researcher asked a debriefing question to every participant at the end of the interview. ''Is there anything else you would like to add or tell about motivation or formative assessment in the English subject that we have not mentioned earlier in the interview?'' The interviewer use silence after this last question to make the participant get a chance to think if there was more that could be reported to help the researcher answer the research questions of this master's thesis. At the very end, the interviewer thanked the participants for taking part in the project. Silence and follow up questions were used throughout the interview process, to make the conversation flow naturally and to get in-depth and reflective answers. This will be explained further in the section on the conduction of the interviews.

3.3.2.4 Conducting the Interviews

An interview can be looked at as a *craft*, *a knowledge produced activity* and a *social practice.* The aim of looking upon an interview as a craft is to learn how competent

interview researchers work. The interview is a knowledge production process, where the interviewer and the interviewee produce knowledge together. The interview process is imprinted by an asymmetrical power relationship, where the interviewer will always be in charge (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p.36 -37). It is an important job for the interviewer to make the interviewee feel comfortable during the conduction of the interview. Dysfunctional interviews are imprinted by the social distance and the oppressive feeling that can occur if the social distance is kept. According to Sennett (2004) it is a special and often frustrating craft to do in-depth interviews. The craft is to make social distance to the interviewee without making the person being interviewed feel like an insect under a microscope (Sennet, 2004, p.37-38).

There are many types of interviews, depending on the method chosen. The style of interview needs to match the interest of the collection of the knowledge needed for the research. If the interest is to find out about a persons' stories, a narrative interview is done. A more confronting interview is needed to discover the interviewee's describtions and reasons for his or her actions (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p. 189). In this master's thesis the latter interview style has been used, to find out how and if the teachers' formative assessment practises have changed.

According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2018) a good qualitative interview covers huge parts of spontanity, where not everything needs to be planned in detail. It means that the interviewer is well prepared and knows how and when to track of from the original plan, to collect useful information from the interviewee (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p. 190). The clue is to know what to ask for, why you are asking and how to ask the questions. In this way, interviews that are short, but rich in content, can be conducted (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p.192). The participants were given the

interview guide beforehand, with information about formative assessment and the questions planned to asked were written in the guide. The researcher hadprepared for following up questions if necessary, and did naturally ask more questions when needed in the interviews.

The quality of the interview is crucial for the quality of the analysing, verifying and reporting of the interview. In line with Kvale and Brinkmann (2018), there are six quality criteria for an interview. The first is to what degree the most spontanious, content rich, specific and relevant answers are given from the interview person. The second criteria is based on the positivity of giving short questions and getting long answers. The third criteria looks at to which degree the questions are followed up by the interviewer and how the important parts of the answers are clarifyed. Kvale and Brinkmann (2018) emphasise that the ideal interview gets interpreted while it is conducted. The fifth criteria point out the importance of the interviewer trying to verify his or her interpretations of the interviewee's answers while conductiong the interview. The last quality criteria is that the interview communicates itself, that it does not need any further comments or explanations (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p.194).

In this master's thesis five of the seven interviews have been conducted online, while two of them have been face to face interviews. There are geographical reasons for this, as people from four different counties in Norway have been interviewed. All the interviews have been recorded using the communication programme Zoom. The interviews were conducted from the end of November 2022 until the beginning of February 2023. Each interview lasted approximately 40 minutes. The interviewer and the interviewee talked before and after the recordings, and the whole process lasted

approximately 60 minutes, like it said in the interview guide. The researcher asked if there were any questions before the interview, to make sure the interviewees were ready to participate in the interview. Also, it was a good way to get to know them a little, with some informal speech before the actual interview. This conversation was done on the phone, as there was a time limit on the Zoom program, that was used for the recording. After the interview, we had a short informal talk to end the conversation.

All the participants were teachers of the English subject and have further education in English. There was no doubt that they would be capable of conducting the interviews in English. However, the researcher landed on doing the interviews in Norwegian, to avoid any misunderstandings or stressing situations regard expressing themselves. The main focus of these interviews was the content, not the language. One of the interviews were conducted in English. The researcher had asked in an e-mail if the participant wanted the interview to be conducted in English, but the interviewee made sure Norwegian was ok. On the phone call, just before the interview, the participant changed opinion and preferred English as the spoken language throughout the conduction of the interview. The researcher had at that stage only prepared the interview in Norwegian, as this was the planned situation, but translated the interview guide during the conduction process of the interview. The main aim was that the participant understood the questions properly in order to answer them without any misunderstandings and to fully be able to express thoughts, emotions and opinions.

It is natural to find the interviewees that are well spoken and have a lot of knowledge on the subject, to be perfect for the interview situation. They are honest, stick to the topic and give long and interesting descriptions that are perfect to use in the research.

According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2018) these interviewees can in certain cases cover up contradictory relations in the research. The interviewer should realise that some people are more challenging to interview than others, and the interviewers' job is to make sure the interviews can become knowledgeable no matter who gets interviewed. A skilled interviewer is an expert on the topic and good with human interactions.

This was the first time the researcher conducted interviews for research interest, and they have all been done with the best intentions. The seven interviewees were all doing their best to answer the questions as best they could. Some participants were more talkative than others, but they all tried to answer the questions asked. If the questions were not answered, the interviewer did try to repeat the question or rephrase the question to get an answer.

According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2018) the qualitative research interview is contextual. The interview must be understood in a context. Macrosocial factors such as culture or society can be used as contexts. In other occasions microsocial factors such as environment or situations are the contexts. In this master's thesis both macro – and microsocial factors play a role as the context. This study look at the teachers' view on their change of formative assessment practises. Their educational practise, where their management, colleagues, students, parents, classroom environment, the teachers' competence in English and formative assessment all play a role. According to Kvale and Brinkman, not only does researchers study phenomenons that are contextual, but the interview situation is a specific context for production of knowledge. The four aspects that normally creates the context of the interview are the interviewer, the interviewees, the body and the non-human role (Kvale & Brinkmann,

2018, p.114). As the interviews for this research was conducted using Zoom, the interviewer and the interviewees were the main importance, but their bodies were obviously present too. The importance of the technology working, which is a non-human thing, everyone taking part feeling comfortable enough and that the conversation were flowing well for the interviewer to obtain knowledge about the research questions were all necessary parts of the interview.

3.3.3 Qualitative Data Analysis

According to Creswell (2012) there are six steps involved in analysing and interpreting qualitative data: preparing and organising the data, exploring and coding the database, describing findings and forming themes, representing and reporting findings, interpreting the meaning of the findings, and validating the accuracy of the findings (Creswell, 2012, p.236). These steps have been followed in this section as an organised structure to the analysis.

3.3.3.1 Organising the Data and Transcribing the Interviews

Creswell (2012) says that at an early stage of the analysis, the data needs to be organised into file folders. Ong (1982) says that the spoken language and the written texts contain different language games and different cultures.The rules of the games are different.

Something that is well formulated orally, might sound repetitive when it is written down. Written words can at times sound dry and boring when being read out (Kvale & Brinkman, 2018, p.205). According to Creswell (2012) transcription is ''the process of converting audiotape recordings or fieldnotes into text data'' (Creswell, 2012, p.239). Transcriptions are abstractions of the interview, where the voice rent, intonation and respiration get lost. When the interviews get transcribed, they are more

suitable for analysis (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p.205-206). According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2018, p.207) the golden rule in transcription is to write in the rapport how the transcriptions have been carried out. If the same transcription technique has been used in every interview, it is possible to analyse them all in the same way.

In this master's thesis the interviews have all been transcribed into standard nynorsk, despite one that was done in English. This was because the participant found it easier to express themselves in English. By using nynorsk or English, the dialects have been covered up, and the anonymity of the participants are well kept. The transcriptions are all written following the same transcribing program called o'transcribe and the transcription instructions followed have been the same for every interview. Three full stops after each other indicated a longer pause. Two commas in a row symbolised a change in the middle of a sentence. What is a correct transcription or not is difficult to answer, but the transcription instructions followed must be in line with what is useful information for the research project. If it is a detailed analysis of language, every pause and intonation is relevant. If the aim is to retell someone's story, this is not as relevant (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p.208-212). In this master's thesis the pauses and intonations in the transcriptions are not of high relevance for the analysis of the report to answer the research questions. The relevance for this thesis is the content, what the participants have answered to the questions.

Each interview has been transcribed by the researcher shortly after the interview was conducted. The transcription program o'transcribe.org made it easy to listen to the recordings, by using stop, rewind or speed forward if needed. At the same time as listening, the researcher could type in the spoken words. The transcripts were downloaded and transferred into word documents. They were saved as Interview 001,

002 and so on until interview 007. Each interview lasted approximately 35 - 40 minutes and each interview resulted in approximately 35 pages of transcription. These were printed out and used for further analysis. The audio files and transcriptions were stored on the computer until the thesis was finished. They were then deleted for security reasons.

3.3.3.2 Coding and Categorising the Data

After the transcriptions were done, part two in the process was to explore and categorise the database. The most common way of data analysis is to code or categorise interview statements. *Coding* has to do with connecting one or many keywords to a text segment, for later to axept an identifying of a statement. *Categorising data* is a more systematic concept formation around a statement which creates assumptions for quantification. The terms coding and categorising the data are often mixed (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p.226). In grounded theory designs the categories are themes of basic information identified in the data by the researcher. The categories are used to understand a process (Creswell, 2012, p.431). The categories in this thesis are all the nine parts of the interview. In the interview guide, the interview was structured into five parts, where the first part contained five headlines. All together these nine parts were: Definition of the term formative assessment, teaching background, how formative assessment is being used in the English subject, national tests used as formative assessment, formative assessment practises before and after covid-19, formative assessment and the curriculum (LK20), writing skills, metacognition and motivation.

The chairpersons studied in this research project are the teachers who have been interviewed. *Open coding* has been used, where the information from the interviews

were sorted into categories. The researcher was looking for evidence to support each category and form a theory that would explain the change of the teachers' formative assessment practises (Creswell, 2012, p.432).

The term *method* originally means the way to the aim. It is important to have the method of the research project in mind when doing the coding and categorising of the data. Why have the interviews been conducted? What is the aim of the information found in the interviews? (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p.2017). Kvale and Brinkmann (2018) emphasise the importance of having a clear idea about how the interviews are going to be anaysed, before the interviews are conducted. In this way, the researcher knows what to look for when conducting the interview and most of the analysing part is done before the record button is stopped at the end of the interview. This was thought through in the planning process and the categories were made when the interview guide was designed. As the researcher knew what to look for, the questions were designed to answer the research questions. In this project the researcher did her best to ask following up questions when needed. And some of the analysing part was already done throughout the conduction of the interview.

This master's thesis has used a qualitative method, which build on the theories about interpretation of text (*hermeneutics*) and human experiences (*phenomenology*). The methods contain systematic collection, processing and analysis of material from conversations done through interviews. The aim of the interviews has been to get an insight and in-depth knowledge about the change of teachers' formative assessment practises. The qualitative content analysis interprets the meaning that is related to different types of content. The negative effect of this type of analysis is that there is no direct answers. It is difficult to say if the answers are valid to others than the

people you have interviewed. The positive effect is that it can emphasise opinions, attitudes and wishes.

3.4 Reliability and Validity

In this section it will be described how the accuracy of my findings have been done, to ensure research quality. The quality of the research is highly important. Reliability and validity refers to the research quality and it must be clear to the reader what has been done throughout the research process, and that nothing is kept hidden (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2018, p.272). The assessments of the quality of the research are all based on the term's reliability, validity and generalising. They are originally associated with quantitative research, but researchers such as Marshall and Miles (2016) question if the terms should be used for qualitative research in the way it does. According to Mason and Miles (2014) the meaning of the terms does not solve the challenges we meet when valuing the quality of the research.

In this master thesis transparency and reflexivity are validation strategies that have been used to validate how the study has been done. All the results have been presented for the reader in part 4.1. The researcher read thoroughly through each participants' answer in the transcriptions and presented it for the reader, by using relevant quotes from the interviewees. The answers were presented so that all necessary information was visible for the reader. The researcher structured the presentation in an order that would be logical for the reader to follow, where the codes were the themes from the interview guide. After the questions were presented, the researcher interpreted the meaning of the findings in section 4.3. The description of the collection of data is written in chapter three, while the analysis of the findings has been presented in chapter four. In the attempt to gain transparency, the research

design has been worked thoroughly with. Also, the interview guide, the conducting and the transcribing of the interviews have been done with the focus of the research question in mind, and in a way that the readers can see what is done. The interviews were recorded with a good sound recording and were transcribed straight after the conductions.

According to Creswell reflexivity is how the researcher interpretates his or her findings in the research. The researcher should be self-reflective on the role he or she takes in the interpretation of the research (Creswell, 2012). This validation strategy has been an important part of the whole research project as the process of it has been thought through and reflected upon, before and during writing. The researcher has reflected upon it on her own, with her supervisor, her colleagues and with fellow students.

Another validation strategy used to ensure the recording of correct information in the collection of data in interviews, was that the researcher repeated and summarised the informant's answers, to ensure that the correct information was recorded. The researcher is the interpreter of the findings, and in the recording of these it is important that the data recorded mirrors what the informants stated, and not based on false information (Kvale &Brinkmann, 2018, p.279).

Even if the interpretations of the findings are accurate and valid, the question of whether they are valid only in certain contexts and for certain groups of people remain (Kvale & Brinkmann 2018, p.289). The outer validity is according to Kleven and Hjardemaal what kind of context the results are valid in (Kleven & Hjardemaal, 2018, p.117). The researcher made a purposeful selection of informants with further Education in English from a range of schools, to ensure that the selection was

representative for the population the researcher wanted to say something about (Kleven &Hjardemaal, 2018, p.135). However, a limitation with this study is the size of the participants in the study, in comparison to a quantitative study where the selection is broader. This may affect how valid the study is in terms of generalisation.

3.5 Ethical Considerations

In this next section, the methods and choices made for this research will be presented and discussed. Ethical considerations are important in ensuring the quality of a research project. Kvale and Brinkmann's (2018, p.97) list seven ethical problems that can arise during the interview process. The participants were fully informed and were aware of the aims of the project as they had been sent a consent form with information about the study (Appendix 1). The researcher has ensured that all participants stayed anonymous throughout the whoe projects. Their names or any types of personal information is not published in the master's thesis. NSD (Norsk senter for forskningsdata) was contacted as this research project is directly linked with individual teachers. According to guidelines from NSD all records and data will be deleted after the project is completed, to ensure the protection of personal privacy is kept. (Appendix 3)

In terms of the interview situation, all participants were informed of the anonymity of their answers through their consent form. The purpose of the consent form was to be secure of and protect the informant's confidentiality. The researcher also made an interview guide that prepared the participants what was expected from them (Appendix 2). In addition to this, careful considerations were made to make sure the participants felt comfortable during the interviews. The researcher contacted the participants prior to the interview, to check if they had any concerns or questions, as

well as to establish a first contact. The participants were also given the option of using their preferred language in the interview (English or Norwegian). In the transcription process careful considerations were made to ensure the anonymity of the participants, by using digits instead of names and transcribing into nynorsk instead of dialects. When transcribing the interviews, a lot of emphasis was made on making sure that this mirrored what the interviewee actually said. However, some statements had to be slightly rephrased due to the difference between dialect words and the written nynorsk language.

This thesis is a part of educational research, where people are involved. To find out to what extent and how the teachers' formative assessment practices have changed, seven teachers have been interviewed. The teachers had to give consent by signing a form which formalised that they accepted to be a part of the project (Appendix 1). As a researcher you must respect the people involved in the project, their integrity, freedom and participation. The teachers were entitled to get the necessary information about the project to be able to see the consequences of taking part and to know what the purpose of the project was.

According to Creswell (2012, p.277) it is important to reduce bias in order to ensure ethical considerations. The researcher's background and values may affect the analysis of the data, however this has been carefully considered throughout the process.

Ethics refers to the theoretical foundation of what is right and wrong. Pring (2015) emphasises the importance of not only focusing on guiding principles, but to take ethical objectives throughout the whole research process. In this study this has been considered and tried to be followed at every stage of the process.

3.6 Possible Limitations of the Method and Materials

The positive aspect of using qualitative research and in-depth interviews is that you get a deeper understanding of how the teachers see their situations, and how they look upon the change of their own formative assessment practices. If a quantitative approach had been used, you would have reached broader, by asking more informants, but not necessarily got the information needed, as the questions require honest and not only yes and no answers. It can be a challenge for the teachers to analyse their own development of formative assessment practises over time. It requires reflection and the ability to see their own actions from an outside perspective. Some of the participants have just recently educated, and that they have only a few years of experience, can be a limitation for looking at the change of the formative assessment practises. However, the interesting fact is that putting together teachers of different ages, educations and experiences you get a more varied angle to answer the research questions. The master's thesis has been highly dependent on the informants' answers, as it is what they report that has been analysed, seen in the light of the researcher's interpretation with the background information found in the literature review.

4.FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
4.1 Introduction

In this chapter the analysis of the data will be discussed. The last three points of Creswell's six steps of the process of analysing and interpreting data will be presented. These points are the representing and reporting of the findings, interpreting the meaning of the findings and validating the accuracy of the findings (Creswell, 2012). To analyse means to divide something into fragments or pieces. The researcher's job is to put these elements together and present it to the readers of the thesis. The writer needs to analyse all the answers and put them together to one story that represent what has been told him or her, where the researcher uses a style of language that is preferable to represent the story he or she wants to tell (Creswell, 2012, p.219). In this chapter the analysis of the data will be represented, interpreted and validated. The data, which is the answers from the in-depth interviews, will together with the theoretical background information chosen in the interview review make the foundation for the analysis. The theoretical backdrop, together with the teachers' empirical views and the researcher's analysis of the results will make the answers to this master's thesis.

In the first section, the findings will be presented. The researcher has used a marker pen to high light the relevant answers and direct quotes have been used and commented on. As six out of seven interviews were conducted in Norwegian, the quotes have been translated into English. One of the interviews was conducted in English and direct quotes were used from this participant.

The main research question of this thesis is:

"To what extent and how have teachers' formative assessment practices changed in Norwegian year groups 5, 6 and 7 in the English subject?

In this chapter the main research question will be discussed together with these three sub questions:

1. **Has the introduction of LK20 affected the teachers' formative assessment practices?**

2. **Which formative assessment practices do English teachers report implementing in order to help the students transfer their oral skills to develop written skills in the English subject?**

 3. **Which formative assessment practices do English teachers report implementing in order to give the students clarity regarding their level of oral and written skills in English and what they are going to achieve?**

The findings presented in this chapter are themes that have emerged from analysis of the interview of seven teachers of the English subject of year groups 5, 6 and 7 in Norwegian school classes. In the second section, the findings are discussed in the light of relevant theory that were presented in the literature review. In the third section, the meaning of the findings will be validated. All the analytical methods will be validated to make sure the conclusions in the last chapter will be as accurate as possible.

4.2 Representing and Reporting Findings

The interview was divided into five categories; Formative assessment, formative assessment and the curriculum, writing skills, metacognition and motivation. The open coding part of the analysis involved putting the answers from the participants

into the given categories. These were seen in the light of the research questions, the theory from the literature review and the researcher's view on the findings, in line with grounded theory design and the constructivist approach.

4.2.1 Formative Assessment

In this first part of the interview, five main questions were asked, with some following up questions. The first question was to explain how you define the term formative assessment. The following theme covered the teachers' educational background. The third question asked how formative assessment is being used in the English subject. Question four was about national tests used as formative assessment. The last question in this first part of the interview covered how formative assessment practises were before and after Covid-19.

4.2.1.1 Definition of Formative Assessment

The participants were asked to define the term formative assessment, after they had read Burner (2016), Black and Wiliam (2008) and Hattie and Timperley's (2007) definitions on the topic.

The first participant said:

> ''It is the assessment you give when the pupils are in a work process. When giving them formative assessment, it helps them to see the developmental potential in a written text for example..and that we work together. Instead of telling them where to do changes, they can take part and realise themselves what needs to be improved''.

The second participant looked upon formative assessment as assessment done during the process. The students' formative assessment was in focus, but the participant also

used it as a guide for planning the further teaching. If the students were behind on what was expected to learn, they would put more time and effort into learning it, and spend less time than planned on the topic if the students learnt it faster.

The third participant said they agreed the most with Black and Wiliam's definition of formative assessment.

> ''I think where you say that it shows where the students are, at what point they are in their learning. So I use it more for that. Because then, if I know where they are at, then I can adapt my lesson, my future lesson to where they are at. And then try to make sure like all the lessonplans or learning strategies I am going to develop, will actually help them get to where they need to be... I just feel like that it is more like Lev Vygotsky and the proximal development. Where they are at a certain level and then they have to move to the level where they have to reach and they can do that through collaborative learning or..many other strategies, where they can move up to that level''.

In the fourth interview, the participant looked upon formative assessment as an assessment to say where the studens are in relation to the competence aims in the curriculum. To tell the students what they are good at and what they have to work towards. It can be good to have both written and oral dialogues with the students, where you tell them what the aim is and why it is important to learn this. The students are entitled to know what level they are at. When the teacher tells them this, they will be better at self evaluating. The participant also talks about the teacher and the student coming to an agreement on what it is smart that the student has to work more with.

The fifth participant had not heard the term formative assessment before, but had asked another English teacher what it meant. When they heard the Norwegian term

''undervegsvurdering'' which literally means assessment done throughout the work, the participant understood the meaning of the term. The interviewee said it also helped to read the definitions of Burner (2016), Black and Wiliam (1998) and Hattie and Timperley (2007) to prepare for the interview and understand the term and that the participant supported their definitions.

The sixth participant looked upon the term as formative assessment, to give feedback to students, what they have managed to do and where, and what they need to do to make progress.

> ''Yes, and to help them. Depending on their age, help them to see what they need to do then. That they can participate to make the next aim, to decide what they are working towards...It is something different than the summative assessment, where only the end result counts...It is more process oriented..''.

The seventh interviewee said:

> ''I am thinking it is an assessment, a continuous assessment. All assessment I have until an eventual summative assessment. And I try to do formative assessment with feedback. How we can get on the right track to reach the aim''.

4.2.1.2 Teaching Background

In the second question of part one of the interview, the interviewees' were asked to tell about their teaching background. Five questions were asked: 1.''How long have you worked as a teacher?'' 2. ''How long have you taught English?'' 3. ''What education have you got?'' 4. ''Do you have formal education in the subject? (English)'' 5. ''Did you get taught about formative assessment in your education?''.

The reason for asking the participants about their teaching background was to get a better overview of their competence in the subject of English and to try and chart their education and understanding of formative assesssment, and how they use it in their everyday teaching.

The first participant has worked as a teacher for seven years, and has taught English for year groups 5, 6 and 7 for the same amount of time, including younger students. The teacher has been a qualified teacher since 2020. The participant worked as an English teacher while studying to be a qualified teacher and has completed a master's thesis in special needs.

The second participant started working as a teacher in 2002, and has been in the profession for over twenty years. This teacher has taught English in primary school the whole time, and worked with year groups 5, 6 and 7 for the last ten years. The participant started doing further education in English approximately eight years ago, and is now in the latter stage of doing a master in the same subject.

The third participant has worked as a teacher for ten years. This participant went to university in their home country ''where I completed my bachelor in English literature and I did like a, like one year study in history also. After that I did my post-graduate education. Not post-graduate, the certificate in education, which is the PGCE in English, so that is the formal qualification you need in... to be a teacher'.' Here, the name of the country is left out to keep the participant's anonymity. The participant has also completed a master in special needs education which was completed in Norway in 2009 and has worked as a teacher in Norway for the last five years. The participant has worked at various schools, but is working at an international school at the minute. ''Because it is in the IB curriculum, so right now I am teaching ''syvende

til tiende trinn''. The interview was conducted in English, but the participant said year seven to ten in Norwegian, as they also master this language really well.

The fourth participant finished the teacher education in 2018 and has further education in English. ''I have a year of studies in English. I have sixty points. From five to ten then''. In the last sentence, the reference is to the age group the participant is qualified to teach.

''I started my second job at the autumn of 2018 and got a new job in 2020... and that is where I work now''. The first school the teacher worked at was a small school, while the one the participant is working at now is a much bigger school''. It is interesting. To see the difference how to work at a smaller school contra working at a bigger school. I have a lot more pupils''. Here the interviewer could have asked following up questions, where the participant could have told what the differences between the schools were regarding working with the formative assessment practises in the English subject.

This participant was quite recently educated, but by being asked if formative assessment was covered in the education, the teacher answered:

> ''We had, had very little about it... And that, that I miss. Thinking about it today, it should have been an even bigger focus on it then... So I had to get a bit of guidance at my work place. I had to ask a bit then. Because it turned out to be a bit, a bit unknown in that subject how, how I should do it. What should I really, what should I look for?''

The teacher said they asked the leaders at the school for advice, but did not get any specific answers. But by asking her colleagues about their procedures on formative

assessment in the English subject, they got the understanding of structuring the English subject into three parts ''and then I thought that..I divide it into three parts, because we have the grammar part, the oral part and the written part.''.

The fifth participant worked as an uneducated teacher for a year, before starting their teacher education from year 2000 until 2003.

> ''I started working at upper secondary as a supply in the autumn of 2003. Then I got a longer contract. And I worked at a secondary school from 2004 and six years ahead... I started working at a primary school in 2010.''

The teacher has a varied teaching background, from upper secondary to primary, and has worked at the latter since 2010. The participant was interviewed in January 2023 and was teaching year seven this school year. The teacher has half a year of further education in English, which they completed approximately eight years ago. The teacher can not remember being taught about formative assessment in her education.

> ''I can actually not remember if we got that. But it is a bit weird if we have not got it. Ee, so I am guessing. I am guessing that when we had that type of didactic for middle school and didactic for primary, that it was in these chapters..I do not think it was like: Now we are going to have about formative assessment.''

The teacher concludes with there was probably theory about the topic in the education, but it was not specifically named formative assessment.

The sixth participant has worked as a full time teacher since 2007 and worked as a supply teacher before this. The participant first did a nursery nurse education, before specialising in Norwegian, maths and English. The teacher has further education in

special needs studies and has nearly finished a master's thesis in English. The teacher did get some training in formative assessment in the further education, but not in the intitial studies.

The seventh participant started teacher training school in 2012 and finished a master in mathematical didactics in 2017. This participant worked as a supply teacher during the studies, but started as a full time teacher after the studies. ''I got a permanent possition at a school that I worked at for five years''. The teacher now works at a private school. ''In 2020, I think it was, I got an offer to do further education in English. I said yes to that. And studied for a year. So part time, it was in total thirty study points''. When asked about being taught about formative assessment in the studies, the answer was: ''I can not remember we talked too much about that... Not specifically''.

4.2.1.3 How Formative Assessment is being used in the English Subject

The interviewees were presented with Wiliam and Thompson's (2007) five formative assessment strategies.These are aim oriented teaching, meaningful teaching, teacher assessment, fellow- student assessment and self-assessment. After they were asked to say a bit about how they use formative assessment in the English subject. ''How do you structure it and what documentation do you use? What do you think is working?'' Here the researcher could have added the question: ''Why do you think it is working?''.

The first participant answered that they focused on oral activities and was more tied up to the teaching book when they taught younger pupils, but from year group 5 and onwards they introduced more writing and pair activities.

‘‘... I have used a lot of process oriented writing, and group work, where they are allowed to co-operate. They have, well, I, I am trying to structure it so that I make enough time for a project. So that they know when it is pre-activities, what we are going to write about, what ideas to work on in groups and together with the whole class..This is my ideal way of doing it...’’

The interviewee also said that they evaluate and give each other feedback.

‘‘I feel that the fellow student assessment that you mentioned, is... in fact maybe more valuable for them than teacher feedback... if you have a good group. Because they listen to each other in a nice way, and they learn... are maybe listening more to their fellow students than their teacher. We are a litte boring to listen to.’’.

The second participant said that they structured the lessons with themes used over a certain period of time. Then they have a chapter test, with listening, reading, grammar and writing. ‘‘I use them as a little pinpointer on how far they have got in their work.’’. This teacher used the tests from the book Explore as indicators to plan the further lessons. The teacher emphasised that even if the chapter was finished, the participant would carry on practising what they struggled with, to make them succeed.

‘‘...we have not finished the theme, even if we have finished with the theme in the book. Because we continue working with it. So it is not an enclosed chapter for my part. That, I am very aware of. But it gives me a pinpointer on where are you right now.’’

The teacher also mentioned that:

''to follow the pupils throughout the lessons... and their homework, when they hand in written work and when they read things they have practised. It gives me a clear indication on where they are in their learning and work.''

The third participant described how they would teach a chapter or unit. The teacher would start off doing a quiz or class discussion about a topic.

''That will help me find the level at which I need to start... and based on the response I get from them, I will devise the lesson... I do a lot of interactive activities. So like they have to work in groups and constantly present, like for instance a podcast about the short story we are constantly doing. And that will show me whether they understand what is a short story, they understand what is a character, they understand what is the theme, language, plot, setting. All of those things.''

The teacher recently made the pupils make a Facebook page about Emily Bronte's *Wuthering Heights* where they had to put themselves into the younger Kate's position and over a period of three months post their feelings.

''So how she is feeling. She will keep updating that. And then, that will show me, if they are getting the character or not... The social media activities will give me an insight on the character, and it will as well show me if the students are displaying some empathic skills.''

The teacher explained that they do a post-activity with the pupils to round up at the end of the lesson. ''And sometimes one activity goes over three lessons. It is easier on me also, just to get the direct feedback''. The teacher said that they also did formative assessment more formally.

''Because before the summative assessment, I like to see where it is that they are falling short, maybe? ... I assign like a... analyse the character of Heathcliff and they will have to do it in groups of three. So then they have less to correct the work, but at the same time I can act at their knowledge. And depending on how they respond I will tell them what it is that they need, what is it that is lacking.''

The fourth participant explained that they always have an introduction to a new theme in the English subject, where the pupils are explained what to do and why. ''My experience is that for many, this can be ok. The aims are so clear about what I am going to do. And what I am going to try to learn for a period now.'' The teacher also used the pupils as resources for each other. ''They are telling each other and giving feedback and evaluating''. The teacher explained to the pupils that they had to give positive and constructive feedback. If they had a presentation or had to hand in some work, the teacher emphasised ''That I give clear feedback then, written or oral''. The participant emphasised that the feedback given were on the aims that were set at the start of the project.

Participant five reported to use process oriented writing in the teaching:

''They hand in a text to me, and then they get feedback on the text. And then, they are going to write further with the help from the feedback. And maybe hand it in once more, to improve the text''.

The interviewee said that the conversation with the partents and the pupil every half a year is the formalised formative assessment, but when not being the class teacher, the participant feels it does not function in an optimal way, as it is best to be in direct contact with the pupil. The teacher said that the notes written before the conversation,

made the participant aware where in the learning process the pupils were. ''But when I am not there, and do not know how they react, and might forget what I have written next time I meet them, I do not think it is functioning well''. The colleagues at theacher's school have a focus on co-operative learning and the pupils' participation in the education, and the participant can see that they are connected to formative assessment. The participant explained some activities they had worked with when learning about verbs. The teacher had shown them how to use the dictionary, but then one of the pupils said ''But I do not want to look it up, I want to know it myself! Ok. What should we do then? Yes, then we have to learn these verbs then, right!''. Instead of just learning the irregular verbs by heart from revising after a schematic table, the teacher said ''So I thought that now they can decide themselves what to do... I had brought boxes, notes, Lego... different things. And then I told them that this week we are going to learn five verbs'' The pupils were divided into groups ''and try to find out how you think you will learn these verbs. And then you have to learn them in such a way that you can use them when you are writing.''

The sixth participant first showed the pupils a model text and gave them some criteria and aims for what they were going to learn. The teacher reported that the pupils were assessing each others texts and the teacher also gave formative assessment throughout their work. The pupils have also done self-assessment. When the participant is going to assess their oral work, the teacher listens to when they do pair work or read for each other. If anyone finds it difficult talking in the lesson, the teacher has made an agreement with the pupil, where they make aims for what the pupil will manage during the lesson. ''Maybe you can manage to say a sentence next time, right? To the person you sit next to''. The teacher said that they did not write down the formative assessment, but kept it in mind for further lessons.

The last participant said it varies how formative assessment is used, depending on what theme is being taught. The teacher is using devices such as Kahoot and Blooket to ask them questions. The participant sometimes have open questions and other times more alternatives. The interviewee makes a discussion around each answer, when they go through the quiz after, to see how they were thinking. In oral English the teacher listens to them reading their homework and give them feedback on their pronunciation. The teacher also gives written feedback on texts they write and see if there are certain mistakes they do.

4.2.1.4 National Tests used as Formative Assessment

The national tests are meant to contribute to formative assessment. National tests are done in year groups 5, 8 and 9 in the English subject (MER, 2019). The tests that are done in the autumn of year group 5 are useful guidelines to how the pupils are doing in the English subject. The teachers can get an idea of each pupil's skills, both what the pupil master and what is a challenge. This tool gives an indicator on what each individual needs to improve, what the class they are in have to work further on, and how they are doing, compared to other schools in the country. The participants were asked how the results of the national tests were worked with at their school.

The first participant reported that at their school they had discussed that the teacher in year group 4 should get the results from the national tests of the year group 5 pupils too, as they would then get feedback on the results of the pupils they had just taught. They could then adjust their teaching, depending on the results. This had just been discussed at the school, but there was no practise for handing over such information. The teacher said that there was not set of much time to go through the results and there were no procedures to how they were followed up.

The second participant had recently completed the national tests with the pupils at year 5 when the interview took place. The teacher said that they had just received the results and looked through them to see what levels the pupils were at. The teachers at the school normally go to a course arranged by the municipality to get feedback on how to work to improve the results. At the time of the interview, the meeting had not been held yet, as all the analysis from the national tests were not ready. The teacher said ''the most important is to get an overview of the pupils' levels and that we can then do changes at school where needed''. The teacher emphasised that they thought the weakest pupils needed the most help.

The third participant works at an IB school, but they do the national tests as well. They use it as a formative assessment tool to see how the pupils can improve in the English subject. Also they use the national tests to compare the pupils to the Norwegian schools, and especially if pupils are changing from an IB to a Norwegian school, the national tests serves as guidelines for the levels the pupils are at, as information for the new school.

Participant number four found the national tests interesting, as they show the levels the pupils are at. The teacher said that her colleagues told her they got suggestions from MER online on how to work with specific tasks for weaker students, but they had discussed in the team, that thay had not found these guidelines now. The teacher wishes there would be more guidance on what to do to help the pupils make progress.

Participant five reported that they had meetings with all the teachers where they looked at the results. They used to get information on how the classes throughout the years had done and were shown graphs where the results were compared. This had been stopped as there were teachers who felt offended by it. At this teacher's school

they had a meeting after the results were presented, to plan how to follow up and make progression. The teacher said that after the meeting, the focus faded out as other topics were more important.

The sixth participant explained that at their school they used to have a good structure with an information conference about the results followed by a meeting on how to lift the pupils' results. They also had meetings with the secondary school to plan a good transition. About five years ago, there was a high turnover of people working in the municipality the school is ran by. When the person who arranged the national tests meeting stopped working there, it all fell apart. Nobody has taken the responsibility after, and the national test results have not been touched on an organised group level.

The seventh participant works at a private school. The school has had poor results on the national tests in English for years. After the results have been given, the teachers have done the tests too. In this way they know the questions and the level of the tests very well. They have spent about four afternoons, where they have been sat in teams and worked on the way forward from here.

> ''We work extra with the national tests. We discuss it amongst the colleagues to try and implement English in several subjects. The daily plan in all subjects are in English. We are trying, when the pupils read articles, for example in Science, that they also meet English articles.''

The teacher interviewed said he thinks there are many reasons for the low score at his school. He is one of two fully qualified English teachers at the school, so the levels of English competence amongst the staff are low. Many of the pupils have started off at different schools, but moved to this private school because of bullying, difficult behaviour or other reasons. The teacher also emphasised that every single pupil at the

school does the test, it is not like at many other schools, where pupils with learning difficulties are left out.

4.2.1.5 Formative Assessment Practises before and after Covid-19

The pandemic forced the whole society to close down and the way to give formative assessment might have changed after Covid-19 entered the world (Zou et al., 2021).The interviewees were asked to answer how they found their formative assessment practises before and after the pandemic.

The first participant taught year 1 and 2 in English at the time and focused mainly on oral activities online. The teacher said it would probably have been different with older kids, where they would have to hand in written work. This teacher preferred to give feedback orally, as they could then see the reaction, if the pupils understood the feedback or not. It was hard to give this type of feedback one to one under the pandemic, due to organisational reasons.

The second participant reported that her formative assessment practises has changed after the pandemic. This is specifically due to the fact that each pupil has got a chromebook each, and they are able to do more digital writing. The teacher can see that this helps both their writing and motivation. It is easier to spell words correctly in English when having digital programs helping out.

The third participant expressed that they found the teaching under the pandemic very challenging. The teacher was used to doing drama activities and a lot of teaching in groups. Then the participant was suddenly forced out of her comfort zone and had to teach them all digitally on Teams. ''It is not really easy to reach all the students. I did a lot of explicatory teaching. So old school. Just directly telling them''. The teacher

found it hard to reach all the students online, as if was often the same students talking. The participant also tried to put them into groups online, but it was hard to organise.

The fourth participant said that the focus on formative assessment feels stronger after the pandemic. If it is the period at school they lost under Covid-19 or the tight co-operation with parents as a result of it, the teacher is not sure of.

> ''I feel there is more of a focus of both seeing the work and the pupil in a way. It is not that we have not done that earlier on, but the focus now is stronger, which I think is good''.

Participant five reported that they started using digital tools and the platform called Canvas just before the pandemic started. When the society was closed down, they did a lot of process- oriented writing, where they continued on a text they got feedback on.

The sixth participant said that it was at the time when their school became more digital. The teacher started using office more, and wrote comments to the pupils' texts. The teacher used a lot of formative assessment by writing comments to their texts that the pupils had to work further on. This was also done before the pandemic, but when they got digital tools to work with, it was easier to reach all the pupils.

The seventh participant said he used some digital tools under the pandemic, in a different way to how they were used before. He made the pupils produce more digital texts where he gave feedback, compared to what he had done before. But apart from that he feels the formative assessment practise stayed the same before and after the pandemic.

4.2.2 Formative Assessment and the Curriculum (LK20)

In paragraph 3.3 in the Education Act it is written that the aim of assessment is to make learning happen and to create the willingness to learn throughout the process. To give information about the competence during the process and at the end of the education in the subject (The Education Act, 1998). Formative assessment is according to the curriculum LK20 required by the Education Act from year one until after upper secondary school. In LK20 each subject has a separate part about formative assessment (MER, 2019; NDET, 2017). The interviewees were asked to tell how this affect them as teachers. They were asked if the new curriculum LK20 has done that they have changed assessment practices. They were asked to tell what assessment practices they used before LK20 and how they now do the assessment.

The first participant has recently completed her education, and the importance of formative assessment was emphasised when they studied. The teacher reported that they also see the value of summative assessment, but by being informed how valuable the formative assessment is, they have not had to change their practise in any way. This is as the teacher has worked with LK20 since they became a qualified teacher. The teacher said that to give the pupils the desire to learn, to talk with them and give them feedback, to actually show that you care, means a lot to them. The participant believes that by doing this, the results also become better.

The second participant reported that they do not think they do much different when it comes to the formative assessment practises, before and after LK20. What has changed, is their view on formative assessment.

> ''Earlier I did think that, yes, when we for example have had a chapter test,
> then we have finished the topic for now. But now I have realised, we are not

finished. We have to continue working. We kind of build stone on stone and continue constructing''.

The teacher has realised that their way of teaching has changed a bit over the years, and the assessment practises are in relation to the way you teach. The participant uses more co-operative learning in their English lessons now, compared to before LK20. ''It becomes an assessment to see how they have conversations together too, for example in English''. The participant thought their formative assessment practises have changed just a little, but not much.

The third participant works at a private school where they use the IB curriculum, not the national curriculum LK20. The teacher was asked if they do any changes to their formative assessment practise now, compared to when they started working. The teacher explained that they have become much more confident when giving formative assessment.

> ''I used to have very standardised assessments, because I was more focused on seeing what is it that the students are lacking. Now I kind of... I am more flexible, less regent. Because it is no point of just looking at the grammar of the student... It is still, it is important, but it just give them low self esteem''.

The teacher used to look for mistakes and was focused on their own teaching, that they went through all the topics. Now the participant's focus has changed to what the pupils are able to do and they look at what kind of knowledge they have.

Participant four said that there was not as much focus on formative assessment in their education even if they finished their teacher training in 2018. The teacher was a bit in doubt if it was their old work place or the previous curriculum that was the reason for

not focusing on formative assessment. Now, after LK20, they found that there was a big emphasis on both formative and summative assessment. The teacher thought it was good that the pupils get information about their levels and that they get taught how to assess themselves, but they feel the pressure on results and reaching aims have got too much focus. ''I have to honestly say that I think there is too much focus on assessment. We need to have a bit of motivation. It is ment to be fun''. The teacher liked that the competence aims in LK20 make the teachers choose more how they want to plan their lessons, compared to the previous curriculum. ''You have a bit more room then, for how you are going to plan the lessons in a way''. This interviewee values the positive part of formative assessment, but is worried about the negative effect of it. ''There are in a way to sides''.

The fifth participant reported that after LK20 the staff at their school has had a lot of focus on the core elements and the basic skills in the subjects and that they are going to be as valuable and governing as the competence aims. The teacher complained that it was hard to focus at everything at once in the new curriculum. But the participant did see the relevance between formative assessment, co-operative learning and student participation, and realised that they have worked with formative assessment, even though the teacher was worried they had not. ''I can see that it goes hand in hand, now with these other focus areas, co-operative learning and student participation. And then it automatically becomes more self-assessment and formative assessment too''. Apart from this, it is like it was before, they reported. The pupils get oral feedback all the time, and they get feedback on their written work too. The teacher said it has become much easier for the pupils to continue their written work after feedback has been given, as the texts are now digital.

Earlier on in their career participant six worked mainly with pupils who had an ADHD diagnosis. The teacher said that they automatically had to do formative assessment, as for pupils with special needs it was hard to wait until the end to get feedback. They needed close following up to be able to complete their tasks. But the teacher does remember that they had more weekly tests in the classes. There was a tradition for doing a test on the Friday to show what they had learnt during the week. The participant is against this. The participant's daughter, who hardly had to look at the English words, would memorise them straight away for her test. But when she came to secondary school and had to produce longer texts, this was harder. The teacher does not think tests where you just memorise without producing your own text has much of a learning effect, it is when you have to produce texts yourself that learning happens.

The seventh participant who has worked as a teacher for six years, and been a qualified English teacher for three years, said that compared to when they went to school and now a lot has happened with the assessment practises. The participant was used to get a lot of summative assessment, while now they use a lot of formative assessment in their teaching.

> ''Earlier on, from my own time at school, there were many assessments that were looked upon as formative assessment. You had a test, got feedback on it, and then it was a new theme. There was no formative assessment in between''.

The teacher admitted that they could improve their use on formative assessment. The participant used glossary tests to raise the pupils vocabulary level. When the teacher studied, these tests were looked down on by the university lecturers. At the school where the teacher works they however feel the pressure to use them, as all the other

teachers do. The participant also explained that they only have digital books at school. The teacher found the digital feedback given straight away to be positive, but the distraction with computers and the internet made it harder for the pupils to focus on their work.

4.2.3 Writing Skills

The interviewees were asked what formative assessment practises they used to activate the pupils to use their oral skills to then develop their written skills. This question is packed with information and the researcher found that they had to rephrase and explain it, for many of the participants to be able to answer the question. It is almost the same as sub-question two, only with different wording: *2.* Which formative assessment practices do English teachers report implementing in order to help the students transfer their oral skills to develop written skills in the English subject? The interviewer explained that often pupils are strong oral speakers, but they lack the ability to write at the same level. What do you as a teacher do to make them use their oral skills to develop their writing skills? What kind of formative assessment practices do you use?

The first participant said that they used a lot of power point presentations for year group 5 and 6, where the pupils had these for the class. In this way they would present something orally as well as they had done written work. As a teacher they would give them feedback throughout the work process and after they had done the presentation. The teacher found that the pupils were very motivated for these presentations and the ones who were not, got encouraged by looking at the example text they had made.

The second participant said that they recognised that their pupils were good oral speakers, but when it came to written work, it seemed to be more hard work and more

demanding. But the teacher often uses literature to make them write. The participant referred to the last homework they had, where they had read a text about a family where everyone was good at things that were not positive, but that made the text funny. The son was good at picking his nose, the mother was good at making a mess and so on. The teacher made a written activity where they had to write about their own family and what they were good at. The participant found that by giving them creative activities like this, helped them stay motivated and helped them to produce texts. "We always go orally through what we, what we can write about, and come with examples during the process to help them". They often get a model text to look at, so that they know what is expected of them. This can help them to write more independently as they develop their writing skills.

Participant three said that in their year 7 class there are three pupils who really struggle with writing. In the English lessons the participant has a teaching assistant who helps them with the writing. The assistant tries to break the questions into chunks for them to easier understand the task. The teacher or the teaching assistant organise group activities first, where they discuss the questions.

> "Trying to express the ideas orally first… and then try to write it with creativity writing. The assistant who I have is very good. They have a special needs education, so they are doing something called voice recognition… They can speak and then it types itself and it can just write it. So, it is their work".

The teacher found this voice recognition app very useful for the pupils who really struggled with writing, as they could speak into the computer, and then see the written words being formed on their computer. To the whole class, the teacher always tells them lower their expectations and just write down their thoughts. The teacher also

uses process-oriented writing, where formative assessment is a part of the writing process. If the summative result differs a lot to the formative assessment, the teacher has a talk with the pupil, to double check that it is their work. "So, I use that also to kind, to make sure like I am accessing the actual learning that there is a consistency".

The fourth participant expected their year 6 pupils to be at a higher level when they took over the class. The teacher focused on a lot of oral work where they had to sit in groups and talk to each other. The teacher also used a lot of reading in the class. They read a lot and learnt new vocabulary by reading. From using the literature and their practise from the oral activities, the teacher experienced that they became better at writing texts.

> "Then we see how important the oral part has been then. That we have learnt a lot of new words. We have a more that less ok vocabulary, right, to be able to express and formulate with, with text then, and to create written texts."

Participant five reported that they agreed to the fact that pupils are often better at speaking than writing. "It is spot on, it is completely… it is absolutely the big picture". The teacher said that the pupils know this themselves, they understand it when they are going to sit down and write. The teacher tried to give them motivating texts, such as where they had to express their meanings. "What did you like about the method we used last time? I saw that it was something that made them write." They also used model texts and sentences. The teacher emphasised that to write about things they are interested in combined with model texts and questions to answer at their level made their writing easier. If the pupils struggle to write down sentences, the teacher said "and you can say it easily orally, and then try to write it down. Yes,

ok. The little you told me now". The teacher used formative assessment and their oral skills to make them produce written text.

The sixth participant said that they used some tools to help their pupils with the writing. These were model sentences with phrases they use orally. "Just start with 'I like'... or 'start with'… well, you need to keep it at a simple level to make them progress". The teacher also reported that they used literature to create written activities. They had to write a text that was related to something they had just read about.

> "If you think of what you have read today, what did you like the best? And then they write it down, before they say it. Because when they have written it down first, I find many find it easier to use afterwards then."

This participant meant that the oral work could support the written work and vice versa. The teacher emphasised that by working on a smaller scale, not to think big project straight away, the pupils will learn step by step.

The seventh participant answered that the pupils often asked the teacher how to write words. Then the teacher told them to say it first, and then try to write it down. "And then I am thinking, based on this, that they are thinking, this looked a bit odd, or this seemed to be correct". The pupils are doing most of their written work digitally, and it happens that they use "speak to text". This is a digital effect, where they talk into the computer, and the computer writes the words down for them. This is a good tool for dyslexic pupils. In addition, the teacher uses Lingdys, a program where the pupils get to listen to the text they have written, to hear if it sounds ok. To motivate the pupils to write, the teacher often has competitions, such as "Write about whatever you like for two minutes. See how much you manage to write! Write whatever you like, in

English". The teacher also encouraged the pupils to write down what they are thinking, to start the planning and construction of a text. The participant often makes them do co-operative learning, where they must read each other's texts to see if it makes sense to the partner. They then practise their oral skills and to give constructive feedback to each other.

4.2.4 Metacognition

The third sub-question is linked to metacognition: Which formative assessment practices do English teachers report implementing in order to give the students clarity regarding their level of oral and written skills in English and what they are going to achieve? In line with Hattie and Timperley (2007) the pupils will be able to develop their own oral and written skills in English by being trained how to do self-assessment. The aim with formative assessment is to become better at self-regulation and metacognition, to get support with what you later will manage yourself in the English subject. Pupils in year group 5, 6. And 7 can be able to understand their own learning development, if they get taught how to use formative assessment. The participants were asked what experience they have with this.

The first participant said that they have done a lot of formative assessment in relation to process oriented writing. The teacher has had classes where they have done a lot of project-based work, where the pupils have worked a lot in groups. The teacher found that the pupils in the classes where they were trained to use formative assessment, acted more confidently in the feedback situations.

> "They have worked a lot on how to give feedback. They know, they have
>
> learnt how not to give feedback, to say it like that. I think the pupils who
>
> manage it, they have a lot… they understand what they must improve".

115

The teacher emphasised that it is important to let the pupil find what is good or need to be improved, not that the teacher just tell them. ''That they are taking part and listening, oh yes, how could I have done this better?''.

The second participant reported that they made the pupils reflect over their own learning process by asking them questions. In this way they practised both thinking about why and how they did their work, as well as formulating themselves by explaining what they did. The teacher emphasised to give them time and the chance to think, reflect and talk themselves has a good effect on their learning process. The participant would ask them questions like *"Is there anything you have become better at? What do you think about this theme? What has been challenging here?".* The teacher also found that having regular conversations with them about the English subject could be very developing for their learning.

Participant three found this question very interesting, as the IB curriculum has a part called reflection skills, where the pupils will discuss how they found the answer, as well as what is the answer. The pupils would get a text to read, but how they read it was up to them. They got trained up in study techniques, where they would then choose the techniques that suited them best to gain learning.

> "So, the student will have to read. Now how the student will read, that is up to the student. Maybe it is better if he or she listens to the text first or just look at it first. Or look and write and high light. Little things like this".

The teacher also reported that in the IB curriculum they have different tasks they target, where it is organised into critical thinking skills, creative thinking skills, organisational skills, research skills, media and literary skills and reflection skills.

The fourth participant said that it is important to understand your own learning development. The teacher gave an example of a pupil they had that was good in oral English, but struggled with writing, both text production and spelling. He also had problems with his concentration. The teacher found it very useful when they had conversations where he was asked to find out what he found good with his writing, where he could improve and that he was involved in this process. "What I remember with this pupil, he became more aware, I think. It did seem like it. And then he became more aware of: Why did I not manage to write longer? What do I have to do?" The teacher emphasised the importance of being in a dialogue with the pupils, not having a monologue telling them what to do, but make them participate and try to find the answers themselves.

> "Give them alternatives, and many ways to do it then. At the same time as they get some participation, where they feel they have taken some responsibility. In this way they will be trained up to develop their own thinking process''.

Participant five said that the staff at their school have recently started the project with this. The teacher emphasised that they need to put this into a structured system, where there will be set off time for the pupils to reflect on their work.

> "My experience is that it has been difficult to put it into a system. But we have to try. And then I might need to calm down, and not put so much into the lessons. So that we get time for that reflection, then".

The teacher looked upon their job as being the facilitator to help them find out how to find their best way to reach the aim of what they were learning. "What is it that we are going to find out? We are going to find out, how is my best way to learn?".

The sixth participant said that they think the pupils can understand their own learning development with a bit of help. As a teacher you communicate with the pupils and guide them, to make them look for how to develop their skills. To reflect over their own work is important. "That learning is not something that just get given to you, but that you actively participate in it, right?". The teacher said that the assessment also involves the level the pupils are at. When the pupils participate in the assessment, they will learn what level they are at and what type of work would be suitable for them.

Participant seven reported that they tried to ask the students open questions to make them reflect on their thinking process. The teacher emphasised that it could be good not to necessarily tell them how to do a task, but to make them test out various approaches themselves.

> "Go around to the pupils and check what methods they have used and maybe present it, ask them to present the methods for each other, so that they can see. Ok! I understood this method, because it was on the same level as I am at".

The teacher said that they have a potential at his school to structure this type of learning.

4.2.5 Motivation

Motivation is an important factor to encourage the students to work. It has got to do with what makes them encouraged to do the work. For some the aim can be what they are achieving, for others it is the joy they get out of doing the activity. To succeed is a positive experience. Motivation is a helpful power on the way to reach their aim.

The teachers were asked ''How do you experience that your formative assessment help the pupils develop and become motivated in the English subject?''.

Participant one said that the way you give the formative assessment is important for their motivation. That you are enthusiastic and show interest in what they are doing. Often the students are able to see their own mistakes, but if they are not, you just need to guide them a little.

> ''When you give them formative assessment, they are not sat with a lot of work in the end. You help them along the way, to get a result they can be a bit proud of, because when they finish they know they can hand it over to me''.

The participant reported that when the students put effort into their work, along with getting formative assessment from the teacher, they are happy with the result, which the participant thinks make them motivated.

The second participant answered that they found the students got motivated and encouraged by getting positive feedback from the teacher, and just the fact that the teacher saw the, both as human beings and for the work they did. ''And then I think that just that to get... that they experience to be seen. That you see that they are doing an effort''. The teacher found that the formative assessment they gave motivated the students to continue their work. That they got regular feedback both on what they did at school and at home. ''It is important, so that the effort they put in to the work is actually of some use''.

The third participant pointed out that formative assessment is more informal, and less stressful for the students than summative assessment and grades. ''This will naturally make them feel less stressed and less anxious and more motivated, because it is more room to make mistakes then, and yeah, they will learn by mistakes''. The teacher reported that they found motivation to be a very important component for learning.

The fourth participant said that they were very careful with how they gave the feedback. The teacher looked for something positive that each student was good at, but also what they had to work more on. There is often a lot students have to develop to become better at English, but instead of drowning them in work, the teacher said ''that I choose one thing that is smart for you, for that pupil then... I experience that many can see that as motivating. And I am thinking, I have to be very involved in the conversation''. The teacher told that to give them few but concrete aims to work towards, help them stay motivated. The participant also emphasised how important they find motivation, and the teacher questioned the focus of always being assessed, that they sometimes doubts the effect of it, that it might have the opposite effect for some.

Participant five reported that ''I think it has had a positive effect''. Their students had just been involved in the formative assessment by chosing and assessing their own methods. The teacher found that the students looked at that way of working where they were actively taking part and making decisions as very motivating. ''I got the impression it was very motivating for them, when they in a way were able to take part in the formative assessment''. The participant said that when they did text writing, the teacher found that the students became proud of their work, as they got positive feedback when writing the text.

> ''Because it is not just that, no, this was not good enough. You have to do it over again. They get a lot of positive feedback on what they have managed... When they get that throughout the process, They do see how good the text gets in the end... and I think they become a bit proud of themselves after''.

The teacher reported to use glossary tests and sentences connected with new words, where they get to correct their own tests straight after. This the teacher found was motivating for the students. ''Can I put a star on the word that is correct? Can I put a smily face? Well, they thought it was fun, then. And then, they want to succeed, right?''. The interviewee said that they know these tests have been controversial, but for them it is important that it has a meaning.

> ''The reason for having such tests, it is that, well, the tests are a formative assessment. And in a way, you are going to teach the pupils something. And a way of learning, it is that they actually practise at home too''.

The teacher believed that a formal, structured assessment, can be motivating for the students learning. The teacher said that they need to know we are doing this because they are going to learn, it is not for the teacher to look for mistakes. The participant also emphasised the importance of teaching formative assessment at an individual level, as there can a big gap between the strongest and the weakest student. Each student needs to get feedback and praise for what they have done.

The sixth participant reported that they think formative assessment is motivating for the students ''I definitely think so, but maybe a bit more unconsciously''. The teacher believed that students do get motivated by formative assessment, but they might not understand it themselves.

> ''I am thinking it creates a more inner motivation, then, than a summative assessment, right? Summative assessment is in itself an outer motivator. While this, gives a more inner motivation to learn and work, right? And to do a piece of work''.

The seventh participant said ''I experience, or think that when they get feedback directly to themselves at their level, that is motivation in itself. Where you can get a bit of positive feedback on what they have done well''. The teacher reported to find ''Two stars and a whish'' as a positive motivating way of working with formative assessment. This is where you find two positive things the students have done, and one specific thing you want them to improve. The teacher also gave an example of a game played with the students, encouraging them to speak English in the lessons. Five circles were put on the white board, and removed one for each time a student spoke Norwegian instead of English. The circles symbolised extra minutes of break time. Instead of removing a circle as soon as anyone spoke Norwegian, the teacher motivated and encouraged them by saying ''Yes, but how do we say that in English?... and then they would save that circle then'' . The participant emphasised the importance of motivation, and said that ''can see that they have to be motivated to learn. And that, if they have motivated teachers, you get more motivated yourselves''. The teacher said that by doing further education in English, they became a more motivated English teacher. The participant said that the further education made themselves more comfortable teaching the subject. The teacher found that it is important that both the students and the teacher stay motivated.

4.3 Interpreting the Meaning of the Findings

In this section the meaning of the findings will be interpreted and connected to theoretical research which has been presented and discussed in chapter two. The section is structured in the same order as sub-section 4.2, based on the structure of the interview guide, which has the research question and the sub-questions as the overall foundation. In sub-question 4.3.3 the formative assessment practices the teachers

report using will be tied up to Wiliam and Thompson's (2007) five key strategies of formative assessment.

4.3.1 Definition of Formative Assessment

Six out of seven teachers who were interviewed were familiar with the term formative assessment. One of the teachers did not know the English expression, but understood it, when the Norwegian translation was given by one of the colleagues. Also when reading the theoretical background in the interview guide, the teacher felt confident to give the answers related to their own experiences on using formative assessment practices. The interviewees had similar understandings of the term formative assessment. One of the participants said:

> ''It is the assessment you give when the pupils are in a work process. When giving them formative assessment, it helps them to see the developmental potential in a written text for example..and that we work together. Instead of telling them where to do changes, they can take part and realise themselves what needs to be improved''.

In this statement much theory on formative assessment is covered. The fact that the assessment is given during a work process, that they do co-operative learning, and that the student are given the responsibility of looking on what to improve, are all considered to be in line with formative assessment theory. According to Black and Wiliam (2008), the students need to be shown where they are going to reach their learning aims. In this way it is necessary to give the feedback throughout the work process. Hattie and Timperley (2007) emphasises the importance of self-assessment, and that the teachers need to be aware of this, to teach the students this skill. In the result from the interviews, many of the participants pointed out that it is important the

students get taught to look for their own improvements during the process of doing their work.

Another participant came with this quote:

> ''I think where you say that it shows where the students are, at what point they are in their learning. So I use it more for that. Because then, if I know where they are at, then I can adapt my lesson, my future lesson to where they are at. And then try to make sure like all the lessonplans or learning strategies I am going to develop, will actually help them get to where they need to be... I just feel like that it is more like Lev Vygotsky and the proximal development. Where they are at a certain level and then they have to move to the level where they have to reach and they can do that through collaborative learning or..many other strategies, where they can move up to that level''.

Many of the same points are given here, as the information from the previous participant, that are in line with Black and Wiliam's definiton on formative assessment. This quote is included, as it also gives additional information several of the teachers pointed out in their interviews, that they use the information gained from the formative assessment to plan their future lessons. In this way the teaching is designed to suit the students learning level. As the participant says, this is in line with Vygotsky's ZPD. The feedback and the teaching is efficient if it addresses the students ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978).

4.3.2 Teaching Background

The teachers interviewed had different experiences towards how long they have been teachers. All together the teaching experience varied from five to twenty years. Two of the participants had taught for more than twenty years. One had sixteen years of

experience, and the remaining four teachers had between five and ten years with teaching background. All the teachers had taught English throughout their whole career, apart from one participant who did further education in English just recently and then chose to teach in the English subject. The participants were all qualified teachers. Six out of seven of the teachers had or were at their end of receiving their master degrees. Some of them had masters in special needs, one in didactical mathematics and the other two in English. All the participants have further education in the English subject. The researcher deliberately chose participants who had higher education in English.

None of the participants could say that they had been given information on formative assessment through their education. One of the teachers believed that they probably had been given a lecture on it, without it being called formative assessment. Another teacher who finished her teacher education in 2018, stated

> ''We had, we had very little about it. And that, that I miss. Thinking about it today, it should have been an even bigger focus on it then.». But there was unfortunately not much information to gain from the participants from their education time. I can not remember we talked too much about that..Not specifically''.

The researcher expected the teachers who were educated in 2017 and 2018 to get specific education on formative assessment, as it was first introduced in the Education Act in 2009, and has been given a gradually stronger role since then. In the present Education Act it is stated that all students from year 1 and throughout the whole of the upper secondary are entitled to be formatively assessed (The Education Act, 1998). In LK20 the formative assessment is focused on, with a section on the topic in each

subject. In the English subject it is stated what the teachers have to do to give the students formative assessment (MER,2019). It needs to be taken into consideration that teachers who did their education recently could have learnt about metacognition or teaching strategies that are linked to formative assessment.

4.3.3 How Formative Assessment Practices are being used in the English Subject

The teachers all reported that they use formative assessment in their English teaching. Several of the teachers mentioned that they use aim oriented teaching, where specific aims and assessment criteria are developed, in line with Wiliam and Thompson (2007). The teachers showed model texts and explained the aims of the period they are going to work at. In this way the aim of where the students are going is clear for them, which is connected to Black and Wiliam's theory where the students need directions to know where they are going (Black & Wiliam, 2008).

Wiliam and Thompson's second formative assessment strategy is meaningsful teaching, where efficient classroom discusions are developed and good assessment tasks for documentation of the students skills (Wiliam & Thompson, 2007). Many of the teachers reported that they use process oriented writing, where the students get feedback and continue their writing process based on the feedback they get.

> ''They hand in a text to me, and then they get feedback on the text. And then, they are going to write further with the help from the feedback. And maybe hand it in, once more, to improve the text''.

Hertzberg and Dysthe (2012) both claim that there is a high learning potential in process oriented writing, even though many teachers find it time consuming. Burner (2015) points out that cyclic writing, the focus on fewer texts and peer-assessment is

the key to save time and still keep the learning effect of formative assessment and progress on EFL writing.

The third formative assessment strategy according to Wiliam and Thompson (2007) is teacher assessment, where the feedback given encourage learning. The teachers reported that they used various forms of teacher assessments, where they wanted to find out where the students were at in their learning process, to help them reach the next level. This is in line with Vygotsky's ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978). The formative teacher assessments reported used were feedback given in relation to reading, oral presentations, group-work and written work. The teachers gave formative feedback on the focus area the students were working on. Burner (2016) emphasises that to pick out the relevant area to work on, helps the students progress.

Formative assessment strategy number four, in line with Wiliam and Thompson's theory, is peer-assessment. Here the students get activated as resources for each other. All the teachers said that they used co-operative learning as a strategy in their English lessons. However, not all of them reported using peer-assessment. The teachers reported to do this with both oral and written work. One of the teachers told about a creative way they got the students to work, by providing them with different material and giving them the aim of the project, to learn five verbs. The students were then all participating in their own learning, and they had to assess what they found as the learning outcome of the learning strategies they had chosen. The teacher found that the students got very motivated of working this way, and they had never seen them more enthusiastic.

''But they were unbelievable to write then, I saw now. When I said, now you are going to write down what you liked with this and what you learnt, they were kind of on it, straight away, and everybody started''.

Wiliam and Thompson's (2007) last formative assessment strategy is self-assessment, where the students' ability to learn how to learn get activated. This strategy is thightly linked with metacognition. According to Burner (2016) the teacher's job is to ask questions that make the students learn to reflect and think themselves. The teachers were asked to say how they structure the formative assessment and what documentation they use. Also, what they think is working in relation to their formative assessment practices. These questions were asked at the start, after Wiliam and Thompson's formative assessment strategies were presented. To collect evidence of the students learning takes time, and according to Harlen (2007) and Davies (2007), observation, dialouge and students work are three sources of collecting the levels of where the students are at. The teachers reported that they observed the students when the students were in learning situations, where they for example talked or read to their fellow students. When the students were put in groups, the teacher observed a lot about their communicative skills when they interacted with each other. The teachers also gained information about the students level in English when they were in dialouge with them. All the teachers made their student write texts digitally, and the students received both written and oral feedback on their work. Two of the teachers reported to use quizes as formative assessment, to check the students level of English, but also to encourage them to learn more. They were used as pre-, during- and post- activities. One of the teachers said they regulary used the chapter tests designed for the English book formatively, to know how to plan the lessons ahead of them to fit the students levels. This is in line with Hattie & Timperley's (2007) theory

on where the student is in the learning process (feed back), where the student is going

(feed up) and how to progress (feed forward). One of the teachers explained that they

did not take notes of the observations they made on formative assessing the students,

but the participant kept it in mind for future lesson planning. According to Burner

(2016) it is important that the teachers have a structured plan for their formative

assessment practices, to easier implement them in their classrooms.

4.3.4 National Tests used as Formative Assessment

The reason for asking the question on how the national tests were used at the teachers'

schools, was to find out if the tests were used as formative assessment, where the

information gained from the tests helped to promote future learning. This is in line

with formative assessment research (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Hattie & Thompson,

2007). Two of the participants answered there were no structured work done with the

results of the national tests at their schools. Both the teachers would like to have such

a system in place. One of them was used to have good routines at their own school,

but it all fell apart when a key person responsible to present the results to the schools,

left. The other five teachers reported that the results were presented and the way

forward was discussed in groups amongst the teachers. One of the teachers reported to

miss clear instructions and tasks the teachers could give to make the students improve.

The participant thought TDET used to provide such teaching material in the past. At a

school with low scores, the teachers did the tests too, and they spent a lot of time on

finding a solution to how to improve their results. Many of the teachers pointed out

that the information from the results helped them plan their teaching, and gave them

an indicator on what levels the students were at.

4.3.5 Formative Assessment Practices before and after Covid-19

Participant one and three only talked about how they taught during the covid pandemic, but did not report how their formative assessment practices were before and after covid-19, and if their practices had changed. Here, the interviewer should have asked the question again, to get an answer. Many of the teachers reported that they had recently received digital tools for the students, which improved both the students writing and motivation. One of the teachers also said that they did a lot of process oriented writing during the corona time. One of the participant reported that he felt there had not been much of a chance on his formative assessment practices before and after the pandemic, apart from more feedback given digitally. Other teachers said there had been a change. One of the participants reported they thought the focus on formative assessment had become stronger, both on the work done and to see each individual. This, the teacher felt was a step in the right direction.

All the teachers reported there had been a little change in their formative assessment practices after the pademic. The introduction of digitial resources and the close connection with the homes while the society was closed down, could be reasons for this. In August 2020, the new curriculum, LK20 was implemented, with is also a factor of the change of formative assessment practices. (The Education Act, 1998; MER, 2019; NDET, 2017). The findings considering LK 20 will be discussed further in the next section. The formative assessment practices reported from these findings that had an increase after the pandemic, were digital written feedback during process oriented writing. Some of the teachers reported that the students were more involved in their learning processes by using self- and peer-assesment, but also by planning their way of learning. Many of the participants reported to use process oriented writing. Some of the teachers used self- and peer-assessment, but they did not report if

they used these formative assessment practices on a regular basis. According to Burner (2016) it is neccesary to structure self- and peer-assessments, where the teacher come with clear instructions on how to do them, to get the best effect of the learning processes.

4.3.6 Formative Assessment and the Curriculum (LK20)

All the seven teachers reported that their formative assessment practices have changed after the new curriculum, LK20. One of the participants qualified as a teacher when LK20 was implemented, and has not changed practices since. One of the teachers reported that her view of formative assessment had changed the most, where they now understands the value of the assessment practices, how formative assessment practices can contribute to effective learning. Earlier the teacher changed topic and started something new when the period was over, now they looked at where the students were in their process and continued from there. They got information on where the students were at in their learning, to plan further lessons. The teacher also reported to use more co-operative learning, where the students were communicating in English. Here the teacher explained that they used the knowledge of the students levels to navigate how to plan the future lessons, which is in line with Black and Wiliam's research (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Another teacher emphasised that the change in their formative assessment practice had gone from looking for mistakes to focusing on what the students are capable of doing and to help them move on from there. A similar answer was given from another participant who earlier had weekly tests, but now used to make the students produce texts themselves to develop their English by using the language, instead of memorising words for a test. Here the practice at the teacher's school has gone from a ''teach to the test'' attitude, in line with Scriven (1991) to teaching using more formative assessment practices such as Hattie &

Timperley (2007), Black & Wiliam (1998) and Popham (2008) support. One of the teachers reported that the focus areas at their school was co-operative learning and student participation, which they realised was well connected with formative assessment. The teacher said that they have always given written and oral feedback, both before and after LK20, but the digital tools have made it easier for the students to continue their written work after they have been given feedback. Now, by also using self-assessment and co-operative learning, their formative assessment practices have improved to the better. When the students get taught how to assess themselves and each other, they get aware of where they are in their learning process and will become better at adjusting themselves in the right direction in their learning processes. This is in line with Hattie and Timperley's (2007) research. The last participant compared the assessment practices to when they went to school themselves and up to how they now use formative assessment today. The teacher said a lot has happened since then, where summative assessment was more in focus, while the tests now are used more formatively. The teacher admitted that they could become better at using formative assessment more actively in their teaching.

4.3.7 Writing Skills

Most of the participants reported that they used model sentences, phrases and texts to help their students become better writers. All the teachers found that the students looked upon writing as a harder process than speaking. This is in line with Shanahan and Shanahan (2014). The teachers encouraged the students by telling them to write down what they wanted to say, and in this way, they lower the pressure of putting words on the paper. Two of the teachers used digital applications to help students with reading and writing difficulties, where they could say the sentences, the computer would write. One of the teachers found that the students got motivated when making

power point presentations. They would then get feedback from the teacher during the process and after. They then used both oral and written skills. Some of the other teachers reported that creative writing tasks, tasks where they had to express their meaning or writing as a competition with a time limit, were ways of encouraging the students to write. Another teacher said that process-oriented writing, where formative assessment was a part of the writing process, was used. According to Hertzberg and Dysthe (2012) there is a high learning potential in this formative assessment practice. It was reported by several teachers that they used to talk about the topic they were going to write about, where the students would get ideas and knowledge about the theme. Literature was also used, where they read a lot to gain knowledge and raise the students word level. This supports the first component ''To Build Knowledge'' in the circle model of education and learning (NTNU,2021). None of the participants referred to this model directly, but they described to use relevant content from it. Most of the teachers reported to use model texts to make the students write, which is in line with the second component ''To Deconstruct Model Texts'' in the circle model. Not all teachers who reported using model texts did go in detail on if they deconstructed the models, but many of the model texts in the learning books in the English subject emphasise each part in the text. ''To Construct Texts Together'' is the third part of the circle model. Many of the teachers reported using pre-activities together with the class, where they planned for the writing process together. None of the teachers talked directly about students sitting in groups planning and writing a text together, but more as a classroom activity. One of the teachers reported using peer-activity as an assessment practice, to read each other's texts. All teachers reported that they activated their students to use ''Individual Writing'', which is the last part of the circle model. The teachers encouraged the students to write individually by building

upon their knowledge gained from the pre-activities, model texts and by giving them feedback and support throughout the writing process.

4.3.8 Metacognition

All the teachers reported useful formative assessment practices that would help the students to find their level of English and help them learn how to learn, so that the students are able to develop in the English subject. Peer-assessment was mentioned as a formative assessment practice, where the students get trained to give each other feedback. According to Burner (2016) it is important that the students get told how to give this feedback, to make it an effective process where the students learn of each other. The fact that the students use self-assessment and look for what to improve themselves, can be a good way of learning, instead of the teacher always giving this feedback. Burner (2016) emphasises the importance of the students getting trained to adjust their own learning, to be good at self-assessment. One of the participants said that they thought the students can work on their own, with a bit of feedback from the teacher. This is in line with Vygotsky's ZPD, where the students can learn more with a bit of help. If the teacher finds the students proximal development zone, it means that is how much the students manage to do on their own. With a bit of guidance, the students can be able to understand more (Vygotsky, 1978).

Another teacher gave the students questions to answer, to reflect over their own learning. The participant said it was important to give them time to think about their own learning process. The fact that they talk about what they have done, will make them aware of what they have learnt. It is the teacher's job to facilitate this (Harmer, 2001). Some of the teachers reported the importance of being in a dialogue with the students about their work. This is in line with the English subject curriculum in LK20

134

where it is stated that "The teacher and pupils shall engage in dialogue on the pupil's development in English… they shall have the opportunity to express what they believe they have achieved and how they have improved their skills" (MER, 2019, p.8).

Some of the teachers emphasised the importance of putting the formative assessment practices into a structured system. This is in line with Burner (2016) who found that to structure the formative assessment practices is necessary to get the best effect out of the assessments. Two of the teachers reported that they still feel their formative assessment practices are too unstructured, and that they have a potential to improve this. According to Burner (2016) this can be done by the teacher giving the students feedback, spending more time for the students to reflect on their own work in the lessons, to use peer-feedback, self-assessment and the teacher talking to the students about formative assessment, so that they are aware of what it is and how to use it. Burner says that by using a set of reflective questions for each formative assessment practice, the students get used to the activity. To become better in the English subject, they need to practice. To get clear instructions on how to use the same formative assessment practices repeatedly, will easier make the students reach their aims in the English subject.

One of the teachers said that they looked upon their role as a teacher to be a facilitator. This is in line with Black and Wiliam's research (1998) where they claim there are two main functions with feedback: directive feedback, where it is told directly what needs to be done. Facilitative feedback is where the student gets the chance to think, and the teacher becomes the facilitator. Many of the teachers mentioned to let the students find the answers themselves, and not the teacher always

guiding them to use a specific way of thinking or doing their English work. To introduce various study techniques to the students, for them to find out which way of working would suit them and in which situation, is a good way to experience and learn the language. "The pupils shall be given the opportunity to experience that experimenting on their own and with others is part of learning a new language" (MER, 2019, p.8). In this quote from the English subject curriculum in LK20, co-operative learning and to experiment on their own is a part of learning English. According to Burner (2016) research show that learning takes place in classrooms where mistakes are accepted, and that students learn from their own mistakes. This a huge contrast to the previous view of assessment, as it in curriculum from the 1980's (M74) was stated that mistakes should be avoided.

4.3.9 Motivation

The teachers reported that their formative assessment practices made the students motivated in the English subject. One teacher said they thought the students were not aware of the motivation the formative assessment practices make in a direct way. The participant compared summative assessments with tests and end results to outer motivation and compared formative assessment with inner motivation, where the students have a desire to work. One of the teachers questioned the effect of formative assessment, as they believed the constant assessment can have a negative outcome for some students learning processes.

All the teachers reported that the students got proud of positive feedback, which they could see made the students motivated to work more. To give constructive feedback such as ''Two stars and a wish'' was used as an example. The teacher would then praise two things with the students' work and come with a constructive message on

what the teacher wish the student would put in there for next time. Many of the teachers reported motivation occurred when giving feedback to the students at their right level, which according to Vygotsky (1978), is when the students are at their zone of proximal development.

The teachers found that the students got more motivated when they were actively taking part in their learning, by choosing and assessing their own learning processes. This is in line with Black and Wiliam (1998), Hatiie and Timperley (2007) and Burner (2016). According to Ryan and Deci (2000), the students can achieve autonomy when they are able to take part in their own learning by expressing what they mean, come with suggestions about their learning situations and make their own decisions.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This final chapter is organised into the summary and implications of the teachers'
change of formative assessment practices (5.2), where the main research question and
the three sub-questions will be discussed, and the findings of the thesis will be
summarised. In part 5.3, the limitation of the study is reflected upon, and suggestions
for future research are presented. In the last section, 5.4, the conclusion of the thesis
will be presented.

5.2 Summary and Didactical Implications of the Teachers' change on Formative assessment Practices

The overall research question for this master's thesis was "To what extent and how
have teachers' formative assessment practices changed in Norwegian year groups 5, 6
and 7 in the English subject?". The focus has been on the teachers' change of
formative assessment practices, and in this part of the study the aim is to try and
answer this question, by summing up the findings of the sub-questions of this thesis.

The first sub-question of this study was "Has the introduction of LK20 affected the
teachers' formative assessment practices?" The English teachers of year groups 5, 6
and 7 who were asked, meant there has been a small change in their formative
assessment practices. Findings indicate that the introduction of the curriculum LK20
has affected the teachers' formative assessment practices, in terms of their view of
formative assessment and the organisation of it. Some of the teachers explained that
their view on formative assessment practices had changed. Previously they worked
towards a result, and they were focused on the students' mistakes. Now, the teacher
reported to see the value of formative and summative assessment, as intertwined. As
an example, they could use tests as a formative assessment. The teachers gained

information on where the students were in their learning processes, by using dialogue, observation and student's work, in line with Harlen (2007) and Davies (2007). They used this information to plan their lessons and guide the student's how to progress in their learning, by using formative assessment processes such as formative feedback, peer-assessment, self-assessment and process writing. The pandemic started around the implementing of the new curriculum, LK20. Covid-19 and the closing of the society and classrooms caused a special situation. All the students at the participants' schools received digital devices to easier communicate with their teachers. According to the findings in this thesis, process writing is a formative assessment practice that was used to a greater degree after this. Some of the teachers report to use "Two stars and a wish" where two positive and one constructive feedback were given. It is also reported that some of the teachers used more co-operative learning, with peer- and self-assessment now than before LK20, where the students are a part of their own learning processes, in line with Hattie and Timperley (2007) and Black and Wiliam (1988).

Sub-question two "Which formative assessment practices do English teachers report implementing in order to help the students transfer their oral skills to develop written skills in the English subject?". All the participants found that their students looked upon writing as a harder process than speaking. To help them with this process, some of the teachers reported to use creative teaching strategies to guide their students. They found the students got motivated and wanted to write when they were engaged in the task and got to express their feelings or opinions. The teachers reported to use oral literature-, class- and group activities to create knowledge on what they were going to write about. Model sentences, phrases and texts were provided as examples for the students to understand the structure of a text. In this way, the students would

be prepared for individual writing. Several teachers reported to use voice recognition programs to help students with dyslexia to speak into the device, for the computer to write the spoken words. One teacher found that Power Point presentation made the students motivated to write. The formative assessment practices reported used to transfer the students' oral skills to develop their written skills in English are peer-assessment, where they for example read the text for each other and give feedback on each other's work. All the teachers reported giving formative assessment during the writing process, by encouraging the students to write down their thoughts and lower the fear of writing.

The last sub-question asks: "Which formative assessment practices do English teachers report implementing in order to give the students clarity regarding their level of oral and written skills in English and what they are going to achieve?". The participants all emphasised the importance of teaching the students to learn how to learn. When the students learn how to reflect upon their own learning, they will become more independent students. This is in line with Hattie and Timperley (2007). Many of the teachers reported to use oral activities with the students to help them reflect to see how to improve their own learning. Many of the teachers were aware of the importance of student participation in the learning situation, where the students take part in the decision making of their learning process. Some of the teachers reported using peer- and self-assessment. Not all teachers reported using self-assessment. To structure the formative assessment practices and make time for reflection in the lessons is what some of the teachers felt they must improve on.

5.3 Concluding Reflections

This study has contributed to the field of EFL didactics by providing an in-depth view on the change of teachers' formative assessment practices. The findings in this thesis are that the teachers' formative assessment practices have changed in the English subject of Norwegian year groups 5, 6 and 7, from looking for mistakes to have a focus on how to help the students improve their work. The thesis indicate that the formative assessment practices have changed a little after LK20 was implemented. After the pandemic, more process writing has been used, due to technical devises and the focus on formative assessment. Findings in the thesis indicate that the teachers use more cooperative learning, where the students have higher participation in their own learning process. The findings indicate that many of the teachers activate the students' reflections, in a way where they can reach their ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978). The teachers emphasise that they have a need to structure their formative assessment practices. This is in line with Burner's (2016) research, where this structure is necessary to make the formative assessments function. The findings show that the teachers report a change in their assessment practices, where the teachers previously used feedback to point out errors. They now use feedback that are more constructive. The teachers are guiding the students where to go by using "Two stars and a wish", where two positive and one constructive feedback is given. According to Burner (2020) the implementing of peer-assessment and self-assessment require instructions from the teacher, for the students to conduct the assessments in an appropriate way. Some, but not all teachers reported to use these assessment practices in their classrooms, which indicates this to be an area to have focus on in the future. To make this implementation process possible, it is essential to use Fullan's (2016) and Burner's (2018) change theory.

5.4 Limitation of the Study and Suggestions for Further Research

To write a master's thesis is certainly a learning process, and the researcher knows a lot more about the change of formative assessment practices and research now, compared to when this project started. The researcher gained knowledge on the theory of research and realised that it is important to make the right choices of research from the beginning of a research process. In this section reflections will be presented on what could have been done differently if the research project was done over again.

This thesis is a qualitative research study that has investigated the change of teachers' formative assessment practices. To find out to what extent and how teachers' formative assessment practices have changed, can only be seen from the teachers' point of view in this study. This is due to the time aspect and size of the master's thesis, as a wider project would be too much to complete within this format. It would be interesting to get a wider perspective on this topic, and some suggestions for following issues will be considered for future research.

In the present master's thesis, it is the teachers' voices that are represented on how they see their change of formative assessment practices. It would be interesting to further investigate to what extent there has been a change, by listening to the students of these teachers. Here it is important to consider the students ages and devise questions that are appropriate to their levels.

Another interesting angle for further research would be to do classroom observations, to see with your own eyes what is happening inside Norwegian year 5, 6 and 7 classrooms when the students learn English. The researcher is then able to observe which formative assessment practices are being used in the English teaching.

This master's thesis indicates that teachers' formative assessment practices have changed. However, it would be interesting to investigate one specific formative assessment practice, to get more in-depth on how this type of assessment practice has been implemented in the Norwegian classes of English teaching. To look further into students' co-determination right in the English subject, related to formative assessment, would be an interesting angle. This is also highly relevant within the new Education Act (The Education Act, 1998).

LIST OF REFERENCES

Angvik, S. A. (2022). Læring og vurdering gjennom dialog.
https://www.utdanningsnytt.no/bedre-skole-fagartikkel-karakterer/laering-og-vurdering-gjennom-dialog/342353

Asssessment Reform Group. (2002). Assessment for Learning: 10 principles. Research-based principles to guide classroom practice. In A. R. Group (Ed.).

Berge, K. L., Skar, G., Matre, S., Solheim, R., Evensen, L., Otnes, H., & Thygesen, R. (2017). Introducing teachers to new semiotic tools for writing instruction and writing assessment: consequenses for students' writing proficiency.
https://uia.brage.unit.no/uia-xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/2493681/Berge.pdf?sequence=4

Birenbaum, M., DeLuca, C., Earl, L., Heritage, M., Klenowski, V., Looney, A., Smith, K., Timperley, H., Volante, L., & Wyatt-Smith, C. (2015). International trends in the implementation of assessment for learning: Implications for policy and practice. *Sage*, *13*(1), 117-140.
https://doi.org/https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1478210314566733

Black, P. J., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2003). *Assessment for learning. Putting it into practice* (1 ed.). Open University Press.

Black, P. J., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the Black Box Raising Standards Through Classroom Assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 17. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171009200119

Black, P. J., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *21*(1), 5-31.

Bloom, B. (1969). Some Theoretical Issuses Relating to Educational Evaluation. *70*(10), 26.
https://doi.org/https://www.scribd.com/doc/283341599/Scriven-The-Methodology-of-Evaluation-1967#

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, *36*(2), 81-109.
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/1652/1/borgs1_Language_Teaching_36-2.pdf

Burner, T. (2012). Jeg lærer mye av mappevurdering og ser hva jeg har gjort og kan forbedre mye mer. En studie av mappevurdering i praksis. In F. Rønning, R. Diesen, H. Hoveid, & I. Pareliussen (Eds.), *Rapport fra konferanse om praksisrettet FoU i lærerutdanning* (pp. 61-70). Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
https://www.academia.edu/1577261/En_studie_av_mappevurdering_i_praksis_s_61_70_A_study_of_portfolio_assessment_in_practice_pp_61_70_

Burner, T. (2014). The potential benefits of portfolio assessment in second and foreign language writing contexts: A review of the literature. *43*, 139-149.

Burner, T. (2015). Processes of change when using portfolios to enhance formative assessment of writing. *Assessment Matters*(9), 53-79.
https://doi.org/10.18296/am.0011

Burner, T. (2016). Formative assessment of writing in English as a foreign language. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *60*(6), 626-648.
https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2015.1066430

Burner, T. (2018). Why is educational change so difficult and how can we make it more effective? *Research and Change*, *1*(1), 122-134.
https://doi.org/10.23865/fof.v1.1081

Burner, T. (2020). Formative assessment in English. In C. Carlsen, M. Dypedahl, & S. H. Iversen (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning English*.

Cambourne, B., & Turbill, J. (1987). *Coping with Chaos*. Primary English Teaching Association.

Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733109

Carless, D. (2005). Prospects for the implementation of assessment for learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *12*, 39-54. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594042000333904

Charmaz, K. (1994). Identity dilemmas of chronically ill men. *The Sociological Quarterly 35*, 269-288.

Common European Framework of References for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. (2007). Council of Europe Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2012). *Introduction: How a Genre Approach to Literacy Can Transform the Way Writing is Taught.* Routledge

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research. Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Davies, A. (2007). *Making Classroom Assessment work* (2 ed.). Connections Publishing.

Drew, I., & Sørheim, B. (2009). *English Teaching Strategies* (2nd ed.). Samlaget.

Dysthe, O. (1999). *Ord på nye spor. Innføring i prosessorientert skrivepedagogikk* (2 ed.). Det norske samlaget.

Dysthe, O. (2008). Klasseromsvurdering og læring. *Bedre skole*(4), 16-23. https://docplayer.me/412225-Klasseromsvurdering-og-laering.html

Dysthe, O. (2022). Olga Dysthe - 4 punkt om pedagogikk og dialog. *Bedre skole*(5). https://www.utdanningsnytt.no/bedre-skole-fagartikkel-pedagogikk/olga-dysthe-4-punkt-om-pedagogikk-og-dialog/317865

Dysthe, O., & Hertzberg, F. (2012). Prosesskriving- Hvor står vi i dag? In S. Matre, D. K. Sjøhelle, & R. Solheim (Eds.), *Teorier om tekst i møte med skolens lese- og skrivepraksiser* (pp. 59-69). Universitetsforlaget.

Dysthe, O., Hoel, T. L., & Hertzberg, F. (2000). *Skrive for å lære*. Abstrakt forlag AS.

Evensen, K. (2021). *Helhetlig vurderingspraksis i skolen* (1 ed.). Fagbokforlaget.

Fenner, A.-B. (2018). The Historical Development of English as a School Subject. In A.-B. Fenner & A. S. Skulstad (Eds.), *Teaching English in the 21st Century. Central Issues in English Didactics*. Fagbokforlaget.

Flavell, J. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, *34*(10), 906-911. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906

Fullan, M. (2016). *The New Meaning of Educational Change* (5 ed.). Teachers College Press.

Gamlem, S. M., & Smith, K. (2013). Student perseptions of classroom feedback. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *20*(2), 150-169. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2012.749212

Gardner, J. (2010). What is innovative about theacher assessment? . In J. Gardner, W. Harlen, L. Hayward, & G. Stobart (Eds.), *Developing Teacher Assessment* (pp. 71-84). McGraw-Hill.

Grocott, C. (2022). Intended or unintended consequences? Assessing the ways in which the National Tests of English are implemented and acted on in Norwegian schools. *Nordic Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.46364/njltl.v10i1.1017

Handal, S. (2023). Elevmedvirkning og lærerskjønn. *Utdanning*(4). https://www.utdanningsnytt.no/files/2023/05/08/Utdanning_04_2023.pdf

Harlen, W. (2007). Formative Classroom Assessment in English, the Humanities and Social Sciences. In J. H. McMillian (Ed.), *Formative classroom assessment. Theory into practice*. Teachers College Press.

Harmer, J. (2001). *How to Teach English. An introduction to the practice of English language teaching* (7 ed.). Longman. https://ia800801.us.archive.org/31/items/HowToTeachEnglish/How%20to%20Teach%20English%20Harmer%2C%20Jeremy.pdf

Hasselgreen, A., & Caudwell, G. (2016). Assessing the Language of Young Learners. In. Sheffield: Equinox Publishing Ltd.

Hasselgreen, A., & Ørevik, S. (2018). Assessment and Testing. In A.-B. Fenner & A. S. Skulstad (Eds.), *Teaching English in the 21st Century* (pp. 361-383). Fagbokforlaget.

Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement. *Routledge*. https://apprendre.auf.org/wp-content/opera/13-BF-References-et-biblio-RPT-2014/Visible%20Learning_A%20synthesis%20or%20over%20800%20Meta-analyses%20Relating%20to%20Achievement_Hattie%20J%202009%20...pdf

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81-112. https://doi.org/10.3103/003465430298497

Haukås, Å. (2011). Læringsstrategier i språkundervisninga. . *Bedre skole*, *2*, 38-41. https://www.utdanningsnytt.no/files/2019/08/22/Bedre%20Skole%202%202011.pdf

Havnes, A., Smith, K., Dysthe, O., & Ludvigsen, K. (2012). Formative assessment and feedback: Making learning visible. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *38*(1), 21-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2012.04.001

Hoel, T. L. (2007). Omskriving - ein kritisk faktor i skriving og rettleiing? In S. Matre & T. L. Hoel (Eds.), *Skrive for nåtid og framtid* (pp. 14). Tapir.

Hopfenbeck, T. N. (2011). Vurdering og selvregulert læring. *Bedre skole*(4), 26-30. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Therese-Hopfenbeck/publication/272508537_Vurdering_og_selvregulert_laering/links/54ea25be0cf27a6de113877c/Vurdering-og-selvregulert-laering.pdf

Hudelson, S. J. (1989). *Write on: Children Writing in ESL*. Centre for Applied Linguistics.

Klenowski, V., & Askew, S. (2006). Portfolios for learning, assessment and professional development in higher education. *Taylor & Francis*, *31*(3), 267-286. https://doi.org/DOI:10.1080/02602930500352816

Kleven, T. A., & Hjardemaal, F. (2018). *Innføring i pedagogisk forskningsmetode* (3 ed.). Fagbokforlaget.

Kluger, A. N., & A.S., D. (1996). The Effects of Feedback Interventions of Performance: A Historical Review, a Meta-Analysis, and a Preliminary Feedback Intervention Theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, *119*(2), 254-284. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.254

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon Press Inc. https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/54883275/Krashen_Communicative_Approach_by_Stephen_Crashen_1-libre.pdf?1509538343=&response-content-disposition=inline%3B+filename%3DPrinciples_and_Practice_in_Second_Langua.pdf&Expires=1684076291&Signature=RHvFLUm3BQ8j0Mu3nGFTTg6ogiwehaCCd219Urb8Q1BMWHM-OjS~NWC6Xm6UnUFmH1obnbt0KAgD2AnAL10LfvR~KzhXQRUS8Aw93o5oXzJHdsRyYantXnLiN-DM1t1fXW9AeN6xJ8myz15QHNv~QMjgqCcMtkpROj7LiMAhUVLr9motz8iXq36SmKGWtEX2a9o-vGVBJ9-2eUP~uSnMdmaBhKc82d9UoPA9JCPs44Hw9mzoekQji-IT4hdJUGd1NzBBpWaKyA9ZIrRUxzQEAcnB48-iJV6a0zaKmesKmVJjPTNjYqMFNF6xKBGQ6bNERyX1bDe6ywGQGqEwZvBs~A__&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA

Kronholm-Cederberg, A. (2009). *Skolans responskultur som skriftpraktik. Gymnasisters berattelser om lararens skriftliga respons på uppsatsen.* Åbo Akademi.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2018). *Det kvalitative forskningsintervju* (3 ed.). Gyldendal Akademisk.

Kvithyld, T., & Aasen, A. J. (2011). Fem teser om funksjonell respons på elevtekster. (9), 10-16. https://skrivesenteret.no/materiale/fem-teser-om-funksjonell-respons-pa-elevtekster/

Kvithyld, T., & Aasen, A. J. (2012). Å skrive, det er å omskrive. https://utdanningsforskning.no/artikler/2012/a-skrive-det-er-a-omskrive/

Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. . *ELT Journal*, *63*(1), 13-22. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn010

Little, D. (1999). Developing learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom: a social-interactive view of learning and three fundamental pedagogical principles, Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses. *Servicio de Publicaciones*(38), 77-88. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/David-Little-10/publication/288926115_Developing_learner_autonomy_in_the_foreign_languag e_classroom_A_social-interactive_view_of_learning_and_three_fundamental_pedagogical_principles/links /577624ad08aead7ba0719578/Developing-learner-autonomy-in-the-foreign-language-classroom-A-social-interactive-view-of-learning-and-three-fundamental-pedagogical-principles.pdf

Little, D. (2009). Learner autonomy in action: adult immigrants learning English in Ireland. In F. Kjisik, P. Voller, N. Aoki, & Y. Nakata (Eds.), *Mapping the Terrain of Learner Autonomy: Learning Environments, Learning Communities and Identities* (pp. 51-85). Tampere University Press.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2016). *Designing Qualitative Research* (6. ed.). Sage.

Messick, S. (1996). Validity and washback in language testing. *Educational Testing Service*, *13*(1), 241-256. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2333-8504.1996.tb01695.x

The Ministry of Education and Research. Curriculum in English (ENG01-04). (2019). Retrieved from https://data.udir.no/kl06/v201906/laereplaner-lk20/ENG01-04.pdf?lang=eng

NESH. (2021). *Forskningsetiske retningslinjer for samfunnsvitenskap, humaniora, juss og teologi*. De nasjonale forskningsetiske komiteene. Retrieved 25.01.23 from https://www.forskningsetikk.no/retningslinjer/hum-sam/forskningsetiske-retningslinjer-for-samfunnsvitenskap-og-humaniora/

The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. Core Curriculum. (2017). Retrieved from https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/?lang=eng

The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. Observations on the National Assessment for Learning Programme (2010-2018). Skills Development in Networks. Final Report. (2018). Retrieved from https://www.udir.no/contentassets/0b8163f632bd48ea9552ae3693513654/the-norwegian-assessment-for-learning-programme_final-report-2018.pdf

The Norwegian Education Act. Lovdata. (1998). Retrieved from https://lovdata.no/lov/1998-07-17-61

NTNU. (2021). *Sirkelen for undervisning og læring*. https://skrivesenteret.no/ressurs/sirkelen-for-undervisning-og-laering-3/

OECD. https://www.oecd.org/

Ong, W. J. (1982). *Orality and literacy: The technologizing of the world*. Methuen.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2 ed.). Sage.

Popham, W. J. (2008). *Transformative Assessment*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Postholm, M. B., & Jacobsen, D. I. (2016). *Læreren med forskerblikk. Innføring i vitenskapelig metode for lærerstudenter.* Cappelen Damm.

Pressley, M. (2006). *Reading Instruction That Works. The Case for Balanced Teaching*. Guilford Publications.

Pring, R. (2015). *Philosophy of Educational Research* (Vol. Third Edition). Bloomsbury Academic.

Raaheim, A. (2006). Do students profit from feedback? *Seminar.net*, *2*(2). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7577/seminar.2517

Race, P. (2001). Using feedback to help students to learn. *The Higher Education Academy*. https://phil-race.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/Using_feedback.pdf

Ramaprasad, A. (1983). On the definition of feedback. *Behavioural Science*, *28*(1), 4-13. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830280103

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 68-78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, *18*, 119-144. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714

Sandvik, L. V., & Buland, T. (2013). Vurdering i skolen. Operasjonaliseringer og praksiser. Delrapport 2 fra prosjektet Forskning på individuell vurdering i skolen (FIVIS). *Trondheim: Program for lærerutdanning, NTNU*.

Scriven, M. (1967). The Methodology of Evaluation. *Social Science Education Consortium*, *110*. https://www.scribd.com/doc/283341599/Scriven-The-Methodology-of-Evaluation-1967#

Sennet, R. (2004). *Respect. The formation of character in an age of inequality*. Penguin Books Ltd.

Shanahan, C., & Shanahan, T. (2014). Does Disciplinary Literacy Have a Place in Elementary School? . *Reading Teacher*, *67*(8), 636-639. https://doi.org/ https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1257

Sjøberg, S. (2014). Pisa-syndromet. Hvordan norsk skolepolitikk blir styrt av OECD. *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift 2014*, *1*, 30-43. https://sveinsjoberg.com/artiklernorsk/pisa-syndromet/

Slemmen, T. (2019). *Vurdering for læring i klasserommet* (2nd ed.). Gyldendal.

Stobart, G. (2008). *Testing Times* (1 ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203930502

Thagaard. (2018). *Systematikk og innlevelse* (5 ed.). Fagbokforlaget.

Tierney, R. D. (2006). Changing practices: influences on classroom assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *13*(3), 239-264. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/09695940601035387

Topping, K. (2003). Self and Peer Assessment in School and University: Reliability, Validity and Utility. *Kluwer Academic Publishers*. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-48125-1_4

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society. The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1990). What influences learning? A content analysis of review literature. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *84*(1), 30-43. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1990.10885988

Wiliam, D., & Leahy, S. (2007). A theoretical foundation for formative assessment. In J. H. McMillian (Ed.), *Formative Classroom Assessment. Theory into Practice* (pp. 39). Teachers College Press.

Wiliam, D., & Thompson, M. (2007). Integrating Assessment with Learning: What will it take to make it work? *Semantic scholar*. https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10001162/1/Wiliam2006Integrating.pdf

Wolden, G. (2020). Pupils' writing skills declined during home schooling. *Norwegian SciTech News*. https://norwegianscitechnews.com/2021/02/pupils-writing-skills-declined-during-home-schooling/

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The Role of Tutoring in Problem Solving. *Pergamon Press*, *17*, 89-100. https://acamh.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x

Zou, W., Kong, S. D., & Lee, I. (2021). Teacher Engagement with Online Formative Assessment in EFL Writing During COVID-19 Pandemic: The Case of China. *THe Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *30*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00593-7

Vil du delta i forskingsprosjektet

"A grounded theory study on the change of teachers' formative assessment practices "?

Dette er eit spørsmål til deg om å delta i eit forskingsprosjekt der føremålet er å finne ut i kva grad og korleis engelsklærarar på mellomtrinnet sine formative vurderingspraksisar har endra seg. I dette skrivet gjev vi deg informasjon om måla for prosjektet og om kva deltaking vil innebere for deg.

Føremål
Føremålet med prosjektet er å intervjue seks lærarar som underviser i engelskfaget på

mellomtrinnet, for å finne ut i kva grad og korleis dei formative vurderingspraksisane deira

har endra seg. Det vil bli intervjua lærarar frå ulike delar av landet. Problemstillinga for

masteroppgåva er:

I kva grad og korleis har engelsklærarane sine formative vurderingspraksisar endra seg i

norske 5.-7. klassar i engelskfaget?

- Har introduksjonen av kunnskapsløftet 2020 hatt nokon effekt på lærarane sine

  formative vurderingspraksisar?

- Kva formative vurderingspraksisar rapporterer engelsklærarar at dei bruker for å hjelpe elevane til å overføre dei munnlege eigenskapane til elevane for å utvikle seg skriftleg i engelskfaget?

- Kva formative vurderingspraksisar rapporterer engelsklærarane at dei bruker for å tette gapet mellom kva elevane veit om dei munnlege og skriftlege ferdigheitene sine i engelsk og kva dei skal lære? (Metakognisjon)

Kven er ansvarleg for forskingsprosjektet?

Det er Universitetet i Bergen som er ansvarleg for prosjektet.

.

Kvifor får du spørsmål om å delta?

Du får spørsmål om å delta fordi du underviser i engelsk på 5. – 7.trinn.

Kva inneber det for deg å delta?
Metoden som skal brukast i prosjektet er eit semi-strukturert kvalitativt intervju. Intervjuet vil gjennomførast ved lyd/videoopptak over internett. Spørsmåla vil bli sendt på mail i forkant, slik at intervjuobjektet kan førebu seg til intervjuet.

Det er frivillig å delta
Det er frivillig å delta i prosjektet. Dersom du vel å delta, kan du når som helst trekkje samtykket tilbake utan å gje nokon grunn. Alle personopplysingane dine vil då bli sletta. Det vil ikkje føre til nokon negative konsekvensar for deg dersom du ikkje vil delta eller seinare vel å trekkje deg.

Ditt personvern – korleis vi oppbevarer og bruker opplysingane dine
Vi vil berre bruke opplysingane om deg til føremåla vi har fortalt om i dette skrivet. Vi behandlar opplysingane konfidensielt og i samsvar med personvernregelverket. Det er eg, Inger Jorunn Helland Montgomery og rettleiar Craig Grocott som vil ha tilgang til dataene dine ved Universitetet i Bergen. Namnet og kontaktopplysningane dine vil eg erstatte med ein kode som blir lagra på ei namneliste skild frå resten av dataa. Datamaterialet blir lagra på forskingsserver, men blir sletta etter prosjektet er avslutta. Deltakarane vil ikkje kunne

kjennast att i publikasjonen. Dei blir omtala som anonyme i masteroppgåva, der berre opplysningar om kjønn, aldersgruppe og fylke dei underviser i blir presentert, i tillegg til svara på spørsmåla deira.

Kva skjer med opplysingane dine når vi avsluttar forskingsprosjektet?
Opplysingane blir anonymiserte når oppgåva er godkjend, noko som etter planen er i juli 2023. Personopplysningar og eventuelle opptak blir sletta etter dette.

Kva gjev oss rett til å behandle personopplysingar om deg?
Vi behandlar opplysingar om deg basert på samtykket ditt.

På oppdrag frå Universitetet i Bergen har Personverntjenester vurdert at behandlinga av personopplysingar i dette prosjektet er i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

Dine rettar
Så lenge du kan identifiserast i datamaterialet, har du rett til:
innsyn i kva opplysingar vi behandlar om deg, og å få utlevert ein kopi av opplysingane,
å få retta opplysingar om deg som er feil eller misvisande,
å få sletta personopplysingar om deg,
å sende klage til Datatilsynet om behandlinga av personopplysingane dine.

Dersom du har spørsmål til studien, eller om du ønskjer å vite meir eller utøve rettane dine,

ta kontakt med:

- Universitetet i Bergen ved rettleiar Craig Grocott Craig.Grocott@uib.no eller student

    Inger Jorunn Helland Montgomery inger.jorunn.helland@stavanger.kommune.no

- Vårt personvernombod: Janecke H. Veim janecke.veim@uib.no

- Dersom du har spørsmål knytt til Personverntjenester si vurdering av prosjektet kan du

    ta kontakt med:

    - Personverntjenester, på e-post (personverntjenester@sikt.no) eller på telefon: 53

        21 15 00.

Venleg helsing

Craig Grocott   Inger Jorunn Helland Montgomery

(Forskar/rettleiar)   (student)

Samtykkeerklæring

Eg har motteke og forstått informasjon om prosjektet «A case study on the change of

teachers' formative assessment practices» og har fått høve til å stille spørsmål. Eg samtykker

til:

☐   å delta i intervju

Eg samtykker til at opplysingane mine kan behandlast fram til prosjektet er avslutta.

(Signert av prosjektdeltakar, dato)

INTERVJUGUIDE

Eg tar ein master i engelsk didaktikk ved Universitetet i Bergen. Intervjudelen blir utført på norsk, sidan dette er morsmålet til fleire av intervjuobjekta. Eg skal dele intervjuet inn i fem tema og stille opne spørsmål. Eg skal gjere seks intervju, der kvart intervju varer ca.60 minutt. Intervjua blir gjort digitalt, med lydopptak. Poenget er å stille spørsmål som kan gi svar på problemstillinga mi.

Problemstilling: I kva grad og korleis har engelsklærarane sine formative vurderingspraksisar endra seg i norske 5.-7. klassar i engelskfaget?

- Har introduksjonen av kunnskapsløftet 2020 hatt nokon effekt på lærarane sine formative vurderingspraksisar?

- Kva formative vurderingspraksisar brukar engelsklærarar for å få elevane til å overføre dei munnlege eigenskapane til elevane for å utvikle seg skriftleg i engelskfaget?

- Kva formative vurderingspraksisar bruker engelsklærarane for å tette gapet mellom kva elevane veit om dei munnlege og skriftlege ferdigheitene sine i engelsk og kva dei skal lære? (Metakognisjon)

Intervjuguide

154

a.   Formativ vurdering

Formativ vurdering er undervegsvurdering.Tony Burner (2016) seier at formativ vurdering er all vurdering der målet er å utvikle elevane sine læringsprosessar og /eller lærarane sine læringsmetodar.

Black og Wiliam (2008) er leiande forskarar innan formativ vurdering. Dei understreker at poenget med formativ vurdering er å vise elevane kor dei skal vidare i læringa si, slik at dei er i stand til å nå læringsmåla sine.

Ifølge Hattie (2007) er nøkkelen til formativ vurdering å lære elevane å vurdere si eiga læring. For at elevane skal kunne gjennomføre denne sjølvvurderinga, må lærarane vere klar over dette.

1.Kva legg du i omgrepet formativ vurdering?

2.Kan du fortelle litt om lærarbakgrunnen din?
Kor lenge har du jobba som lærar og kor lenge har du undervist i engelskfaget? Kva utdanning har du? Har du formell utdanning i faget? Fekk du opplæring i formativ vurdering i utdanninga di?

Ifølge Wiliam & Thomson (2007) kan formativ vurdering delast inn i fem ulike strategiar. Desse er målorientert undervisning (der tydelege mål og vurderingskriterier blir utarbeida), meiningskapande undervisning (effektive

klasseromsdiskusjonar blir utvikla og gode vurderingsoppgåver for dokumentasjon av elevane sine ferdigheiter), lærarvurdering (der ein gir tilbakemelding som fremmar læring), medelevvurdering (der elevane blir aktiverte som ressursar for kvarandre si læring) og eigenvurdering (elevane si evne til å lære å lære blir aktivert).

3. Sei litt om korleis du praktiserer formativ vurdering i engelskfaget. Korleis strukturerer du det og kva dokumentasjon bruker du? Kva fungerer synest du?

4. Dei nasjonale prøvane er meint som ei kartlegging for å finne ut kor elevane ligg fagleg. Dette er eit utgangspunkt for å finne ut kva ein må arbeida vidare med i engelskfaget. Korleis blir det jobba med resultata av dei nasjonale prøvane på skulen din?

5. Covid-19 og nedstenginga av samfunnet førte til nye måtar å undervise og vurdere på.
Korleis opplevde du den formative vurderingspraksisen din før og etter pandemien?

b. **Formativ vurdering og læreplanen (Kunnskapsløftet 2020)**

Formativ vurdering blei først introdusert i opplæringslova i 2009, og sidan revidert i 2013. I forskrifta til opplæringslova under kapittel 3 står det i paragraf 3-2 at «Elevar..har rett til undervegsvurdering..». «Skoleeigar har ansvar for at retten til vurdering blir oppfylt, jf.opplæringslova paragraf 13-10.

Under paragraf 3-3 som omhandlar vurdering i fag står det at «Formålet med vurdering i fag er å fremje læring og bidra til lærelyst undervegs, og å gi informasjon om kompetanse undervegs og ved avslutninga av opplæringa i faget»

Formativ vurdering er ifølge læreplanen 2020 lovpålagt i heile skuleløpet. I kunnskapsløftet 2020 har kvart fag ein eigen del om undervegsvurdering.

1.Fortel korleis dette påverkar deg som lærar. Sei litt om tidlegare vurderingsformer og dei som blir brukt i dag.

c. Skriveferdigheiter

1.Kva formative vurderingspraksisar bruker du for å få studentane til å bruke dei munnlege ferdigheitene sine til å utvikle dei skriftlege ferdigheitene sine?

d. Metakognisjon

Ifølge store norske leksikon er metakognisjon ei overordna bevisstheit og forståing om korleis ein tenkjer og lærer. Ein kan skilje mellom metakognitiv kunnskap («Eg har lett for å lære matte») og metakognitive strategiar. (Eg lærer meg nye ting ved først å fokusere på prinsippet») Utdanningspsykologen John Flavell blir rekna som opphavsperson til omgrepet metakognisjon (snl.no)

Formålet med formativ vurdering er å bli betre på sjølvregulering og metakognisjon, for å få støtte til det ein etter kvart vil greie sjølv i engelskfaget. Elevar på 5. -7. trinn kan vere i stand til å forstå si eiga læringsutvikling dersom dei blir trena opp i formativ vurdering. Kva erfaring har du med dette?

e) Motivasjon

Korleis opplever du at den formative vurderinga di hjelper elevane å utvikle seg og bli motiverte i engelskfaget?

Referansenummer
163277

Vurderingstype
Standard
Dato
21.10.2022

Prosjekttittel
A grounded theory study on the change of teachers' formative assessment practices

Behandlingsansvarlig institusjon
Universitetet i Bergen / Det humanistiske fakultet / Institutt for fremmedspråk

Prosjektansvarlig
Craig Grocott

Student
Inger Jorunn Helland Montgomery

Prosjektperiode
20.09.2022 - 01.07.2023

Kategorier personopplysninger
Alminnelige
Lovlig grunnlag
Samtykke (Personvernforordningen art. 6 nr. 1 bokstav a)
Behandlingen av personopplysningene er lovlig så fremt den gjennomføres som oppgitt i meldeskjemaet. Det lovlige grunnlaget gjelder til 01.07.2023.

Meldeskjema

Kommentar
OM VURDERINGEN
Personverntjenester har en avtale med institusjonen du forsker eller studerer ved. Denne avtalen innebærer at vi skal gi deg råd slik at behandlingen av personopplysninger i prosjektet ditt er lovlig etter personvernregelverket.

Personverntjenester har nå vurdert den planlagte behandlingen av personopplysninger. Vår vurdering er at behandlingen er lovlig, hvis den gjennomføres slik den er beskrevet i meldeskjemaet med dialog og vedlegg.

VIKTIG INFORMASJON TIL DEG
Du må lagre, sende og sikre dataene i tråd med retningslinjene til din institusjon. Dette betyr at du må bruke leverandører for spørreskjema, skylagring, videosamtale o.l. som institusjonen din har avtale med. Vi gir generelle råd rundt dette, men det er institusjonens egne retningslinjer for informasjonssikkerhet som gjelder.

TYPE OPPLYSNINGER OG VARIGHET
Prosjektet vil behandle alminnelige personopplysninger frem til 01.07.2023.

LOVLIG GRUNNLAG
Prosjektet vil innhente samtykke fra de registrerte til behandlingen av personopplysninger. Vår vurdering er at prosjektet legger opp til et samtykke i samsvar med kravene i art. 4 nr. 11 og 7, ved at det er en frivillig, spesifikk, informert og utvetydig bekreftelse, som kan dokumenteres, og som den registrerte kan trekke tilbake.

For alminnelige personopplysninger vil lovlig grunnlag for behandlingen være den registrertes samtykke, jf. personvernforordningen art. 6 nr. 1 a.

PERSONVERNPRINSIPPER
Personverntjenester vurderer at den planlagte behandlingen av personopplysninger vil følge prinsippene i personvernforordningen:

• om lovlighet, rettferdighet og åpenhet (art. 5.1 a), ved at de registrerte får tilfredsstillende informasjon om og samtykker til behandlingen
• formålsbegrensning (art. 5.1 b), ved at personopplysninger samles inn for spesifikke, uttrykkelig angitte og berettigede formål, og ikke viderebehandles til nye uforenlige formål
• dataminimering (art. 5.1 c), ved at det kun behandles opplysninger som er adekvate, relevante og nødvendige for formålet med prosjektet
• lagringsbegrensning (art. 5.1 e), ved at personopplysningene ikke lagres lengre enn nødvendig for å oppfylle formålet.

DE REGISTRERTES RETTIGHETER
Vi vurderer at informasjonen om behandlingen som de registrerte vil motta oppfyller lovens krav til form og innhold, jf. art. 12.1 og art. 13.

Så lenge de registrerte kan identifiseres i datamaterialet vil de ha følgende rettigheter: innsyn (art. 15), retting (art. 16), sletting (art. 17), begrensning (art. 18) og dataportabilitet (art. 20).

Vi minner om at hvis en registrert tar kontakt om sine rettigheter, har behandlingsansvarlig institusjon plikt til å svare innen en måned.

FØLG DIN INSTITUSJONS RETNINGSLINJER
Personverntjenester legger til grunn at behandlingen oppfyller kravene i personvernforordningen om riktighet (art. 5.1 d), integritet og konfidensialitet (art. 5.1. f) og sikkerhet (art. 32).

Ved bruk av databehandler (spørreskjemaleverandør, skylagring eller videosamtale) må behandlingen oppfylle kravene til bruk av databehandler, jf. art 28 og 29.

For å forsikre dere om at kravene oppfylles, må dere følge interne retningslinjer og/eller rådføre dere med behandlingsansvarlig institusjon.

MELD VESENTLIGE ENDRINGER
Dersom det skjer vesentlige endringer i behandlingen av personopplysninger, kan det være nødvendig å melde dette til Personverntjenester ved å oppdatere meldeskjemaet. Før du melder inn en endring, oppfordrer vi deg til å lese om hvilken type endringer det er nødvendig å melde:
https://www.nsd.no/personverntjenester/fylle-ut-meldeskjema-for-personopplysninger/melde-endringer-i-meldeskjema. Du må vente på svar fra oss før endringen gjennomføres.

OPPFØLGING AV PROSJEKTET
Vi vil følge opp ved planlagt avslutning for å avklare om behandlingen av personopplysningene er avsluttet.

TAUSHETSPLIKT
Lærere har taushetsplikt, og det er viktig at intervjuene gjennomføres slik at det ikke samles inn opplysninger som kan identifisere enkeltelever/foresatte eller avsløre taushetsbelagt informasjon. Vi anbefaler at du er spesielt oppmerksom på at ikke bare navn, men også identifiserende bakgrunnsopplysninger må utelates, som for eksempel alder, kjønn, navn på skole, diagnoser og eventuelle spesielle hendelser. Vi forutsetter også at dere er forsiktig ved å bruke eksempler under intervjuene. Vi anbefaler at du minner læreren om taushetsplikten før intervjuet starter.

Kontaktperson hos oss: Silje Fjelberg Opsvik
Lykke til med prosjektet!