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THE EFFECTS OF PEER-CORRECTION AND PEER-ASSESSMENT ON STUDENTS’ SPOKEN FLUENCY

Abstract

This paper examines the effects of peer-correction and peer-assessment strategies on the development of spoken fluency. This study was conducted with 22 participants of A2 level language ability who experienced difficulties in their fluency when engaging in spoken communication with interlocutors and who wished to demonstrate the same level of fluency in spoken language as in writing for professional development and personal growth reasons. This paper follows the qualitative method studying the effectiveness of an intervention targeted to improve these learners’ fluency. The study was designed to determine the impact that these two self-monitoring strategies had on the participants’ oral fluency by developing communicative competence through mitigating affective filters that hindered these students’ oral development. This process enabled most of the participants to identify their own mistakes by providing each other feedback increasing confidence and a positive perception towards the implementation by reflecting on the value of peer-correction and peer-assessment in EFL contexts.

Keywords: Communicative competence, peer-assessment, peer-correction, pragmatic fluency.
Resumen

Este documento examina el efecto de las estrategias de co-evaluación y corrección por pares en el desarrollo de fluidez oral. Este estudio se llevó a cabo con 22 participantes de nivel A2 en la habilidad de lenguaje quienes experimentaron dificultades con su fluidez al momento de entablar conversaciones orales con interlocutores y quienes deseaban demostrar el mismo nivel de fluidez tanto en lenguaje hablado como escrito para el desarrollo profesional y por razones de crecimiento personal. Este manuscrito sigue en el método cualitativo para analizar la efectividad de la intervención que apuntaba mejorar la fluidez oral de los estudiantes. El estudio fue diseñado para determinar el impacto que estas dos estrategias de auto monitoreo o control tenían sobre la fluidez oral de los participantes desarrollando competencia comunicativa a través de la mitigación de filtros afectivos que privaban a los estudiantes el desarrollo oral de la lengua.

Este proceso permitió que la mayoría de los participantes identificaran sus propios errores proporcionando retroalimentación entre compañeros, creando confianza y una percepción positiva ante la implementación reflexionando sobre el valor de las estrategias en contextos donde se enseña inglés como lengua extranjera.

Palabras claves: Competencia comunicativa, Co-evaluación, Corrección entre pares, Fluidez pragmática.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction to the study

Teaching English in Colombia has become one of the main priorities in national education policy since the Ministry of Education implemented policies for foreign language learning and teaching (Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 2006). For this reason, teachers have focused on finding strategies for learners to develop communicative competence that would enable them to construct and convey meaning effectively. Unfortunately, not all students reach high levels of communicative competence due to several factors which include: lack of exposure to the language, affective factors, lack of experienced teachers and lack of appropriate course materials among others (Tseng, 2012).

This paper focuses on affective factors that have deprived the population under study from real spontaneous communication as a result of inhibitions and anxiety developed when students are assessed and corrected by a teacher. These factors interfere with students’ confidence and, at the same time, prevent them from developing spoken language fluency. In this study, the researcher established an action plan using peer-correction and peer-assessment strategies in order to mitigate these phenomena and create a less threatening environment for the learners. According to Krashen and Terrell (1983) affective factors are directly associated with the cognitive mechanism which can affect the language learning process either positively or negatively. These emotional factors may lead learners to lower self-esteem, efficacy, and confidence in the language classroom and also they may reduce spoken production from the students. These conditions were witnessed during the period of observation by the researcher.

This document explains the process by which 22 university-level students were supported in their development of spoken fluency by the use of peer-correction and peer-assessment
strategies that addressed affective factors that lowered their confidence when speaking. These strategies provided the participants with a less threatening environment by reducing the exposure of the students to the teacher’s corrections and assessments. This project illustrates the impact that peer-correction and peer-assessment had on students’ spoken fluency after the researcher’s intervention.

This study is comprised of six chapters that describe in detail the importance of the study, the root of the issue in our local context and how the objectives were achieved. In addition, constructs related to the issue will be addressed in order to support the project theoretically. The research design will illustrate the type of the study, the participants involved, ethical considerations and the role of the teacher; then, the implementation process will describe how the strategies were applied through sessions created by the researcher with the intent of assessing the impact on students’ spoken fluency. Finally, this paper will provide an extensive analysis of the results evaluating the impact of peer-correction and peer-assessment, explore limitations and arrive at final conclusions.

This project attempts to provide assistance to teachers and learners with sufficient tools and ideas to enhance discourse competence/spoken fluency in monolingual contexts as in Colombia at a university level.

1.2 Rationale of the study

The participants of this project displayed a high level of interest in developing their speaking abilities in order to improve their oral discourse competence in the target language. They highlighted fluency as the most relevant aspect to improve in their performance. Unfortunately, during the needs analysis, the researcher noticed that the majority of the students exhibited inhibitions and emotional factors that did not enable them to produce ongoing
(uninterrupted) speech. This was caused by the social pressure applied by their teacher through assessment and correction strategies. These difficulties were mostly related to affective factors, especially with self-confidence when engaging in oral communication. Ni (2012) states that self-confidence is a significant factor in the learners’ language performance. This author claims that “students with lack of confidence are normally extremely fearful and timid, reluctant to express their opinions and even unable to utter a complete, meaningful sentence in class” (Ni, 2012, p. 2). This constraint discouraged learners from developing oral language fluently.

Spoken fluency has a considerable significance in EFL contexts since it enables language users to produce continuous speech and meaning without comprehension difficulties within an interaction process (Yang, 2014). Fillmore (1979) stated that fluency allows speakers to convey insights coherently by dealing with lexical and syntactic items appropriately. Furthermore, Hedge (2000) claims that fluency development should be within the criteria list of communicative competence in order to be a successful English speaker, since it creates a comfortable feeling and fosters learners’ self-confidence during communicative performance. For these reasons, spoken fluency takes high relevance in this study, since helping these participants develop their spoken fluency would enable them to participate more successfully in communication events; therefore, the researcher proposed peer-correction and peer assessment as the strategies to be undertaken to reduce intimidation, improve the learning environment, and address the lack of fluency through addressing the emotional aspects such as anxiety, nervousness and lack of confidence that hindered students’ production. According to Nilson (2003), these strategies are effective for “developing students’ critical thinking, communication, lifelong learning and collaborative skills” (p. 44). By integrating peer-correction and peer-assessment, learners can feel freer to take risks, developing themselves seeking higher-order
thinking skills, metacognition and autonomy in their learning process (Cheng & Warren, 2005). In addition, these strategies permitted students to deal with psychological obstacles: barriers that prevented them from developing comprehensible speech in communicative events (Krashen, 1982).

In sum, these strategies permitted learners to create awareness during their oral performances and enhance their confidence. Language learning in this context was a cooperative process in which all learners are peers involved with the correction and evaluation process. This intervention was intended for the participants to overcome difficulties related to spontaneity, confidence and fluency in speaking by showing the usefulness of these strategies to make lessons more enjoyable, interesting in order to meet learners’ needs (Williams, 1992). These aspects represent an opportunity for educators and learners to assess their performance in speech events (Hymes, 1972).

1.2.1 Needs analysis and problem statement

Initially, this paper has highlighted the issues that have hindered students’ normal oral development. These issues (such as lack of confidence, language level and exposure to the language) have deprived learners of opportunities to enhance their oral production. Therefore, addressing the problem required strategies with a theoretical foundation that enabled the researcher to build a framework for an effective intervention.

Even though the researcher witnessed several difficulties related to language production, this manuscript focuses specifically on the lack of confidence that caused negative impacts on the students’ oral production. Bandura (1993) argued that emotions have a great incidence within the language learning process. This effect was evident during communicative events where the lack of fluency in speaking was visibly triggered by a lack of confidence.
Developing fluency as part of the communicative competence in a foreign language represents a challenge for new speakers, mainly if emotional aspects are involved where producing oral language becomes arduous. According to Brown, (1994) speaking is one of the most important abilities in language learning, but at the same time, it is the skill in which users show the most difficulties. This is one reason why speaking has become one of teachers’ main concerns in EFL classrooms (Ur, 1991). However, speaking goes beyond producing language: it requires turn-taking, rephrasing, providing feedback and fluency in order to succeed in any communication event (Brown, 1994; Burns & Joyce, 1997; Yang, 2014). Each of these factors was affected by the teacher at the time of correction and assessment during oral performances in class, resulting in participants displaying more issues such as negative affective factors which included nervousness, anxiety, low self-esteem and lack of confidence due to the exposure to judgments about their language.

Despite other shortcomings such as pronunciation, listening skills, and reading the participants were grammatically competent in writing (A2 level). This was observed during the grammar practice activities were the students were able to produce fair written language more than in speaking. Participants were unable to produce continuous language in oral performances, these students proved capable of producing cohesive sentences when asked to write. Notwithstanding, the observation carried out at the beginning of the study, the learners evidenced difficulties producing coherent and reasoned sentences when speaking mainly when they had to be assessed by the teacher. This observation consisted on witnessing students’ perception towards the teacher evaluation and correction and also to determine to what extent emotional factors had been effecting students’ oral performance. This process of correction and assessment caused lack of confidence and nervousness among the participants which made it difficult for
them to achieve oral fluency. Teachers and researchers need to bear in mind that fluency deals with the ability to speak at length with rhythm, intonation, stress interjections and interruptions with moderate pauses (Fillmore, 1979; Richards, Platt, and Weber (1985).

As part of the needs analysis, a survey (See Appendix R: Survey) was administered in order to elicit more accurate information to diagnose these students’ difficulties. The survey revealed that 80% of the students agreed their main objective was to produce spoken (rather than written or any other ability) language efficiently and fluently. Additionally, the 77% of the students stated that the difficulties related to spoken fluency were due to lack of confidence, fear of speaking in public and lack of language knowledge among others. The survey showed that the 75% of the students did not have opportunities for interacting in the target language in previous institutions and also highlighted that these classes were grammar-based. Students were never encouraged nor enabled to develop fluency.

The data collected from the observation and the survey demonstrated that participants were, generally speaking, in need of enhanced fluency in their oral production in the target language. The students stated that their passive participation when performing oral activities was caused by the fear of speaking in front of large groups due to the social pressure and fear of making mistakes. These issues made it necessary for the researcher to choose strategies to minimize emotional aspects that were depriving participants from real oral communication and interaction. The strategies chosen aimed to break emotional barriers that held students back from speaking naturally: to foster learners’ free and fearless speech without the intervention of the teacher. This required encouragement of cooperative work among peers to measure the impact of the strategies on fluency and confidence.
1.2.2 Justification of problem’s significance

The needs analysis demonstrated that the participants had oral problems when conveying meaning fluently without flaws in communication—including the correct and appropriate use of linking devices, intelligible pronunciation and proper intonation (Hedge, 2000). The heart of the problem is that even though the participants were grammatically competent, they struggled producing language in oral performances.

Chomsky (1965) made a distinction between competence and performance, stating that competence has to do with the knowledge a speaker has about language while performance is the actual use of language in concrete situations. The needs analysis revealed that the 90% students’ main goal was to be able to communicate fluently (performance) rather than being grammatically competent. For this reason, the students needed to be provided with strategies that allowed them to combine utterances appropriately in an ongoing talk and to reduce external pressure triggered by the presence of the teacher and other affective factors (House, 1996).

The main negative affective factor was environment. And mitigating this factor required teaching students to evaluate and correct themselves in a non-threatening environment. In this case the teacher took the role of a guide and an observer rather than the main source of knowledge and judgments (Falchikov, 1995; Freeman, 1995; Rollinson, 2005). This paradigm shift is often called a “learner centered environment” and helps to develop independence among students (Falchikov, 1995; Freeman, 1995; Rollinson, 2005; Richert, 1999), since language learning in the classroom is best when it approximates what, for native users, would be “natural language” (Brumfit, 1984).

Identifying, and developing effective strategies for addressing, learning problems (such as this lack of confidence, or a stressful learning environment) that arise from poor educational
practice is what educational research, action research, and the national policy on education should strive to accomplish. Taken as a specific case of a general problem, this research has significance far beyond the small population studied.

1.2.3 **Strategy selected to address problem**

As Brown (1994) observed, speaking has become the one ability to which language learners pay the most attention (Brown, 1994). Speaking encompasses accurate use of linguistic patterns such as intonation, grammar, coherent utterances, and fluency (Thombory, 2000). Fluency is of great importance in speaking since it makes communication more spontaneous and natural while enabling users to speak continuously without interruptions (Brumfit, 1984).

As stated before, the participants were not able to produce continuous speech fluently due to lack of confidence, lack of opportunities to interact and the negative affective factors aforementioned that hindered their normal language development. In addition, the teacher represented a figure of authority and source of knowledge for the majority of the learners what caused inhibitions, anxiety and nervousness. Therefore, to mitigate the problems arising from this teacher-centric, high-stress learning environment, peer-correction and peer-assessment were chosen as strategies to address the problem.

Much research supports the use of peer-correction and peer-assessment strategies to enhance speaking fluency and confidence. Duque, (2014), Chen (2009), Tuttle (2011), and Gomes, (2014) argued in their respective investigations that these strategies had a considerable impact on students’ oral performance and confidence. For instance, their studies revealed that learners were able to acknowledge their difficulties and strengths and to set learning commitments that allowed them to raise awareness regarding their learning processes. Even though the strategies were implemented in populations with different demographic
characteristics (language, age, location, etc.), they provided an idea of how they might successfully impact participants.

Furthermore, various authors support the benefits of these strategies. According to Willey and Gardner (2010) peer-assessment benefits language learning since it provides students with opportunities to assess and give peer feedback on their language production. Thus, learners are able to examine their performance and respond to special needs by creating action plans to monitor their progress during multiple examinations made by their own peers. Langan et al. (2008) and Spies (2012) conducted studies that certify the effectiveness of peer assessment in the encouragement of oral competence; their interventions fostering peer-assessment enabled learners to become more aware of their weaknesses in their speaking practices, allowing them to speak more naturally, reducing the teacher’s intervention, and creating a more enjoyable learning environment. These strategies seek to create a non-threatening environment where learners can speak freely without being judged by the teacher. This factor allows students to speak more and to increase their speaking rate and reduce mistakes. These studies suggest that making students aware of how to identify their own difficulties increases the likelihood that they will overcome them.

Witbeck (1976) concluded that results from the use of peer-correction were positive, increasing the oral production significantly. This study demonstrated that students’ production was more accurate and coherent. In addition, peer correction fostered a more constructive classroom atmosphere for teaching and learning that favored the correctional aspects of language development.
By combining these strategies in the current study, the researcher hypothesized that the benefits that peer correction and peer assessment offered in conjunction would prove effective for addressing these students’ shortcomings.

1.3 Research question(s) and objective(s)

In order to start working on the problem stated above, a research question was created aiming at analyzing how peer-correction and peer-assessment impacted spoken fluency and understanding the impact that these strategies may have on achieving higher levels of fluency. The researcher stated three different objectives which analyzed the possible effects of the strategies, their effectiveness and the increase (if any) in the students’ spoken fluency.

1.4 Conclusion

Throughout this first section, the researcher has highlighted the motivations that led him to conduct this study, addressing the lack of fluency and confidence as the main constraints that hampered the students’ oral performance. The two strategies (peer-correction and peer-assessment) were selected to improve learners’ oral fluency and confidence while achieving a non-threatening learning environment and reducing negative affective factors in the learning process. In the following chapter, the main constructs that support this study will be highlighted to provide a theoretical basis for evaluating the effectiveness and impact of the selected strategies.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework and State of the Art

2.1 Introduction

Spoken fluency is identified as important by both learners and educators in the EFL community; several authors (Duque, 2014; Gomes, 2014; Chen, 2009; Tuttle, 2011; Ortiz et al., 2015) have studied the benefits of fluency in classrooms stating that when students gain fluency in speaking they are able to enhance linguistics patterns such as grammar, pronunciation, intonation, self-esteem and confidence. However, they claim that in order to develop fluency, educators need to use effective strategies. Several authors have highlighted the use of peer-correction and peer-assessment as two such strategies to foster spoken fluency since they provide a cooperative environment where all the participants are involved within a correction and assessment process (Falchikov, 1995; Freeman, 1995; Sambel & Mcdowell, 1998; Rollinson, 2005). These studies have demonstrated positive results that enabled learners to increase their speed when talking, and to reduce their hesitation during oral communication events.

This chapter provides an overview of constructs related to communicative competence, discourse competence, pragmatics, spoken fluency, confidence and finally peer-correction and peer assessment. This section of the study is aimed at providing evidence that the strategies proposed have been effective by illustrating examples from the body of research related to fluency, peer-correction and peer-assessment, and the role that fluency plays in classrooms.

2.2 Theoretical framework

2.2.1 Communicative competence and Pragmatic fluency

Language competence is a wide term that involves linguistic or grammatical competence. It deals with the ability to use knowledge to interpret and produce meaningful insights according
to the situation, (Chomsky, 1965). Hymes (1972) introduced ‘communicative competence’ to highlight that grammatical knowledge was not sufficient for communicating, but rather, that successful communication involved the combination of multiple abilities such as sociolinguistics skills, strategies, discourse, and lexical knowledge (among others). He stated that communication refers to the knowledge of language that enables speakers to convey meaning to others and to understand others’ messages within concrete situations. To take language successfully from the classroom requires that learners be able to relate what is learnt in the classroom to the kind of communication encountered beyond the classroom.

Communicative competence enables users to use linguistic means to perform communicative actions (Selin, 2014). A competent language user knows when, where and how to use language independent of actual knowledge of grammar structures (Hymes, 1972). Li (2008, p. 5) defines it as “the ability to interact successfully in social interaction...a central focus in second language acquisition.” Further, Yule (2010, p. 194) defines it as “the general ability to use language accurately, appropriately, and flexibly.” Canale and Swain (1980) understood communicative competence as the skill required in communication that synthesized knowledge of vocabulary and sociolinguistic conventions in order to succeed in communicative events. In addition, these authors introduced a theoretical model of communicative competence that encompasses four different competences: grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic and discourse. Canale and Swain (1980) further define these competences:

Grammatical competence refers to the accurate knowledge of the language code (grammatical rules, vocabulary, pronunciation, spelling, etc.) Sociolinguistic competence deals with the language user’s ability to produce and grasp language in different social contexts being able to use social conventions such as appropriate vocabulary, register, politeness and style.
Strategic competence has to do with the ability to use language to attain communicative objectives and improve the quality of communication by using verbal and non-verbal communication strategies to boost the efficiency of communication; and Discourse competence is concerned with the ability to combine language structures into different types of cohesive texts (e.g., political speech, poetry).

This paper is concerned with the development of discourse competence since it deals with “the selection, sequencing, and arrangement of words, structures, sentences and utterances to achieve a unified spoken text” (Canale and Swain, 1980; p. 14) and specifically, the fluency of discursive speech. Discourse competence takes great relevance since it permits learners to produce and interpret verbal acts, conversational sequences, activities and communicative styles (Ochs, 1979).

These statements lead this research toward pragmatics in spoken fluency. Pragmatics is the study of language from the users’ perspective, specifically as it relates to decision-making learners encounter when using language in social interaction and the effects of that use of language on other users during communicative performances (Crystal, 1997). It is relevant to state that speaking has a significant impact in this study due the need that the participants display for conveying meaning fluently.

Macaro (1997) states that language teachers should give more attention to speaking and listening skills rather than reading and writing. He claims that focusing more on producing new information encourages active participation that focuses on developing second language competence in meaningful situations rather than on producing well-constructed utterances or isolated words. In this manner, pragmatic fluency can be interpreted as the combination of suitable utterances in a continuous speech. This use of pragmatics needs to be interpreted as an
“acceptable language behavior” (House, 1996). In sum, competence can be defined as the knowledge that a language user has and can apply; pragmatics is concerned with the actual use of that knowledge to communicate meaning.

Fluency is a component of communicative competence, and it can be defined as the ability to make use of linguistic and pragmatic competence (Haastrup & Phillipson, 1984). In order to develop pragmatic fluency, participants need to be exposed to interactive processes where they have the opportunity to build meaning by eliciting and processing information (Burns & Joyce, 1997). Developing fluency requires the learners to talk at length with minimal pauses, and in addition, to speak appropriately in different social contexts and situations in order to meet other speakers’ expectations (Fillmore, 1979). Even though fluency is related to ongoing talks and effortless continuity, Richards, Platt, and Weber (1985) highlight characteristics such as “use of pausing, rhythm, intonation, stress, rate of speaking, and the use of interjections and interruptions” (p. 108) as pertinent for discourse competence. On the other hand, Brumfit (1984) maintains the definition has more to do with “natural language use”. He states that fluency is related to the development of patterns of language interaction within the classroom that parallel those used by competent, native speakers of the language in real life situations. Consequently, the researcher agrees that fluency involves more than speediness and accuracy: fluency involves appropriateness of language in different situations, and a metacognition process where learners synthesize and negotiate meaning. Undeliberate pauses and hesitation in speaking are commonly noticeable in beginners since they are in the process of acquiring the target language. For this reason, it is difficult to talk about “natural language use” at initial stages. Falchikov (1995), Freeman (1995), Sambel & Mcdowell (1998), Rollinson (2005), Duque (2014), Gomes (2014), Chen (2009), & Tuttle (2011) claim that the use of peer-correction and peer-assessment provide
researchers with tools to monitor and evaluate students’ progress in terms of fluency. Cooperative work, immediate feedback, language awareness, metacognition, reduction in affective factors, autonomous learning and independence are some of outcomes that these strategies offer to learners-the results of involving them in their own learning processes to solve and enhance difficulties related to speaking (Verloop & Wubbels, 2000).

Promoting interaction in controlled speaking activities enables learners to negotiate meaning and to develop elements such as turn-taking, rephrasing, providing feedback, or redirecting social skills in order to succeed in any communication event (Brown, 1994; Burns & Joyce, 1997). In short, all the aforementioned elements are positive outcomes; however, researchers and teachers need to search for ways of enhancing those features of fluency since language learners encounter the target language in the context of a first-language (L1) setting. Therefore, involving peers in the recreation of an environment that promotes a natural use of the language is essential to promote fluency--no matter the definition used.

### 2.2.2 Affective filter and learning environment

Successful language learning requires more than processing information and producing output; it is linked to several factors that may interfere with the normal language development. This paper seeks to alleviate emotional considerations that hamper students’ development of fluency in class. Krashen (1987) claims that the affective filter has a great incidence in the language-learning process since it may not be optimal for second language acquisition, he states that if learners have a strong affective filter, the input provided might not reach that part of the brain responsible for processing the information. It means that a student may grasp the input but not attain the acquisition of the information due to emotional factors that influence their thoughts and feelings. Emotional factors play a crucial role in language learning. If the student’s attitude
is not positive, the affective filter may become more pronounced (Krashen, 1987). The researcher agrees since it was evident that students expressed symptoms of anxiety and lack of confidence when conveying messages to the teacher during class.

According to Garner (1996) emotional factors are imaginary obstacles that deprive individuals from achieving their learning goals, thus creating inhibitions and obstructions in the development of learning outcomes. Dewey (1938) also saw emotional barriers as learning conflict that delay the attainment of goals. The success (or failure) of learning can be linked to whether negative affective factors are accepted as part of their learning process or if they are diminished to obtain better results. This researcher takes the position that they ought to be diminished--rather than accepted--and that environments should be created where learners can develop fluency without empowering negative affective factors. For this reason, adapting optimal learning climates may foster self-confidence and reduce inhibitions.

Learning environment can be defined as the physical locations, contexts, atmospheres and cultures where learning takes place (Hidden Curriculum, 2014). Regardless of setting, the environment can be affected by external factors that might be linked to the teachers’ or learners’ attitudes and willingness to comprehend input. Classrooms climate can be associated with students’ performance and efficacy and at the same time to productivity and effectiveness. Osborne (2013) states that learning environments promote and support a range of pedagogies including “delivering, applying, creating, communicating and decision-making” (p. 3). It is important, therefore, to embrace pedagogies that strengthen social conventions in order to create a supportive atmosphere between learners and teachers. Consequently, the implementation of peer-correction and peer assessment provides an alternative environment in which learners are involved in their own learning process without negative affective factors.
2.2.3 Peer-assessment/ peer-correction

Speaking is a collective process that requires the participation of two or more interlocutors. This is why the involvement of the participants of this research is crucial since they demand strategies to increase their spoken fluency. In this sense, the inclusion of peer-correction and peer-assessment provide elements that foster the development of fluency in speaking activities.

Peer-assessment was selected as part of the formative assessment process. This strategy was implemented at the end of the sessions for the learners to assess their own overall performance. Peer-assessment deals with the process in which individuals evaluate their own performance (Falchikov, 1995; Freeman, 1995). This means that the teachers’ intervention is reduced by the participation of learners in their own assessment; thus, the teacher acts as a facilitator. Furthermore, Boud (1990) states that peer-assessment is a powerful didactical method for the teaching domain for four reasons.

1) Teachers and learners work in a community environment, learning from each other and becoming a member of a learning organization (Verloop & Wubbels, 2000). This strategy allows students to communicate and to collaborate with each other. Thus, they are able to acquire communicative competence and collaboration skills. In other words, the learners become responsible for their own learning progress, which encourages autonomy and independence.

2) Discussion about reflection is an ongoing process in the classroom in which metacognition takes place (Richert, 19990). This process enables learners to reflect on their own mistakes when producing language; this is a cyclical process that never ends. Students are aware of their language while speaking. According to Sambel & Mcdowell
(1997) peer assessment exposes learners to the skills of critical reflection and analysis. Reflection skills are conditional for making reliable judgments about peers’ work (Boud, 1990).

3) Third, teachers become advisors in their own classrooms and therefore, it is advisable to teach students how to make critical judgments about the performance of their peers. This is a crucial element in this study, since spoken fluency among the participants needs to be measured to determine the effectiveness of this strategy.

4) The last reason for the relevance of peer assessment in teacher education is that after students have left higher education, they are likely to rely on the judgment of their peers to increase self-esteem and self-confidence (Brown, Rust, & Gibbs, 1994). “Being able to interpret the work of colleagues and peers is a necessary prerequisite for professional development and for improving one’s own functioning” (Verloop & Wubbels, 2000; p. 27).

There are several studies that have proved the effectiveness of peer assessment in developing students’ critical thinking, communication, lifelong learning, self-confidence, language production and collaborative skills (Nilson, 2003). In addition, this strategy encourages students to take responsibility for their own learning process, decreasing teachers’ intervention during their metacognition process. These strategies permit learners to speak freely without negative feelings. By combining these benefits, peer assessment was an excellent strategy to increase participants’ spoken fluency.

On the other hand, in the pedagogical evolution, learner-centered classes have become a great pedagogical tool in language teaching. The use of peer correction has taken high relevance in language classrooms where the students are the center of education enabling learners to
provide instant feedback during the controlled activities what makes it a positive complement with the overall assessment regarding their performance. Rollinson (2005) highlights benefits and techniques that are suitable for applying in learning communities, especially in the target population under study.

Firstly, Rollinson states that peer correction is less threatening than teacher correction because students are more comfortable with their classmates’ feedback and therefore, being corrected by their classmates evokes less anxiety and pressure than the teacher’s. In addition, peer-correction provides an immediate feedback in which users can notice their mistakes when producing language instantly. By reducing teachers’ intervention during their production stage, students can feel freer to produce language without evoking inhibitions. This may increase the rate of speaking in oral performances.

Secondly, when correction comes from the teacher, it reinforces the teacher’s authority. In a traditional language class, the teacher is considered the sole source of knowledge since learners rely on the teacher’s feedback. In such situations, students play the role of just passive receivers of information. But through the practice of peer feedback, the classroom becomes less dominated by the teacher (Rollinson, 2005). In the classroom studied, normal, traditional classes tended to be teacher-centered and this increased the teachers’ intervention, reducing the students’ participation and involvement in class. In addition, input and correction relied only on the trainer. This reduced students’ language practice and interaction (Harmer, 2004).

Thirdly, the involvement of peers in the correction process makes the classroom atmosphere more supportive and friendlier, and encourages learners to produce more language in interactive activities. Grower et al. (1995) claim that it is now acknowledged by most practitioners that students’ involvement in the classroom should be enhanced for better learning
outcomes. Peer correction takes the focus away from the teacher and thus initiates a transfer of roles from the teacher to the learners, providing a student-centered atmosphere. Finally, since peer correction offers students the opportunity to be responsible for their own learning process, it increases the probability of increasing fluency due to increased opportunities for interaction given during the implementation of the strategy. According to Ganji (2009) peer-correction can have a “long-lasting effect on their memory, because they are involved in the process directly and actively, and this can activate the operations necessary for long-term retention” (p, 120).

Nevertheless, despite the multiple benefits that peer correction provides to learners, there is evidence that disagrees with the convenience of using peer correction in EFL classrooms. Sultana (2009) claims that some students are reluctant to correct their peers’ errors because they fear that error correction may harm their relationship. Nelson’s study (1996) agrees that learners withheld critical comments to maintain ‘group harmony’ or to not claim a degree of authority. Although, these behaviors may harm students’ relationships, teachers cannot generalize that these outcomes/behaviors will be observed in all cases since learners have different personalities and learning profiles that change based on context.

Harmer (2004) foresees possible problems with peer correction. For instance, the students, after getting corrected by a peer, might feel inferior to their friends. In addition, students might feel reluctant about soliciting peers’ corrections because they do not want their classmates to know about their errors since this process may affect their self-esteem. Therefore, students may prefer to be corrected by the teacher gently. However, Ronica (1999) found the use of the strategy satisfactory due to several factors that helped learners to enhance communicative skills; for instance, students were able to take care of mistakes, to clarify grammar rules, and to
enhance awareness; however, the most important factor found was that students enjoyed working with their peers.

Krashen (1987) states that factors such as anxiety and lack of confidence significantly affect the acquisition of language. These emotional factors are not optimal when a learner is receiving input or feedback since if the input is not comprehensible, a deficit in the language production may appear. Ni (2012) agrees that emotional factors play an essential role within the classrooms since if the student’s attitude is not positive, the affective filter might be detrimental. According to Arnold (2000), Krashen (1987), Ni (2012), and Chastain (1975) researcher and teacher should be concerned about how to help students to establish and strengthen their confidence during their learning processes. They claim that true language learning only takes place in an environment where learners approach learning with confidence and joy without negative determinants that may create frustration.

The results of implementing these strategies may vary according to the setting due to different features such as age, personalities, learning profiles, learning styles, and gender. The strategies mentioned, peer correction and peer assessment, provided insights into students’ progress and created language awareness in ongoing communicative events. These communicative opportunities permitted the participants and researcher to evaluate their improvements in fluency. Thereby, it is important to assess the impact that these strategies may cause on the participants communicative competence.

## 2.3 State of the art

After addressing the constructs behind the phenomena and highlighting the possible benefits that the strategies may bring in terms of speaking, social skills, affective factors and
metacognition, it is crucial to examine what has been done around these strategies. From these, we can determine the viability of an action plan to address the impact on the participants.

There are several studies related to peer correction, peer-assessment and spoken fluency. For instance, Chen (2009) focused on investigating the effectiveness of peer feedback from communal, cognitive, cooperative and pedagogical perspectives. This study argues that English teachers’ have obligation and responsibility to assure that learners work cooperatively. In this project, students were encouraged to take the role of the editor for their peer’s papers to carry out the correction process; it suggests that learners seemed to be more confident and motivation-stimulated in their writing courses. Although this project was focused on writing, the peer correction strategies can be adapted to edit ongoing oral production and determine the effect of the strategy on the students’ fluency.

This new perspective was also examined by Tuttle (2011) who analyzed the advantages of using peer formative assessments for speaking. The exposure of the students to new learning environments enabled the students to improve fluency due to different mechanisms such as improvement of emotional factors and cooperative learning. Bartram & Walton (1991), Chen & Warren, (1997) and Sultana, (2009) compared the students' attitudes towards the implementation of peer-assessment of both English language proficiency and other aspects of performance by their peers. Their findings suggest that students had a less positive attitude towards assessing peers' language proficiency. Students’ reluctance to be peer-corrected and peer-assessed were due to determinants such age and personality. Their findings revealed that young learners relied more on the teacher’s feedback than on their peers’. Nevertheless, adult participants had a different perspective towards the usefulness of the techniques, affirming that the strategies are beneficial only “if the teacher re-checks it.” These studies concluded that the students’
corrections and assessments should go along with the teachers’ correction to assure understanding and learning outcomes.

Peng (2010) conducted a study using peer-correction with EFL learners in Taiwan. His findings revealed no significant differences in terms of attitudes between the high- and low-intermediate students. However, the participants acknowledged the value of the strategy for future lessons. This study concluded that peer correction is an acceptable alternative to teacher correction that involves students in the assessment process.

At a local level, Duque (2014), Gomes (2014), and Spies (2012) conducted studies related to the influence of self-assessment as a way of developing a student’s oral fluency. These projects found that when students peer-assessed processes, they were able to accurately assess their learning drawbacks and strengths. These studies proved that learners were able to set learning commitments, and use learning strategies that also allowed them to raise awareness about their learning processes through self-monitoring. The projects showed that the learners became more aware of their use of tenses, more able to identify their own mistakes, more willing to provide feedback to their peers and able to reflect on the relevance of peer and self-assessment. Additionally, they became more autonomous and proved to be able to implement new action plans in order to improve their use of tenses.

The aforementioned studies displayed similar outcomes in their results, and found improved attitudes as one of the major outcomes of peer-correction and assessment. Despite the multiple studies regarding assessment and correction, there is no evidence or study showing the effect of combining both strategies for the development of spoken fluency. This creates a unique opportunity to add to the literature by combining both constructs to address the phenomena through a novel approach that provides a different optimal learning environment in which
learners are exposed to their own feedback without being judged by the teacher (which seems to be detrimental for the students). The combination of these strategies is intended to provide an alternative manner of feedback in which learners are directly involved in their own learning process. The evidence supports the use of the strategies, and despite some risks, promises more potential gain than drawback. Therefore, this mixed strategy was chosen to engage these participants in this study.

2.4 Conclusion

In this second chapter, the main constructs related to communicative competence, discourse competence, pragmatic fluency and peer-correction/assessment have been addressed in order to associate and support the problem under study. This theoretical foundation in the established research serves as a framework for understanding the effectiveness of this intervention. The studies mentioned used similar strategies to overcome related challenges, but none of them singled out oral fluency specifically for improvement, nor employed the combination of peer-assessment and peer-review as strategies to address it. For these reasons, this study is highly relevant to the field, and appropriate for the current context.
Chapter 3: Research Design

3.1 Introduction

This paper has focused on factors that have triggered learners’ interest to enhance fluency addressing the issues that hamper students’ oral development. In addition, theoretical foundations that correspond to the field of communicative competence have been broached in order to support the phenomena under study.

This chapter gives an explanation of the methodology used to determine the design of the study. In addition it describes the type of study that the researcher carried out for the purposes of the study, the context where the research project was conducted, the participants that were part of the process, the role of the teacher within the intervention, ethical considerations that were taken into account with respect to several determinants that may hinder the research process, and finally the data collection instruments chosen for the analysis of the study. This stage of the study highlights aspects that are part of the research the design and the condition in which this project was carried out.

3.2 Type of study

This is a qualitative research project corresponding to the field of action research due to the following features:

First, this study allows the teacher to examine students’ learning difficulties and reflect on their learning implications; in addition, it explores the impact, benefits, and positive or negative learning effects upon the population under study (Burns, 2010).

Second, Nunan (1988) states that Action Research has to do with specific cases and specific situations, attempting to determine possible solutions to the problems presented in the study.
Third, this project follows Kemmis and McTaggart’s (2000) parameters that involve “planning a change, acting and observing the process and consequences of the change, reflecting on these processes and consequences and then replanning, acting and observing and reflecting” (p. 5). This cyclical model provides opportunities to explore the current phenomenon at a higher level in order to reach a greater understanding of the issue under study. This model permits researchers to understand a particular difficulty within the context and make conscious decisions about action to address it. In this regards, the teacher acted as a classroom participant, with the aim of solving a problem observed during the teaching practice by implementing an action plan that was evaluated after the implementation.

Fourth, action research focuses on developing teaching situations in order to address specific issues rather than generating new knowledge. Burns (2007) claims that action research works simultaneously on action and research: in other words, on practice and theory. Consequently, according to Cohen, Manion, & Morrison (2007) action research combines action and reflection with the intention of improving teaching practice and student learning. Furthermore, action research encompasses action and reflection of practical and problematic matters aiming at finding possible solutions (Cohen, 2007). Finally, action research contributes practice and theory making research an accessible and reflective process (Stenhouse, 1975).

This type of study enabled the researcher to determine the effectiveness of peer correction and assessment of the learners’ spoken fluency by implementing action plans that served to measure students’ progress.

3.3 Context

This study was conducted at a local university in Bogotá, Colombia. This was a private institution that mainly focused on administrative majors such as accounting, industrial
engineering, administration, and technology among others. This institution does not have English as a major, but students are encouraged to take this subject during their academic process. These students have many options for taking English classes; they can do it through a virtual platform named Rosetta Stone® or through regular classroom education. Although the duration of lessons may vary, participants in this study began with five initial hours per week; however, this was reduced to three hours per week since these students belonged to SENA (Servicio Nacional de Aprendizaje), and schedules often change depending on the SENA’s policies.

3.3.1 Participants

In order to carry out this research, a group of 22 learners was chosen from accounting and finance majors, 11 male and 11 female, whose ages varied between 17 and 24 years old. In terms of language level, the participants tested at A2 level according to the Common European Framework. Although these students were studying at the university’s facilities, they belonged to SENA due to an agreement between these two institutions.

Most of the students came from public schools, and stated that their instruction in English had been limited to the use of Spanish, their native language, in class which deprived the participants of the opportunity for real interaction within the target language. In addition, the number of hours given in their previous schools or institutions did not enable them to achieve proficiency. It is relevant to highlight that several students had not studied the target language for a long time but had developed written proficiency after long hours of English instruction that they started to take at the university (and in some cases, other institutions). These students initially started with 8 hours of English per week, and during this time, learners were exposed to the target language more intensively which allowed them to gain grammar proficiency in writing. Nevertheless, their discourse competence in speaking remained low.
3.3.2 Researcher’s role

The researcher played several roles throughout the different stages of this project. As Burns (2010) claims, in action research, the teacher analyzes, reflects and thinks about possible solutions to address specific issues presented in class. Burns called this process reflective action research. For this reason, the teacher is also a researcher, acquainted with language learning theory, which guided him to make decisions about possible solutions; moreover, theory helped the researcher to support and explain his points of view about the gathered data. The researcher also acted as facilitator of communication among students during the implementation process. The action plan was implemented after analyzing and reflecting on the difficulties with the participants that enabled him to measure, explore, collect data and determine the effectiveness or effect of the strategies.

3.3.3 Ethical considerations

During the research process, the researcher took into account several considerations aimed at protecting the identity and anonymity of the participants and institution in order to validate the purpose and feasibility of the project. According to Whitehead and McNiff (2006) such ethical considerations must be undertaken in order to validate the information presented in such a study. The participants of this study were mostly adults, although there were some minors. For this reason it was necessary to request their parents’ permission in order to carry out this project. In addition, their parents were informed through a consent letter (See Appendix B: Parents’ Consent letter) with detailed information about the objectives and their relevance. The name of the university was preserved in anonymity; however, there was a letter requesting authorization for carrying out this project addressed to the institution (see appendix A) that highlighted the possible outcomes and benefits for the institution. Participants’ anonymity was
guaranteed during the whole research project. The researcher assigned a number and letter to classify data from the participants. These steps enabled the researcher to collect more reliable data and to protect the identity of the participants and the institution.

3.4 Data collection instruments

For the aim of the project, the researcher utilized four tools: a questionnaire, learning logs, a rubric and audio recordings. These data collection instruments served to gather different perceptions (specifically about the strategies), to measure the increase in the participants’ spoken fluency after the implementation, and to assess the impact that these strategies had on students’ communicative competence. The chosen instruments assisted the researcher in collecting valuable information that could be analyzed to draw final conclusions.

3.4.1 Description

3.4.1.1 Questionnaire

This questionnaire was aimed at gathering qualitative data from the participants under study. Marshall and Rossman (1999) highlight several advantages to using this instrument including “accuracy, generalizability, and convenience” (p. 130). Questionnaires are easy to administer and allow the researcher to draw on generalizations from the participants’ insights. In this case, the researcher designed a questionnaire that contained ten different questions including dichotomous and open-ended questions. These types of questions enabled the researcher to more easily analyze the data collected. The participants supplied qualitative and quantitative data about their feelings in relation to the peer-assessment and correction implementations. The purpose of this questionnaire (See appendix C: Questionnaire) was to obtain learners’ perceptions regarding their own communicative performance and the role of peer-assessment and
peer-correction in increasing fluency. The questionnaire was administered at the end of the research process in order to elicit final feedback.

3.4.1.2 Learning Logs

The pedagogical intervention took five sessions in which the researcher needed to gather perceptions and assumptions regarding the implementation and the strategies. Therefore, learning logs were administered in each session to monitor learners’ experiences. According to Friesner & Hart (2005) learning logs serve as assessment and research tools since they provide opportunities to obtain understanding about students’ learning experiences and reflections. Friesner and Hart highlight several advantages, including: validity, reflection, updated data (since their experiences were written weekly), and direct involvement within the action plans. In this regards, the learning logs contained five prompts in which they were able to write about their perception towards the strategies, feelings, the possible effects on their spoken fluency and learning environments with their peers.

The features encouraged the researcher to select learning logs as a valid instrument for collecting data. The researcher considered that with logs it was possible to observe the students’ process in a more detailed way during the implementation. This instrument served to support and validate the learners’ reactions more accurately during the research process (See Appendix E: Learning log sample).

3.4.1.3 Audio recordings

Measuring the increase in, or the effect of the strategies on, students’ spoken fluency among the participants was one of the objectives of this project. For this reason, the researcher decided to administer audio-recordings to measure the change. According to Ariza (2013) and Lince (2012) audio recordings are useful tools that allow teachers to monitor students’ learning
processes. In addition, students are able to identify those aspects in their speech that hamper their effective communication or simply to reinforce language issues during their spoken productions.

Cohen et al. (2007) validate the usefulness of audio recordings for collecting data since it reduces the influence of misinterpretations. The researcher administered this instrument at the beginning and at the end of the implementation to evaluate the impact of the strategies. This instrument was accompanied by a rubric that assisted in determining the increase of fluency. This process led the researcher to make clear assertions and more authentic perceptions of the information obtained from the process. In this study, the audio recordings were used by learners and the researcher to provide them with a general perspective of their fluency development before and after the implementation and the effectiveness of peer-correction and peer assessment strategies.

3.4.1.4 Rubric

This instrument was implemented along with the audio recordings in order to actually measure the impact of the strategies on the students’ fluency. This instrument was applied at the beginning and at the end of the implementation. Following Stevents and Levy (2005), this rubric contained four levels of fluency in which aspects such as hesitation, speaking rate, pauses, intelligibility, speed, language use, use of lexis, and pronunciation patterns were assessed and used to measure participants’ spoken fluency. In addition, Mertler (2001) saw rubrics as scoring guides, consisting of specific pre-established performance criteria that serve to evaluate students’ performance. Rubrics are a specific form of scoring instrument used when evaluating student products resulting from a performance task. This instrument allowed the researcher to accurately measure the students’ speaking rate and to validate the information given by the students with the other instruments (See appendix D:Rubric for oral fluency).
3.4.2 Validity and piloting

During the pedagogical intervention, it was relevant to pilot and assure the validity of the instruments in order to achieve the research question and objectives. According to Strauss and Corbin (2008) validity refers to the researcher’s responsibility to take precautionary steps to confirm the pertinence of the instruments used. The insights of the researcher and an expert in the researcher’s workplace were taken into account. These experts were asked to analyze the appropriateness of each data collection instrument in order to assure reliable outcomes and data from the instruments. This process enabled the researcher to edit and modify certain elements (e.g. language level, organization, length and also the appropriateness of the items).

After checking the validity of the instrument, a piloting was carried out. A different group with the same level was chosen. This process served to reinforce and upgrade the instruments since some questions in the questionnaire were unclear to the students. Fortunately, the learning log and the rubric used to assess the strategies seemed to be clear for the learners. This process enabled the research to assure the effectiveness and reliability of the data collection.

3.5 Conclusion

The research design of this study enabled the researcher to structure a path for learning about the effects of peer-assessment and peer-correction in students’ fluency development. Questionnaire, videos, audio recordings and learning logs were implemented in order to gather relevant data. The following chapter provides the rationale for the pedagogical intervention, the vision, learning, curriculum, instructional design and procedures implemented.
Chapter 4: Chapter Four: Pedagogical Intervention and Implementation

4.1 Introduction

The researcher has illustrated the motivations behind the study of this phenomenon, highlighting the students’ needs and issues that affected the participants’ normal development in speaking. Moreover, in exploring the constructs that have framed the issues presented by students and the research design, the researcher has attempted to explain the determinants that led to this type of study. This chapter aims to present the pedagogical intervention by explaining the vision of language, curriculum, learning and classroom taken into account during the intervention. Furthermore, it describes in detail the process carried out including pre-, during, and post-implementation. Finally, the materials and strategies used will be explained in detail. This section of the study provides a descriptive explanation of the visions of language, learning, curriculum, and classroom.

4.1.1 Vision of language

Language is the means which speakers use to convey meaning through linguistic systems that enable them to express thoughts and feelings. Although language encompasses skills like writing, listening and reading, the participants of this study focus on in this particular feature which deals with use of oral language fluently and they wish to improve it the most for reasons including: improving facility in communicating with others, assisting in professional growth, achieving effectiveness in language use, and developing self-confidence (among others). According to Brown (1994) speaking is the most important ability in language learning, but at the same time the most difficult to master. Furthermore, for most of the teachers, learning how to teach students to develop oral communication skills spontaneously is one of their major concerns (Ur, 1991).
This study is intended to assist students in gaining fluency in spoken communication through “smooth, rapid, effortless use of language” (Crystal, 1987, p. 421) and the “continuity of speech” (Koponen & Riggenbach, 2000, p. 8) by fostering an optimal learning environment where learners can produce language without anxiety and with confidence. While it is unlikely that any single intervention would allow students to achieve smooth oral production, this study intends to determine the extent to which peer-correction and peer-assessment may impact students’ spoken fluency and mitigate negative emotional factors that hinder students’ production.

4.1.2 Vision of learning

In order to assure effectiveness in language learning during the implementation, the researcher used the guided discovery approach and content based instruction. According to Saumell (2011) the guided discovery approach combines deductive and inductive learning, “Guided Discovery is a modified inductive approach in which there is exposure to language first, followed by the use of inference, and finally an explicit focus on rules and practice” (p, 2). In other words, the learners go through different learning transitions and input in which grammar is inferred at the end of the process and monitored by the teacher. This approach involves cognitive, linguistic, and social benefits that facilitate learning.

Furthermore, the inclusion of content based instruction in the classes along with peer correction and peer-assessment was intended to expose learners to different kinds of language and content in order to provide students with communicative opportunities to use peer-correction and peer-assessment, in keeping with the research objectives of the study.
4.1.3 Vision of curriculum

According to Richards (2013) the term *curriculum* refers to the overall plan or design for a specific course and how the contents need to be transformed according to the teaching or learning needs which enable students and teachers to achieve the learning outcomes desired. The participants in this study are accounting students, so they take English as a foreign Language (EFL). Unfortunately, the university does not own a strong curriculum since these students do not belong completely to the university since they only attend classes through an agreement between the university and SENA. For this reason, SENA’s curriculum is used as part of their process. This curriculum is grammar-based. Therefore, it was necessary to adapt and adjust the content with different methodologies in order to meet the researcher and students’ expectations, needs, goals and learning styles.

All the content provided in the curriculum had to be modified in order to provide students with more opportunities for interaction so they could use the strategies proposed to increase spoken fluency. If the research had followed the normal curriculum, it would have been unlikely to provide sufficient opportunities for such interaction, and impossible to measure the impact of peer-correction and peer-assessment within the implementation. Although, the curriculum was modified, the researcher attempted to follow the topics in the order presented.

4.1.4 Vision of classroom

*Classroom* can be defined as the social environment where learning takes place. Morgan (1998) suggests that the classroom is a place where learning communities have the opportunity to create “new” cultural traditions, histories and commonalities that may improve learners’ learning experiences. The researcher’s vision of classroom was intended to create a safe- and non-threatening learning environment in which students would become the central focus of the
classroom. Student-centered classes encourage independence, self-regulation and more autonomous learning; these conditions facilitate the use of the strategies proposed (peer-correction and peer-assessment) to address the fluency issue. Students in friendly and supportive environments are more likely to gain confidence and self-efficacy in language learning and the strategies proposed are conducive to producing less-intimidating environments thus addressing the affective filter that communicative events may cause (Krashen, 1982).

Indeed the role of the teacher as a facilitator of communication was relevant for the normal development of the activities in the classroom. Nevertheless, the students’ attitude and commitment helped to carry out the implementation in class in a controlled and safe environment. Likewise, the materials and methodology supported the development of the class since they offered real communication opportunities for interacting among peers.

4.2 Instructional design

The implementation of this study was carried out in three stages: pre-, during, and post-implementation. Each stage was divided into twenty four hour pieces. The process began with the training of the students in the use of peer-correction and peer-assessment by showing them the rubrics and learning log formats for the development of the lessons. These instruments were displayed to the students for them to get familiar with the lesson process and format.

At the beginning of the implementation it was necessary to record students’ oral production as a starting point to elicit initial information regarding their levels of oral language fluency. The researcher gave the students a document that outlined the peer-correction format (See Appendix F: Peer-correction format) to be used during the activities. The teacher modeled how to peer-correct and what aspects of language to edit according to the lessons’ needs and aims. The peer-correction format contained three items that allowed them to write the possible
mistakes and observations. The learning log format (See appendix E Learning log sample) was given at the end of each lesson in order to assess the overall performance of their partners. It is important to highlight that the recording instrument was used at the beginning and at the end of the process to determine the impact of the strategies after the implementation.

4.2.1 Pre-implementation

For this initial stage of the process, it was necessary to use two sessions of two hours to train students in the use of the peer-correction and peer-assessment formats. The aim of the first session was to elicit feedback about the students’ perception concerning the use of peer-correction and peer-assessment. The idea was to find out the background information that students may have, and also, to pilot the instruments before actually implementing.

In the first session, students were given the peer correction format, the learning log and the peer-assessment rubric for them to become familiar with the instruments and to obtain initial perceptions and assumptions regarding the process.

In the second session, the objective was to train students to correct and assess their partners in a real activity. The training was based on modeling and guided practice where learners had the opportunity to interact with the formats and determine what to correct or assess according to the language session objectives. The learners were exposed to a modeling stage to experience how to correct and assess their peers. The researcher showed how the formats were going to be administered and analyzed in order to assure understanding from the participants. Then, the participants were prompted to perform a role play in which learners had to create a dialogue about a job interview to prove that they understood the process. In this lesson, the aim of the activity was the reinforcement of the use of the endings, “-ed” and “-ing”. First, learners had to decide whether to be the interviewer or the interviewee for the oral presentation. Second,
during the students’ presentations the rest of class had to fill out the formats already given with the pertinent corrections. Each of the groups were assigned a number in order to keep their identity secret. Then, the researcher monitored the whole process to assure the effectiveness of the instruments and to make sure the participants had understood the process of correcting and assessing, and finally, the researcher collected the information from the students.

At the end of the two first sessions, the researcher recorded the conversations and collected the information given by the students in the formats.

**4.2.2 During implementation**

For this stage, five sessions of four hours each were implemented. The lessons contained cultural and social topics that took into account learners’ interests, likes, and learning needs. The materials chosen for the lessons were aimed at providing students with the opportunity to use relevant language and engage in authentic communication; they also included imagery (posters, videos and slides). Students’ engagement was key in this part of the implementation since their insights were going to be important for the validity of the information collected. For example: in the third session, the aim of the class was for students to be able to compare countries orally. In this stage, learners were asked to complete a puzzle as a warm up activity. This lesson was created in the light of content based instruction aimed at linking real information with the target language. This activity enabled learners to activate higher order thinking skills since they had to use prior knowledge to complete the task.

For the analysis stage, students were prompted to read information related to different countries (See Appendix I: Countries Lesson plan 1) and to create a poster based on the information they considered relevant for the following stage in which they had to present the information previously read. The researcher named this part of the class a “symposium” since
students did not have to present group by group in front of their classmates but were instead asked to choose one presenter while the remaining classmates walked around the classroom seeing the others’ presentations. Through this activity the participants were not required to present in front of the whole class at a time, but in front of small groups. This was part of a gradual process designed to create a less intimidating environment for sharing in front of peers. In this information transfer process, students were given the peer-correction format to highlight general problems in speaking such as: intonation, pronunciation and grammar based on their background knowledge and the input provided at the beginning of the lesson. At the end of the session, the participants compared the information among the countries using comparatives and provided correction on the given format handout. The researcher modeled some examples as input following the guided discovery steps. Finally, the learners filled the learning logs formats.

In the fourth session, the aim was that by the end of the sessions, students would be able to use second conditionals for hypothetical situations in a role play. At the beginning of the lesson a video called “Mars One” (See Appendix K: Video Lesson plan 2) was shown to be analyzed along with guiding questions (See Appendix M: Guiding questions Lesson plan 2). The researcher formulated several questions using hypothetical situations (second conditional) (See Appendix L : Mars one project questions.) as input. Finally, students performed a role play in which one group member had to be the recruiter from NASA and the other a candidate for traveling to Mars. In this stage of the lesson, students were given the peer-correction format to provide feedback regarding the use of second conditionals in the oral presentations. Although at the beginning of the session the corrections given by the students were not vast, the participation of the students increased during the sessions. As in the previous lesson, the learning log and the rubric for peer-assessment were given to end with the session. The lesson provided a less
threatening environment where the teacher acted as a facilitator promoting interaction among the students. The teacher attempted to foster a student-centered class to create opportunities for the students to produce more language spontaneously aiming at increasing fluency in speaking and reducing negative affective factors.

In the fifth session, the researcher integrated reading comprehension activities and speaking tasks. These activities involved associating culture with language. The researcher used an Ernest Hemingway’s novel *The Old Man and the Sea* (See Appendix O: Author’s information) to be analyzed by the students. A summary of the chapters was given to the learners (five chapters) to be presented in class. The researcher aimed at providing students with a wide range of vocabulary to reinforce reading skills and enhance fluency in spoken language. These sessions contained reading comprehension, oral presentations, debates, and correction. In this way, students had the opportunity to reflect on their mistakes and to assess their general performance in class.

In the sixth session, the participants had the opportunity to go the computer room. The researcher attempted to include technology within the process in order to increase engagement with the implementation process. In this lesson, the learners were prompted to do some research regarding festivals in Colombia. They had to choose a local festival and prepare a short presentation using a web tool (screencast). In this presentation, the learners shared important facts about the festival and at the end, made an invitation using first and second conditionals as the grammar focus for the activity. The learners had to send their products to one another through e-mails, and used the peer-correction format to identify mistakes made during the activity. Once in the classroom, students debated and reflected on their classmates’ performances and mistakes. Finally, students were given a worksheet to reinforce grammar patterns in the use
of the conditionals that students were having more difficulty with. It is important to highlight that the teacher modeled the steps that had to be followed during the task.

In this session, the aim was to use phrasal verbs in oral presentations. In these lessons, it was important to use reading as an input strategy. In addition, a game was necessary to introduce new vocabulary in their repertoire. Phrasal verbs and their meaning were separated in pieces of paper and the students had to find the meaning or the word among their patterns. After acquiring a sufficient quantity of phrasal verbs, students were asked to create and perform a story using phrasal verbs. The learners used the peer-correction format to take notes about specific issues in the presentations. Students filled the learning log and the assessment rubric after the tasks were completed.

### 4.2.3 Post-implementation

For the final part of the implementation, the researcher administered a questionnaire to elicit the final perceptions about the use of peer-correction and peer-assessment in class. Recordings were made to assess and to determine the impact of the strategies proposed and also to determine the improvement (if any) in spoken fluency after the implementation. In the following chart, the timeline, activities, objectives and instruments are shown in detail to give an idea how the process was carried out.
### Table 1

**Pedagogical intervention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time Allotted</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Implementation</td>
<td>March 24th – 31th</td>
<td>● To elicit previous information about the students’ perception of the use of peer-correction and peer-assessment</td>
<td>1. The questionnaire is administered to elicit information before the implementation.</td>
<td>1. Questionnaire (First piloting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 sessions</td>
<td>● To train students to correct and assess their partners before the implementation.</td>
<td>2. (Role play working interview use of adjectives with ED and ING ending). The audio recording will be used to extract the first insights. The students will be measured according to the fluency rubric.</td>
<td>2. Audio recording (Fluency Rubric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>April 7th – May 14th</td>
<td>● To observe the development of the students’ spoken fluency through the strategies (Peer-correction and Peer-assessment).</td>
<td>3. Mars one. Video analysis and debate.</td>
<td>3. Learning log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Sessions 4 hours each</td>
<td>● To assess students’ initial speaking performance.</td>
<td>4. Comparing countries (information transfer) Symposums activity.</td>
<td>4. Peer-correction format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● To create opportunities for the students to interact with each other.</td>
<td>● “Crazy festivals in Colombia” Presentation of invitations/ commercials screencast as a tool for presenting products (pair work).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● To foster pair and group work.</td>
<td>● The Old Man and the Sea by Ernest Hemingway plot analysis and exposition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Reading activity and oral presentation using phrasal verbs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Implementation</td>
<td>May 8th – May 30th</td>
<td>● To analyze the data obtained after the implementation</td>
<td>● The Questionnaire will be administered again.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● To determine the effect of peer-correction and peer-assessment</td>
<td>● The audio recording will be used again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Conclusion

This chapter presented the pedagogical intervention explaining the vision of language, curriculum, learning, and classroom taking into account theoretical foundations during the intervention. Furthermore, it described in detail the process carried out pre-, during and post-implementation and the instruments that utilized. Finally, the materials and strategies used in the classroom were explained in detailed.
Chapter 5: Results and Data Analysis

5.1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, the theoretical foundations that have addressed the spoken fluency difficulties experienced by this group of EFL learners have been examined. Furthermore, this project has illustrated the implementation process carried out on the population under study to mitigate these issues. In this chapter, the data management and data analysis procedures are presented. These findings will enable the researcher to assess the effect that peer-correction and peer-assessment had on students’ spoken fluency.

This section of the paper is based on the principle of Corbin and Strauss (2008) for data analysis, according to whom, the data analysis process deals with the researcher’s ability to present the participants’ perspective through the data. Consequently, it enables the researcher to develop conclusions regarding students’ thoughts and opinions. The instruments administered during the process enabled the researcher to gather information that later needed to be classified in different categories and subcategories. This data will reveal the possible outcome of the paper attempting to assess the impact on students’ oral fluency after the implementation.

5.2 Data management procedures

For the accomplishment of the research question and objectives, it was necessary to implement four instruments: learning logs, rubrics, questionnaires and audio recordings.

Learning logs were used in five sessions. This instrument was implemented to elicit students’ initial perceptions and opinions in regards to the strategies proposed to address the problem during the implementation. The students were provided with a form which contained guiding questions for them to fill out. This information was collected and digitalized in a Excel
spreadsheet (See Appendix S: Learning Logs). This procedure served to monitor the students’ insights in each session and to assure validity and accuracy with the information given.

*Rubrics* were essential for the collection of the data since they enabled the researcher to measure the possible improvement in fluency from the participants during spoken performances. This instrument measured patterns of fluency that constitute fluent speech (adapted from O’Malley and Pierce, 1996) such as hesitation, amount of pauses, and fillers among others. This rubric was administered at the beginning and at the end of the implementation process to evaluate the possible effect of the strategies proposed. The results of the rubric were color-coded and digitalize within an Excel sheet (See Appendix T: Rubrics).

A *questionnaire* was administered at the end of the implementation to elicit final insights regarding students’ perceptions towards the implementation of peer-correction and peer-assessment strategies. This instrument contained open-ended questions, multiple choice and dichotomous questions in order to obtain more reliable information and to complement the data gathered from the other instruments (See Appendix U: Questionnaire results). The kind of questions made the coding process easier and allowed the researcher to categorize the responses more appropriately.

It was also necessary to record students’ performances in order to obtain more accurate information regarding students’ spoken fluency change or increase. To do so, audio recordings were taken at the beginning and at the end of the implementation to assess pre- and post-implementation outcomes. Even though this information was not transcribed, it served to determine the effect of the process on the participants since the researcher observed and listened to the learners’ oral production several times to assure reliability in the results obtained.
This procedure enables the researcher to collect plenty of data that later served to be categorized, coded, and analyzed.

5.2.1 Validation

The validation of data is essential to determine the effectiveness of the instruments used during the implementation process. The information collected within the process enabled the researcher to filter, assess and disregard the data obtained (Nunan & Baley, 2009). According to Ritchie and Lewis (2003) the validation of the information involved the use of sources to evaluate the purity of assumptions obtained from the data in connection with both the data and the conclusions reached. It was necessary for the researcher to have a constant interactive process with the data which involved reading, thinking, analyzing, posing questions, and filtering codes and information to obtain preliminary and final outcomes (Nunan & Baley, 2009).

After the implementation process, it was necessary to digitize and transcribe the data since the amount of information was immense. All the information was digitized in an Excel sheet. In addition, the participants’ anonymity was respected for ethical considerations. In keeping with best practices for coding participants (Corbin & Strauss, 2008), all learners were given a number/letter combination as identifying codes.

5.2.2 Data analysis methodology

Qualitative researches involve specific methodological approaches for the analysis of the data. Therefore, this paper focuses on Grounded Theory for the interpretation of the information collected. According to Glaser and Strauss (1967) the analysis of data is a methodical process that involves analyses, coding, categorization and identification of multiple variables contained in the data obtained. The researcher opted for Grounded Theory as the method to analyze the data to explain the current phenomenon and to determine the possible effect on the students’
emotional states after the implementation of the strategies. This analysis enabled the researcher to classify the relevance of the information and generate theory based on reasoning (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007).

Grounded Theory can be defined as an interactive process with data that is used to create a frame for the theory (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). This qualitative method permits researchers to approach the data to establish a continuous comparison to draw initial and final assumptions and conclusions from the findings. Grounded Theory proposes several stages of analysis aimed at reducing, conceptualizing, and categorizing data. These stages are open, axial, and selective coding. Open coding refers to the process of generating initial concepts from data; axial coding refers to the association through inductive and deductive process; selective coding refers to the transformation of simple codes into core categories to develop a theoretical frame. These types of coding allowed the researcher to make a progressive judgment of those assumptions during the intervention (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Following Grounded Theory principles, the process of analysis initiated with open coding in order to identify simple units of information to facilitate the study of the phenomenon under study. Several codes emerged from the data. These codes helped to build categories that later served to identify the core category. The following chart shows the initial codes that arose from open coding.
Table 2

Preliminary codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Preliminary Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do peer-correction and peer-assessment impact university EFL students’ spoken fluency?</td>
<td>• Siento que mi nivel de fluidez ha mejorado ya que ahora sé cómo utilizar los verbos además sé más vocabulario.” I feel that my level of fluency has improved since now i know how to use verbs”</td>
<td>• The increase of lexis enhanced fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Las correcciones con mis compañeros fueron importantes, ya que al socializar nuestras fallas es más sencillo corregir y evitar caer de nuevo en el error. “The corrections with my classmates were important since when we were analyzing our mistakes was simpler to correct and to avoid committing the same mistake.”</td>
<td>• The strategies improved confidence when speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• La evaluación final con mis compañeros fue relevante ya logramos caer en cuenta de nuestros errores a tiempo. “The final assessment with my classmates was relevant since we managed to notice our mistakes on time.”</td>
<td>• Peer-correction fosters cooperative learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer-correction encouraged language awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer-assessment fostered awareness in language production.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the information was codified in single units, it was necessary to analyze data with axial coding to identify patterns within the preliminary codes in order to sort them into categories. Several codes were examined to create associations with the existing theory. According to Corbin and Strauss (2008) axial coding consists of constructing series of interlinking patterns to build a category that illustrates the general coding (Cohen, et al. 2007). The researcher linked similar responses to create a code and the corresponding category.

Finally, selecting coding served to identify the core category in order to relate it with the initial codes at the initial stage of the data analysis. This type of coding served to consolidate the main or umbrella category after an extensive analysis. According to Corbin and Strauss (2008),
the core category represents the main phenomenon of the study that shows the focus of the results.

5.3 Categories

5.3.1 Overall category mapping

As a result of the data analysis process, three categories emerged from the coding stage that addressed the research question. These categories were: enhanced perception of spoken fluency, increased self-confidence when speaking, and improvement in language awareness. These categories arose from an extensive comparative analysis aiming at connecting the categories with the research question. This permitted the researcher to associate similarities in patterns within the four instruments administered during the implementation. The following chart illustrates the category mapping carried out in the process:

Table 3
Overall category mapping

| How do peer-correction and peer-assessment impact University EFL students’ spoken fluency? |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Enhanced perception of spoken fluency        | Increased self-confidence when speaking | Improvement in Language Awareness |

5.3.2 Discussion of categories

5.3.2.1 Enhanced perception of spoken fluency

The analysis carried out after the implementation provided the researcher with vast information that needed to be sorted and coded in multiple sub-categories and main categories to
analyze the possible assumptions and findings. The aim of this study was to assess the effect that peer-correction and peer-assessment had on students’ spoken fluency. This first category, which identified students’ own self-perception of fluency, emerged because 90% of the participants claimed to be more fluent after the intervention as a result of the strategies implemented to increase their oral production. This improvement could be seen from the first session onward and was documented within the learning logs where participants described their experience (See Appendix S:Learning Logs). The emergence of this category proves that the participants produced more language during the intervention triggering an improved perception of speediness when speaking and confidence. Observe the following answer to a question of self-assessment of language fluency.

“Mejorado; aunque debo practicar mucho más.” (It has improved; however, I need to practice more.) (Excerpt, S11 Learning Log 1)

This excerpt shows that the student had an improvement sensation after the first session; however, he/she is aware that practice should be more constant to be more fluent. Even though it was the first session where the strategies were implemented, it assisted to learners to enhance their perception towards their speed when producing language.

“Mi nivel de fluidez aumentó, puesto que con las correcciones anteriores, pude mejorar.” (My level of fluency increased since the previous corrections helped me to improve.) (Excerpt, S2 Learning Log 2)

This sample demonstrates that while peer-correction strategies were being implemented, learners perceived an enhanced perception of fluency when interacting with their peers. The immediate feedback provided by their classmates allowed them to be aware of their own
mistakes, thus creating an enhanced perception of fluency. The activities planned by the teacher enabled the students to produce more language and to participate more within the activities. Ronica (1999) also found this strategy successful, since it helped learners to take care of their mistakes, to clarify grammar rules, to enhance students’ awareness and the most important factor was that students enjoyed working with their peers reducing the affective filter. As expected, learners felt freer to speak in a less threatening environment. In this research, the participants highlighted the value of the strategies for their fluency in speaking, mainly those learners who claimed to have improved their grammar use and lexis after the implementation of peer-correction and peer-assessment. This category proves that the strategies had a positive impact on students’ fluency by encouraging motivation to produce language continuously.

“The nivel de fluidez ha sobresalido gracias al complemento de nuevo vocabulario.” (My level of fluency has stood out thanks to the complement of new vocabulary.) (Excerpt, S2, Learning log 5)

“My nivel de fluidez es bueno, ya que tuve una mejora de manejo de gramática.” (My level of fluency is good since I had an improvement in the management of grammar.) (Excerpt, S12, Learning Log 5)

The two above excerpts show that students reflected positively on the improvement in their self-perception of improvement in grammar and lexis due to the opportunity of interaction given by the teacher and the peer-correction and assessment. This exposure to the language enabled learners to practice more and to have access to new language patterns and vocabulary that triggered cooperative learning and strengthening of self-confidence and enhancement of fluency. Verloop & Wubbels (2000), Richert (1999), Dochy, Gielen, Onghena, Smeets & Struyven, (2011) agree that these strategies where students become responsible for their own learning progress foster students’ communication and collaboration skills, and encourage reflection and metacognition. These assumptions lead the researcher to infer that students with
more exposure to the strategies might increase their spoken fluency and enhance their confidence as a consequence of the safe environment created by the implementation.

5.3.2.2 Increased self-confidence when speaking

Participants acknowledged the increase of self-confidence in speaking activities. Most of the participants stated that without the intervention of the teacher, speaking activities caused fewer inhibitions and less nervousness. The majority of the learners agreed that they felt more comfortable and confident with the implementation of the activities—as Falchikov (1995) and Freeman (1995) suggested. In other words, the procedure carried out during the intervention enabled the participants to interact constructively and more often with their peers rather than negatively, and less frequently, with the teacher. This encouraged the learners to be more independent and confident.

“Mi confianza después de la implementación fue muy satisfactoria ya que perdí mucho mis nervios y pude relacionarme más con mis compañeros.” (My confidence after the implementation was satisfactory, since my nervousness was reduced and I could interact more with my peers.) (Excerpt, S2, Learning log 5)

Clement, Dorney & Noels (1994) highlight the importance of self-confidence as the most important determinant of attitude and effort towards the learning of a new language. This category illustrates that the strategies indeed impacted students’ oral fluency since the more language learners produced, the better they felt and became throughout the process. This was a key aspect when speaking in the classroom. Although learners recognized that their speech lacked grammatical accuracy, they were optimistic regarding their spoken fluency:

“Yes: definitivamente me siento más cómodo hablando con mis compañeros.” (Yes, I definitely feel more comfortable speaking to my peers.) (Excerpt, S8 Questionnaire, Question #7)
These excerpts show that the students felt more comfortable and optimistic interacting with their peers, and their confidence and fluency were determined by how amenable the learning environment was to producing language. This demonstrated the effectiveness of the strategies in producing an environment of comfort and tranquility for the students. This result is supported by Rollinson (2005) who affirmed that peer-correction is less threatening than teacher correction since students are more likely to feel more comfortable with their classmates’ feedback; hence, being corrected by classmates evokes less anxiety and pressure than having a teacher do so.

In the questionnaire, the students were asked after the implementation if their confidence when speaking had any impact on their fluency. The participants had positive perceptions towards the implementation and its impact. In addition, participants seemed to accept their peers’ correction and evaluation respectfully, recognizing the relevance of the strategies for their
language development. Nevertheless, they were aware of the need to expand their vocabularies to reach higher levels of fluency.

5.3.2.3 Improvement in language awareness

This study has shown that peer-correction and peer-assessment have had positive impacts on students’ fluency by fostering self-confidence and enhanced perception of fluency when speaking. In addition, the majority of learners recognized the importance of being corrected and evaluated to monitor and be aware of the language mistakes committed during communicative events.

“Las estrategias fueron buenas, porque podemos seguir aprendiendo de nuestros errores.” (The strategies were good because we can keep learning from our mistakes.) (Excerpt, S7, Learning log #2)

“Las actividades fueron muy buenas porque así puedo mejorar en la utilización de verbos en la primera, segunda, y tercera persona con la ayuda de corrección de mis compañeros.” (The activities were very good because in this way I can improve the use of verbs in first, second, and third person with the help and correction of my classmates.) (Excerpt, S9, Learning log #2)

“Las estrategias fueron prácticas ya que esto nos ha ayudado a corregir muchas cosas que pensábamos estaban bien dichas.” (The strategies were practical since they helped us to correct many things that we thought were right.) (Excerpt, S6 Questionnaire, question #1)

This awareness process was triggered as a result of the strategies since it enabled the learners to appraise possible mistakes during their performances. As each lesson contained a specific topic, learners became aware of grammar rules, vocabulary, and intonation in ways that later allowed them to speak smoothly in ongoing talks. The researcher observed that learners were able to produce more continuous speech with shorter pauses (See Appendix T: Rubrics).
Even though their production was not completely grammatically accurate, their fluency and positive attitudes were consistently improved with their growing confidence.

These excerpts illustrate that the strategies led the participants to raise their language awareness after being exposed to the implementation. This encouraged learners to attempt to be more accurate and to increase their rate of speaking as it was evidenced in the rubrics and researcher’s observation. According to Fillmore (1979), developing fluency requires the learners to talk at length with minimal pauses and to speak appropriately using accurate grammar to avoid breakdowns in communication.

At the beginning of the process, a rubric from O’Malley and Pierce (1996) (See Appendix D Rubric for oral fluency) was adapted by the teacher for implementation to measure the existing level of fluency and the possible of effect of the strategies on the students. This rubric contained four different aspects of fluency, and took the following considerations into account: vocabulary and expressions, use of grammar structures, frequency of errors, hesitation, intelligibility, confidence, pronunciation and length of pauses. The first rubric implemented before the implementation indicated that the 72% of the learners were located in level one due to low fluency when speaking (See Appendix T: Rubrics); nevertheless, Only 27% of the learners achieved levels two and three. This first rubric revealed the participants’ lack of confidence, language awareness and speediness in communicative performances.

However, after the pedagogical intervention, 46% students increased their fluency by reducing their hesitation and pauses, increasing their rate of speaking, and accuracy. Notwithstanding, the 59% participants remained at the same level without indicating significant changes in their oral production. This second rubric used at the end of the intervention illustrated
that 12 students out of 22 increased their fluency revealing that the strategies indeed had a positive impact on their spoken fluency and language awareness.

To sum up, the extensive analysis made during the process helped the researcher to evaluate the outcomes of the implementation by measuring them against the baselines taken at the beginning of the intervention. This analysis enabled the teacher-researcher to build three categories that assisted in elaborating the core and auxiliary categories.

### 5.3.3 Core category

![Diagram of Core category and sub-categories]

**Figure 1 Core category and sub-categories**

The improvement in self-reliance towards spoken fluency development emerged from the process of coding participants’ perceptions and assumptions. The increased exposure to language along through the strategies during the implementation strengthened their confidence, transforming their perception of their being more fluent in speaking. These instruments allowed the students to reflect on the significance of these strategies for the development of their fluency. This core category emerged due to factors that learners experienced during the intervention such as pausing, rhythm, intonation, stress, rate of speaking, and the use of interjections and interruptions (Richards, Platt, & Weber, 1985). These factors were enhanced through improved confidence, cooperative work, and a growing sense of independence. Although these participants cannot be considered *fluent* since the time of intervention was short, nevertheless, the researcher
could measure these improvements thanks to the instruments administered (Rubrics). Rate of speaking and intonation were the aspects in which the improvements were most noticeable as it was indicated in the rubric.

This implementation process nurtured students’ learning processes since participants had opportunities to reflect upon their progress with the language and were encouraged to monitor their improvements. Every session served to construct new perceptions of learning by attempting to make students more fluent by strengthening confidence. Their self-confidence and awareness of language made noticeable improvements that helped them to convey meaning more fluently. This proves that the peer-correction and peer-assessment strategies effectively impacted on students’ oral production, and created an enhanced perception of fluency.

Even though a 20% of the students claimed to feel certain discomfort with the implementation due to reliance on the teacher’s feedback, the rubric revealed that even these participants had a moderate increase in their oral production. In addition, they displayed respect and acceptance towards their peers’ correction and assessment. In general, the participants’ responses were essential to understand their perception and feelings toward the phenomenon and the strategies implemented.

5.4 Conclusion

In this analysis the researcher assessed the significance of the strategies and the perceptions and feelings of students during the intervention, and identified that the strategies had a positive impact. The intervention helped learners to be more aware of their language (indicated through their learning logs and the questionnaire) that learning became a more conscious process. Analysis also revealed that the students increased their self-confidence which enabled them to speak more freely without a sense of being judged. This positive feeling allowed them to
have an enhanced perception of their own fluency and may increase learning through increased motivation. Students’ assumptions towards the implementation improved over time, as evidenced by the learning logs and questionnaire.
Chapter 6: Conclusions and Pedagogical Implications

6.1 Introduction

This project has illustrated the process and the mechanisms that the researcher implemented to address the phenomenon of fluency issues among a group of University EFL students. These mechanisms led the researcher utilize peer-correction and peer-assessment as to improve language development, and subsequently, to evaluate the impact of these strategies on students’ spoken fluency.

In this chapter, the conclusions derived from the data analysis present promising outcomes. As a consequence of implementing these learning strategies, the participants were able to increase their speaking rate, reduce pauses, and improve continuity in their speech. These results may contribute to the EFL context addressing similar issues in different settings.

The results of this study are also analyzed in order to assess their significance for the EFL context in Colombia. These results support the conclusion that such strategies improve students’ confidence since they encouraged the participants to take risks and indeed, the students themselves indicated improved confidence in oral performance. This paper highlights confidence as the most positive effect of the implementation.

This final section of the research also examines the limitations of this study, and also suggests insights for further research into alternatives methods for improving students’ fluency in language learning classes.

In sum, this chapter draws conclusions from the intervention and an analysis of the data produced by the instruments.
6.2 Comparison of results with previous studies’ results

While speaking generally has been a major concern among EFL researchers (Brown, 1994), this paper departs from generalities by focusing specifically on fluency. The researcher concluded that factors such as confidence, language awareness, cooperative work and positive perceptions assisted learners in increasing their speaking rate and reducing hesitation and long pauses. In addition, the implementation process demonstrated that negative emotional factors made students reluctant to produce language. The researcher acknowledges that the strategies did not impact on the whole group, but showed moderate, objectively-measurable (through rubrics) improvement in the majority of the participants which led the researcher to conclude that spending more time on these strategies in the classroom may result in students reaching higher levels of fluency in speaking.

Roskams, (1999), Spies, (20120, Tuttle, (2011), carried out similar studies that reported similar results. Their projects focused on using peer-assessment to improve students’ fluency in speaking and concluded that peer formative assessment provided a dynamic process for daily assessments and led to measurable improvements within a limited time frame. This is similar to the current study, although the increase in participants’ spoken fluency was not as evident--most likely due to the decreased time frame. The majority of the participants in this study experienced a moderate increase in their spoken fluency after the process. The remaining participants claimed to feel more comfortable with the teacher’s corrections and seemed to be reluctant about implementing new strategies.

Sultana (2009) and Bartram & Walton (1991) reported results that were similar, as students in these studies also expressed reluctance towards peer-correction due to determinants such age and personality. Their findings revealed that young learners relied more on the
teacher’s feedback rather than on their peers’. However, adult participants viewed peer-correction as a useful technique, although they affirmed that the technique would only be beneficial if the teacher confirmed the validity of the feedback. Bartram & Walton (1991) concluded that teacher feedback is crucial and should be administered on a daily basis in order to have a long-term positive effect on students’ ability to monitor their own performance. It is important to bear in mind the participants of this study were mostly adults, so this outcome might be linked to the age group. However, the reluctance rate in this group was low, and the students generally demonstrated comfort with their peers’ corrections.

Spies, (2012), Gomes (2014), and Duque (2014) concluded that peer-feedback helped learners to become autonomous and at the same time to become more active participants in their learning processes. This process project demonstrated that participants were able to increase their oral production, and results were also noticeable in their degree of independence and confidence. This process enabled learners to self- and peer-monitor oral production.

Tuttle (2011) and Peng (2010) examined the usefulness of different learning strategies in EFL contexts. Their findings revealed no significant differences in terms of attitudes between the high- and low-intermediate students. However, these participants displayed an increasing use of advanced tenses during spoken activities during the implementation. This indicates that the strategy fostered improvement in students’ use of the language. In terms of attitudes, the participants of this study showed positive feelings when corrected and assessed by their peers which, in turn, promoted confidence and reduced the affective filters.

In sum, all the studies related to peer-correction and peer-assessment yielded similar outcomes: most acknowledged the importance of different types of corrective feedback that the students receive and the value of different strategies in different contexts. The majority of the
studies aimed at specific features of language such as linguistic patterns and attitudes but none of them addressed students’ affective needs around correction and assessment.

6.3 Significance of the results

Peer-correction and peer-assessment indeed had an impact on students’ spoken fluency and feelings towards the production of language in this study. Even though the increase in their fluency was relatively small, this was probably due to the short period of implementation. These strategies cannot be expected to affect all populations, nor all members of a population, in the same way of the current participants since not all learners believed in the effectiveness of peers’ feedback. However these results provide an alternative to teacher feedback and without exposing learners to its attentive negative affective factors that may cause reluctance to participate.

The significance of the results within the EFL context relies on students’ self-confidence, willingness to participate, and their oral production as evidence. Addressing affective factors was essential since the social pressure that teachers and large audiences produce hindered students’ normal language development. The comfort level and environment experienced by students during the implementation fostered interaction, cooperative learning and assisted the learners in producing continuous speech.

In sum, these strategies resulted in improved perceptions that participants had toward peer-correction and assessment by modifying the paradigm that placed the teacher as the source of all knowledge in the classroom, and empowered students to see themselves, and their peers, as authorities in their own language production.

As has been indicated, the implementation period of this project was relatively brief. Therefore it is suggested that future researchers should aim to include more sessions over a longer period in order for the developments in fluency to be more noticeable. Even though this
project was carried out in a university, it could be adapted in different settings such as language institutions and schools. The results of an extensive implementation may fundamentally change students’ perceptions and the paradigms of teacher-centric educational models in EFL learning.

6.4 Limitations of the present study

Although this study demonstrated the effectiveness of the strategies chosen to address the research question, nevertheless, there were some constraints that delayed the research process. At the initial stage of the implementation, the researcher began as the assigned teacher of the studied group. Unfortunately, this group was changed by the university. It was necessary for the teacher to make arrangements in order to comply with the university requirements since he no longer had the same population on which to conduct the research. This predicament made it difficult to follow the time frame that was scheduled previously, and limited total time available with the group.

Another limitation that hampered the normal development of the study was the students’ class attendance. The study initially started with twenty two students, but unfortunately, only nineteen to twenty students attended all classes normally. This made it difficult to monitor all students’ perceptions. Moreover, valuable data and student feedback was not collected from those students who were absent on days when such data points were recorded, or data-collection instruments employed.

During the training stage at the beginning of the implementation, the participation from the participants was limited. The researcher had to modify the timeline to give learners more time to become adequately familiar with the instruments and the new methodology of the class. Furthermore, the attitudes of some learners did not enable the researcher to develop smooth transitions between the training and the pedagogical intervention. Late-comers added
significantly to the logistical challenges and administrative burden of the study during both the training and the implementation.

Finally, the researcher himself experienced a sudden, serious injury that did not allow him to continue with the research process; the project had to be postponed for two months while the researcher healed, until he was able to resume the intervention. Fortunately, key data was collected before the complication; however, the data analysis was delayed due this adversity.

(These limitations were the main reasons for the delay of the project, but the researcher managed to overcome all complications that arose. It should be noted that researchers are people themselves, and subject to imperfect and even undesirable conditions and limitations in their lives that affect the outcome. Neither the classroom nor the students’ lives occur in laboratory conditions, and personal hardships may have a great effect upon the results of any study. A parting piece of wisdom would be to design research with plans to address potential interruptions and other external challenges that may arise in the course of normal events.)

6.5 Further research

After assessing the impact of peer-correction and peer-assessment and determining the effectiveness of the strategies on students’ spoken fluency, several interesting features arose. Among them:

Researchers should take into account affective considerations that impact students’ oral production. It would be interesting to investigate to what extend peer-correction and assessment activities might mitigate affective factors in spoken interaction.

Students’ attitudes are another aspect that may influence the success of an implementation. It would be interesting to assess the incidence that attitudes have within a
pedagogical intervention to evaluate to what extent these attitudes negatively or positively affect language production.

Most of the participants claimed to feel comfortable interacting with their peers. However, some participants disagreed with the method of implementation and preferred to rely on the teacher’s feedback and assessment. Future researchers could focus on determining the improvement in students’ fluency through a comparative study between an intervention where only the teacher’s correction and assessment was used (as a control), and a second intervention that relied upon peer-correction and peer-assessment. Such a study might challenge the old paradigm that accepts the teacher as the source of all knowledge.

In addition, it would be interesting to focus further research on the improvement of learners’ lexis by using peer-correction and peer-assessment strategies. Such a study may help learners to expand their vocabulary to enhance their intelligibility and speaking in general.

6.6 Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated final insights from this study of a university-level EFL intervention to improve students’ fluency through the use of peer-assessment and peer-correction strategies. The comparison to the results of other studies revealed similarities in the results which reflect positively on the methodology of this research project. Furthermore, despite the multiple constraints and limitations, the study was completed, and overall, an analysis of the data collected process (although delayed) indicated the significance of the study by highlighting the benefits that peer-correction and peer-assessment strategies contributed to these students’ fluency. Improvements to the classroom culture that facilitated improvement included a safe, non-judgmental environment, cooperative work and increased opportunities to interact and
participate. All of these resulted in improved involvement with the students in their own learning processes.

The combination of these two strategies was novel for this study; no similar study of the impact of these two strategies in tandem as a means to improve fluency could be found in prior research. That makes this a groundbreaking method for generating feedback and producing results in EFL learning environments.

The contribution of the study may help other populations increase their fluency and mitigate possible affective factors that would deprive learners of opportunities for language development. It is the researcher’s contention that new research into the use of these synergistic strategies would bring new breakthroughs in teaching methodology and training, contributing meaningfully to the development of students’ communicative competence, both in and beyond the context of EFL classrooms in Colombia.
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Santa fe de Bogotá, Mayo 1 de 2014

Señor

Nelson Roa

Cordinador Académico

Fundación Universitaria del Área Andina

Respetado Cordinador

Actualmente me encuentro cursando la Maestría en didáctica del Inglés con énfasis en ambientes de aprendizaje autónomo en la Universidad De La Sabana. Durante este semestre comenzare a desarrollar mi tesis, la cual tiene por objetivo ___________________________________________________________________________ del semestre ___________________________. Considero que esta investigación refuerza el trabajo que se lleva a cabo con el proyecto de Bilingüismo, el cual es relevante para el área de inglés en el semestre.

Este proyecto requiere recoger muestras del trabajo de los estudiantes para incluirlos en la tesis. Me gustaría contar con su autorización para recolectar dicha información e igualmente, tener su aprobación para comunicarles a los padres de los estudiantes que se tomaran en cuenta, el tipo de investigación que estoy realizando y así poder utilizar los datos y trabajos obtenidos en el proyecto. Usted puede tener acceso al documento que contiene el material mencionado cuando usted lo desee.

Agradezco enormemente su colaboración.

Atentamente,

____________________________

Docente de Ingles
Appendix B: Parents’ Consent letter

Santa fe de Bogota, Mayo 1 de 2014

Apreciados Padres de Familia:

Actualmente me encuentro cursando la Maestría en didáctica del Inglés con énfasis en ambientes de aprendizaje autónomo en la Universidad De La Sabana. Este semestre llevaré a cabo un estudio el cual tiene por objetivo
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________

Dicho proyecto requiere recoger muestras del trabajo de los estudiantes del semestre _________. Apreciaría su permiso para analizar el trabajo de su hijo y poder incluirlo en la tesis. Dicha información será compartida con fines investigativos y en ella NO aparecerán los nombres reales de los niños, se utilizarán seudónimos para mantener el carácter confidencial. Ustedes pueden tener acceso al documento que recoge el material mencionado cuando lo deseen.

Esta investigación cuenta con la autorización del Coordinador Académico quien tienen conocimiento del trabajo a desarrollar.
Si está de acuerdo, por favor firme las dos copias de este formato, conserve una y regrese la otra. Cualquier duda puede consultarla conmigo o con el Coordinador Académico Nelson Roa, quienes estaremos dispuestos a resolver sus inquietudes.

Autorizamos utilizar el material descrito en la parte de arriba.

Nombre de los Padres: _________________________________________
Firma de los Padres: __________________________________________
Nombre del Niño: _______________________________________

________________________
Docente de Ingles

________________________
Coordinador    Académico
Appendix C: Questionnaire

Cuestionario

Por favor no escriba su nombre en la encuesta puesto que se trata de una investigación anónima. No se sienta obligado a responder si se siente incomodado por las preguntas o indisputado. Su esfuerzo es altamente apreciado. Agradezco mucho por tomar su tiempo para completar esta encuesta.

1. ¿Explique brevemente su experiencia después del proceso de corrección y evaluación con sus compañeros?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

2. ¿Cómo se sintió cuando sus compañeros lo corrigieron?
   a. Acepte con respeto sus sugerencias
   b. Me pareció que no tienen criterio para corregir
   c. Me siento más cómodo que cuando me corrige el profesor.
   d. Otro:

      __________________________________________________________________
      __________________________________________________________________
      __________________________________________________________________

3. ¿Cómo se sintió hablando en inglés con sus compañeros durante el proceso?
   a. Excelente
   b. Bien
   c. Regular
   d. No muy cómodo
   e. Otro: ____________

4. ¿Qué tan activa es su participación en clase después del proceso de corrección y evaluación con sus compañeros?
   a. Muy Activa
b. Poco activa
c. Nunca participo

5. Durante las actividades de interacción en clase, considera que se siente mejor interactuando con sus compañeros de clase después de la implementación de corrección y evaluación entre ustedes?
a. Si
b. No
c. Explique:____________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

6. ¿Considera que después de la implementación de las actividades, su nivel de fluidez hablando en la segunda lengua ha mejorado?
a. Si
b. No
c. Si tu respuesta es afirmativa, por favor mencione los aspectos de fluidez en cuales mejoro:____________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________

7. ¿Siente que la implementación ha ayudado a fortalecer su confianza hablando en la segunda lengua?
a. Si
b. No
c. Explique:_________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

8. Describa muy brevemente su experiencia interactuando con sus compañeros en otra lengua.

1. ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________

9. ¿Que tan frecuentemente considera que este proceso debería ser aplicado en clase?.
a. Una vez a la semana
b. Dos veces a la semana
c. Una vez al mes
d. Todas las clases
e. Nunca

10. Aparte de las horas dadas en la universidad, dedica más tiempo extra para el estudio del Inglés después de la implementación?
   a. Sí
   b. No

11. ¿Qué tan apropiada encuentra la rúbrica de evaluación de fluidez utilizada en el proceso?
   a. Muy apropiada
   b. Apropiada
   c. Poco apropiada
d. No posee suficientes criterios de evaluación.
e. Otro: ______________________________
### Appendix D: Rubric for oral fluency

#### Rubric for Oral fluency activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Demonstrated competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4**  | • Uses a variety of vocabulary and expressions  
        • Uses a variety of structures with only occasional grammatical errors  
        • Speaks smoothly, with little hesitation that does not interfere with communication  
        • Stays on task and communicates effectively; almost always responds appropriately and always tries to develop the interaction  
        • Pronunciation and intonation are almost always very clear/accurate |
| **3**  | • Uses a variety of vocabulary and expressions, but makes some errors in word choice  
        • Uses a variety of grammar structures, but makes some errors  
        • Speaks with some hesitation, but it does not usually interfere with communication  
        • Stays on task most of the time and communicates effectively; generally responds appropriately and keeps trying to develops the interaction  
        • Pronunciation and intonation are usually clear/accurate with a few problem |
| **2**  | • Uses limited vocabulary and expressions  
        • Uses a variety of structures with frequent errors, or uses basic structures with only occasional errors  
        • Speaks with some hesitation, which often interferes with communication  
        • Tries to communicate, but sometimes does not respond appropriately or clearly  
        • Pronunciation and intonation errors sometimes make it difficult to understand the student |
| **1**  | Uses only basic vocabulary and expressions  
        • Uses basic structures, makes frequent errors  
        • Hesitates too often when speaking, which often interferes with communication  
        • Purpose isn’t clear; needs a lot of help communicating; usually does not respond appropriately or clearly  
        • Frequent problems with pronunciation and intonation  
        • Creates long pauses and lack of accuracy  
        • Use of fillers and lack of ongoing speech. |
### Appendix E: Learning log sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fecha</th>
<th>Las actividades de corrección con mis compañeros me parecieron</th>
<th>El ambiente con mis compañeros fue</th>
<th>Considero que mi nivel de fluidez fue</th>
<th>La confianza hablando inglés después de la implementación fue</th>
<th>Las actividades de evaluación con mis compañeros me parecieron…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lesson:________  Student N°:___________
Appendix F: Peer-correction format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEER-CORRECTION FORMAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the activity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistakes: (Pronunciation, Grammar, intonation etc…)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Appendix G: Lesson Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of teacher: Oscar Alfonso Caicedo Alvarez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Fundacion Universitaria del Area Andina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic: Countries similarities and differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/grade: Fifth semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students: 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years of English study: one year and a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Objective: At the end of the lesson students will be able to compare countries orally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reinforce reading skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To foster cooperative work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Procedure Teacher and student activity</th>
<th>Time and interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm up stage</td>
<td>To engage students through a puzzle in order to get acquaintance with the topic.</td>
<td>The students will get in pairs and they will be given a puzzle (appendix 1) in which they will find some information related to countries. There will be some clues below the puzzle related to characters that belong to certain countries or history. Then, the students will get in groups of four in order to compare their answers. Finally the teacher will display the answers on the screen so the learners can correct and compare their answers.</td>
<td>10 minutes Ss-Ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis stage</td>
<td>To analyze and create a poster related to counties</td>
<td>Students will be gathered in groups of three people. Then, every group will be given two different countries along with an empty poster (appendix 2). These groups will be prompted to analyze and to write relevant</td>
<td>20 minutes Ss-Ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis stage</td>
<td>To promote interaction</td>
<td>There will be a short “symposium” where the students will walk around the classroom seeing each other’s posters and presenting information about their countries.</td>
<td>10 minutes Ss-Ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive stage</td>
<td>To compare the countries according to the information gathered during the symposium.</td>
<td>The teacher will give some examples modeling the use of comparatives (see appendix 4). Then, a round table will be created. The teacher will request the students to compare the countries according to their characteristics; population, cultural, location etc.</td>
<td>15 minutes Ss-Ss T-Ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrap up</td>
<td>To strengthen the use of comparatives and superlatives</td>
<td>The teacher will write some examples on the board in order to provide feedback about the use of comparatives. The students will be encouraged to infer the rule of the sentences and to peer-correct.</td>
<td>5 minutes T-Ss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Puzzle lesson plan 1

Country & City word Puzzle
Use the clues below to guess what word is in the puzzle

Across
6. This African country is famous for football stars like Samuel Eto'o and Roger Miller.
7. This country has the world's second largest population after China.
9. They speak French in this European country.
11. The capital is Brasilia.
15. Where is Nelson Mandela from?
17. This country is home to the kangaroos and koalas.
18. This is the capital of England.

Down
1. Which country's capital is Mexico city?
2. What is the capital of Italy?
3. This is the oldest country in the world.
4. What sport is Brazil famous for?
5. The capital of this country is Moscow.
8. Like Australia, this country is English speaking with a Maori & European population.
10. This is the country where the Great wall is.
12. This country hosted the 2006 World Cup.
13. Which North African country is famous for its pyramids?
14. It's capital is Tokyo.
16. It is a Spanish speaking country in Western Europe.
Appendix I: Countries Lesson plan 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Official Language</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Cities</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geography**
Spain is the 3rd country of Europe in extension and the 5th in population. Spain has five big mountains crossing the country about 50% of it are located at an elevated plain. Landscapes are extremely varied, some almost desert-like, others green and fertile, and of course there are the long coasts, in the east along Mediterranean Sea from Pyrenees to Gibraltar, and in the west (the major part of the Iberian peninsula's western coast is occupied by Portugal) along the Atlantic Ocean and Cantabrian Sea.

**Culture**
Spain is more or less a Christian nation wherein around 77 percent of the population is part of the Catholic Church, while only 1 percent belongs to the Protestant Church. However, there is a good mix of other religions like Islam as well. Bullfighting is probably the most popular of all the Spanish traditions and culture, reflecting the great influence that other cultures and races had on this beautiful country. Brought into the Iberian Peninsula by the Greeks and Phoenicians, bullfighting is a sport that has evolved over the centuries and has since then adapted well with the Spanish culture.

**Climate**
Spain has tremendous variable climate due to its large size. Visitors can generally expect a Mediterranean climate, characterized by hot, dry summers and mild, rainy winters. The vast central plateau, or Meseta, has a continental climate with hot, dry summers and cold winters. Rain generally falls in spring and autumn. The mountains surrounding the plateau have a higher rainfall and often experience heavy snowfalls in winter.
Brazil

Area | 8,547,404 Square kilometer
Population | 196.7 million (Approximately)
Capital | Brasília
Official Language | Portuguese
Location | South America
Main Cities | São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Belo Horizonte
Currency | 1 real = 100 centavos
Religions | Roman Catholic, Protestant

**Geography**

Covering nearly half of South America and the continent's largest nation, Brazil extends 2,965 mi (4,772 km) north-south, 2,691 mi (4,331 km) east-west, and borders every nation on the continent except Chile and Ecuador. Brazil may be divided into the Brazilian Highlands, or plateau, in the south and the Amazon River Basin in the north. Over a third of Brazil is drained by the Amazon and its more than 200 tributaries. The Amazon is navigable for ocean steamers to Iquitos, Peru, 2,300 mi (3,700 km) upstream. Southern Brazil is drained by the Plata system—the Paraguay, Uruguay, and Paraná rivers.

**Climate**

Sao Paulo and Brasilia, on the plateau, enjoy a mild climate with temperatures ranging around 66 F (19 C). Whereas Rio de Janeiro, Recife, Natal and Salvador have comparatively warmer climates. Porto Alegre and Curitiba experiences subtropical type of climate, with frequent frosts during the winter. The north east part of Brazil is most dry in nature where temperature even moves up to 38 degree summer.

**Culture**

The family is the foundation of the social structure and forms the basis of stability for most people, families tend to be large (although family size has been diminishing in recent years) and the extended family is quite close, the individual derives a social network and assistance in times of need from the family. Nepotism is considered a positive thing, since it implies that employing people one knows and trusts is of primary importance.
Area | 9826630 Square kilometer
---|---
Population | 313.9 million (Approximately)
Capital | Washington, DC
Official Language | English
Location | North America
Main Cities | New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, San Francisco

**Geography**

Based on population and land area the United States of America is the third largest country in the world, it also has the world's largest economy and is one of the most influential nations in the world. The U.S. borders both the North Atlantic and North Pacific Oceans and is bordered by Canada and Mexico. It is the third largest country in the world by area and has a varied topography. The eastern regions consist of hills and low mountains while the central interior is a vast plain (called the Great Plains region) and the west has high rugged mountain ranges (some of which are volcanic in the Pacific Northwest). Alaska also features rugged mountains as well as river valleys. Hawaii's landscape varies but is dominated by volcanic topography.

**Climate**

The temperature range runs between the extremes of 57 degrees C during the summer months in California's Death Valley to -62 degrees C in Alaska, with every other shade in between. The northern states are the coldest, with bitter, freezing winters - especially in the plains, Midwest and Northeast. Low temperatures in January and February in the Northwest are occasionally tempered by warm chinook winds from the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains. In contrast, the southern states are known as the Sunbelt, where it rarely drops below freezing.

**Culture**

The Culture of USA is influenced by the Native American peoples who mostly came from the western Part of Africa. There were people from host of European Countries in France, Germany, Portugal and Spain. The cultural practices and the food of the Americans reflect a perfect blend of all these cultural tends. However the strongest influence was that of the Britain, Ireland and Germany. Due to the wide extent of the American culture, there are divisions inside the country into different subcultures. These are vividly seen in the cultural practices of the people in
different parts of the country. American has often been referred to as the melting point of this existing culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>377,800 Square kilometer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>127.8 million (Approximately)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Tokyo (Tōkyō)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Language</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Cities</td>
<td>Yokohama, Osaka, Nagoya, Sapporo, Kyoto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geography**

With an area of 377,873km², Japan is located in the North Pacific off the coast of Russia and the Korean peninsula making it slightly smaller in land mass than California. Japan consists of four main larger islands and more than 4000 smaller islands. The main islands are Hokkaido, Honshu, Shikoku, and Kyushu. Honshu is the largest with an area of 231,000km². A modern railroad system connects the major islands with Japan's high-speed Shinkansen connecting major urban areas.

**Climate**

Japan has basically wet and humid climate and is marked in most places by four distinct seasons. Hokkaido and other parts of northern Japan have long, harsh winters and relatively cool summers. Average temperatures in the northern city of Sapporo dip to -5°C in January but reach only 20°C in July.

**Culture**

The traditional arts of Japan offer an opportunity to experience something truly exotic or find inner calm. For the serious practitioner, solemn awareness of the history and intimate knowledge of the past-masters of your chosen form of expression are essential if you wish to practice at the highest level. These ancient 'ways' are not for the faint of heart, but many foreigners come to Japan each year to enlighten themselves through their study. For the rest of us, just a nibble at this great banquet of culture will be more than enough.
Argentina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2,766,890 Square kilometer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>40.76 million (Approximately)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Language</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Cities</td>
<td>Córdoba, Rosario, Mendoza, Mar del Plata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geography**

In size and population Argentina is second only to Brazil in South America. Argentina is a plain, rising from the Atlantic to the Chilean border and the towering Andes peaks. Aconcagua (22,834 ft, 6,960 m) is the highest peak in the world outside Asia. Argentina is also bordered by Bolivia and Paraguay on the north, and by Uruguay and Brazil on the east. The northern area is the swampy and partly wooded Gran Chaco, bordering Bolivia and Paraguay. South of that are the rolling, fertile Pampas, which are rich in agriculture and sheep- and cattle-grazing and support most of the population.

**Climate**

Argentina is a long country stretching from the subtropics along the north eastern border with Brazil to the subpolar regions of Tierra del Fuego in the south. The western edge of the country runs along the Andean Mountains. Because Argentina is south of the Equator, the seasons are the reverse of Europe, North America and much of Asia, being similar to Australia. Summer in Buenos Aires (months of January and February) is quite hot and humid, while winter is damp and chilly. Average annual temperatures range from 24°C (75°F) to 11°C (51°F) in Buenos Aires (sea level) and Córdoba (420m/1270ft), and 24°C (75°F) to 8°C (46°F) in Mendoza (820 m/2484ft).

**Culture**

Argentina's cultural roots are influenced by the Europeans and this is clearly reflected in its architecture, music, literature and lifestyle. The cultural activity here is intense and is seen in the festivities, expositions, cinemas, theatres, and concerts that take place in the principal cities. Buenos Aires has approximately 100 cinemas and 90 theatres with a great diversity of spectacles that turn it into one of the cities with the major theatrical activity in Latin America. In the Borges, Recoleta y General San Martín cultural centers the cultural dynamics of the country and the world are exposed.
Area | 1,221,040 Square kilometer
---|---
Population | 50.59 million (Approximately)
Capital | Pretoria (administrative capital)
Official Language | English
Location | Africa
Main Cities | Cape Town (legislative capital), Bloemfontein (judicial capital), Johannesburg, Durban

**Geography**

Almost all of South Africa's 472,000 square miles (1.2 million sq. km.) lie below the Tropic of Capricorn, and the country is geographically composed of three primary regions: an expansive central plateau, a nearly continuous escarpment of mountain ranges that ring the plateau on the west, south, and east, and a narrow strip of low-lying land along the coast.

**Climate**

There is very little difference in average temperatures from south to north, however, in part because the inland plateau rises slightly in the northeast. For example, the average annual temperature in Cape Town is 17ºC, and in Pretoria, 17.5ºC, although these cities are separated by almost ten degrees of latitude. Maximum temperatures often exceed 32ºC in the summer, and reach 38ºC in some areas of the far north. The country's highest recorded temperatures, close to 48ºC, have occurred in both the Northern Cape and Mpumalanga.

**Culture**

This is a multiracial community and defining certain distinct subgroups by skin color alone will land you into a great deal of trouble. Those of British and Afrikaner descent most certainly won't be too happy to be mistaken as one another, and there are many different major and minor groupings that come under the traditional black African cultures.
Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>9,976,140 Square kilometer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>34.48 million (Approximately)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Language</td>
<td>English and French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Cities</td>
<td>Toronto, Montréal, Vancouver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geography**

Canada is the Americas most northerly country and the second largest country in the world. It borders the Atlantic Ocean to the east, the Pacific Ocean on the west, the Arctic Ocean to the north and the United States of America (USA) on the South. It spans a total area that covers almost ten million square kilometers (9,984,670 sq km). To put it into clear perspective, Canada could contain 18 countries the size of France or 40 United Kingdoms (UK), and has six time zones. Canada also has the longest coastline of any country.

**Climate**

Canada has a boreal climate. Winters are cold with average temperatures ranging between -2.5oC and -10oC and summers are relatively warm by comparison, with temperatures ranging between 16oC and 28oC in the southern regions. Canadian temperature has climbed up to a scorching 35 degrees Celsius in the summer and has descended to a glacial -25 degrees Celsius during winter.

**Culture**

With only 32 million people, the country is a modest nation compared to its densely populated southern neighbor. There are over 200 distinct cultures in Canada. In fact, the Nation is often defined as a "cultural mosaic" and has a greater mix of people from diverse backgrounds than almost anywhere else on Earth. It is home to the world's immigrants and encourages its people to hold closely to their traditions and culture. Around two-fifths of the Country's population comes from an origin other than British or French.
# Appendix J: Lesson plan 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of teacher: Oscar Alfonso Caicedo Alvarez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Fundacion Universitaria del Area Andina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Allotted: two sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/grade: Fifth semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students: 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years of English study: one year and a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Objective: By the end of the sessions, students would be able to use second conditional for hypothetical situations in a role play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm up stage</td>
<td>To introduce the topic through a video.</td>
<td>The teacher will request the students to get in pairs. Then the teacher will display a video(appendix 1) about Mars one project. The students will be given a worksheet (appendix 2) with ten open questions related to the video which students will have to answer. (the video will be played only once. The instruction will be given before the activity</td>
<td>Ss-Ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis stage</td>
<td>To analyse and share the answers from the worksheet.</td>
<td>The students will be prompted to get in groups of four students. The students will have to share their answers and to discuss the content of the video.</td>
<td>Ss-Ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis stage</td>
<td>To debate the significance of the project.</td>
<td>The teacher will request the students to make a round table. Then, one student will be chosen randomly to lead the discussion. This learner will use the questions from the worksheet to lead the conversation. The teacher will be monitoring the discussion. The teacher will provide input about the use of the conditional through questions (appendix 4) about the video in order to elicit previous information about the use of second conditional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive stage</td>
<td>To create and perform a role play using second conditional</td>
<td>Firstly the teacher will ask the students to make groups of three. Secondly, the teacher will request them to choose a role (one interviewer and two interviewees). In this stage, students will have to create a dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integraded learning approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ss-Ss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
simulating that one student is the recruiter from NASA and the two interviewees are the candidates for the project. The learners will be prompted to use second conditional. The teacher will model (appendix 5) a conversation with one of the students to show them how the activity needs to be done. During the activity, the teacher will be constantly monitoring taking notes of the possible mistakes that they may have.

| Wrap up | To strengthen the use of the second conditional using Discovery approach. | The teacher will write some examples taken from the productive stage on the board in order to feedback about the use of second conditional. The students will be encouraged to infer the rule of the sentences and to peer-correct. | T-Ss |
Appendix K: Video Lesson plan 2

Getting Humanity to Mars- TEDxDelft. Video taken from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sj1C14nJ85A
Appendix L : Mars one project questions.

1. What is the talk mainly about?
________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2. According to the speaker why should we go to Mars?
________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

3. What is the hardest part of the mission?
________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

4. Are we prepared for such a long trip?
________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

5. How is the project going to be financed?
________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

6. How is the crew going to survive in mars?
________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

7. How much would this project cost?
________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

8. What does the speaker mean by “revenue”
9. What are the steps of the project?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

10. How would the people be recruited?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Appendix M: Guiding questions Lesson plan 2

☐ If you had enough resources, would you sponsor this project?
☐ What would you do if one of your family member decided to go to Mars?
☐ If you had the opportunity, would you go to Mars?
☐ What would be the reaction of the public, if these people succeeded arriving to Mars?
☐ What if one of the crew members regretted his/her decision, what would happen?
### Appendix N: Lesson plan 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of teachers: Oscar Caicedo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Fundacion Universitaria del Area Andina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic: The old man and the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/grade: Fifth semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students: 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years of English study: Two years and a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Objective: At the end of the class, the students will be able to associate the information of the novel with the author ideas critically through a debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To reinforce reading skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To promote cooperative work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To reinforce high order thinking skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To foster the use of L2 in presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To reinforce speaking abilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Teacher and student activity</th>
<th>interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm up stage and pre-reading</td>
<td>To ask information about the author “Ernest Hemingway and the Old man and the sea”</td>
<td>The teacher will ask students questions related to experiences with the army, war during time and American Authors.</td>
<td>Ts-Ss</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading stage</td>
<td>To analyse the information related to the author and his novel.</td>
<td>The students will be prompted to get in groups of three students. One group will have an overview about the author’s information (life, style, philosophy, products etc...) (annex 1). The old man and the sea will be divided among the group. Students will be given craft paper</td>
<td>Ss-Ss</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information transfer stage</strong></td>
<td>To present the information gathered from the reading</td>
<td>Ss-Ss 40 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher will request the students to present the outcomes from the reading in front of their partners. The students will present in order. Starting with the information of the author and the chapters that the novel contains. Learners will have 5 minutes per each presentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productive stage</strong></td>
<td>To analyse the facts the may influence the author to write the novel.</td>
<td>Ss-Ss 20 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The students will be given five questions to analyse. (Annex 2). The students will be organized in groups of three members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wrap up</strong></td>
<td>To discuss the answers in a debate</td>
<td>Ss-Ss T-Ss 10 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher will request the students to organize a roundtable. Then the teacher will select a students to lead the discussion taking into account the guiding questionsgiven previously.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix O: Author’s information

Ernest Hemingway (1899-1961)

Few writers have lived as colorfully as Ernest Hemingway, whose career could have come out of one of his adventurous novels. Like Fitzgerald, Dreiser, and many other fine novelists of the 20th century, Hemingway came from the U.S. Midwest. Born in Illinois, Hemingway spent childhood vacations in Michigan on hunting and fishing trips. He volunteered for an ambulance unit in France during World War I, but was wounded and hospitalized for six months. After the war, as a war correspondent based in Paris, he met expatriate American writers Sherwood Anderson, Ezra Pound, F. Scott Fitzgerald, and Gertrude Stein. Stein, in particular, influenced his spare style. After his novel The Sun Also Rises (1926) brought him fame, he covered the Spanish Civil War, World War II, and the fighting in China in the 1940s. On a safari in Africa, he was badly injured when his small plane crashed; still, he continued to enjoy hunting and sport fishing, activities that inspired some of his best work. The Old Man and the Sea (1952), a short poetic novel about a poor, old fisherman who heroically catches a huge fish devoured by sharks, won him the Pulitzer Prize in 1953; the next year he received the Nobel Prize. Discouraged by a troubled family background, illness, and the belief that he was losing his gift for writing, Hemingway shot himself to death in 1961.

Hemingway is arguably the most popular American novelist of this century. His sympathies are basically apolitical and humanistic, and in this sense he is universal. His simple style makes his novels easy to comprehend, and they are often set in exotic surroundings. A believer in the “cult of experience,” Hemingway often involved his characters in dangerous situations in order to reveal their inner natures; in his later works, the danger sometimes becomes an occasion for masculine assertion. Like Fitzgerald, Hemingway became a spokesperson for his generation. But instead of painting its fatal glamour as did Fitzgerald, who never fought in World War I, Hemingway wrote of war, death, and the “lost generation” of cynical survivors. His characters are not dreamers but tough bullfighters, soldiers, and athletes. If intellectual, they are deeply scarred and disillusioned. His hallmark is a clean style devoid of unnecessary words. Often he uses understatement: In A Farewell to Arms (1929) the heroine dies in childbirth saying “I’m not a bit afraid. It’s just a dirty trick.” He once compared his writing to icebergs: “There is seven-eighths of it under water for every part that shows.” Hemingway’s fine ear for dialogue and exact description shows in his excellent short stories, such as “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” and “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber.” Critical opinion, in fact, generally holds his short stories equal or superior to his novels. His best novels include The Sun Also Rises, about the demoralized life of expatriates after World War I; A Farewell to Arms, about the tragic love affair of an American soldier and an English nurse during the war; For Whom the Bell Tolls (1940), set during the Spanish Civil War; and The Old Man and the Sea.

Appendix P: The old man and the sea

THE OLD MAN AND THE SEA

Ernest Hemingway

Summary

Day One

Santiago, an old fisherman, has gone eighty-four days without catching a fish. For the first forty
days, a boy named Manolin had fished with him, but Manolin’s parents, who call Santiago salao,
or “the worst form of unlucky,” forced Manolin to leave him in order to work in a more
prosperous boat. The old man is wrinkled, splotched, and scarred from handling heavy fish on
cords, but his eyes, which are the color of the sea, remain “cheerful and undefeated.”

Having made some money with the successful fishermen, the boy offers to return to Santiago’s
skiff, reminding him of their previous eighty-seven-day run of bad luck, which culminated in
their catching big fish every day for three weeks. He talks with the old man as they haul in
Santiago’s fishing gear and laments that he was forced to obey his father, who lacks faith and, as
a result, made him switch boats. The pair stops for a beer at a terrace café, where fishermen
make fun of Santiago. The old man does not mind. Santiago and Manolin reminisce about the
many years the two of them fished together, and the boy begs the old man to let him provide
fresh bait fish for him. The old man accepts the gift with humility. Santiago announces his plans
to go “far out” in the sea the following day.

Manolin and Santiago haul the gear to the old man’s shack, which is furnished with nothing
more than the barest necessities: a bed, a table and chair, and a place to cook. On the wall are
two pictures: one of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and one of the Virgin of Cobre, the patroness of
Cuba. The old man has taken down the photograph of his wife, which made him feel “too
lonely.” The two go through their usual dinner ritual, in which the boy asks Santiago what he is
going to eat, and the old man replies, “yellow rice with fish,” and then offers some to the boy.
The boy declines, and his offer to start the old man’s fire is rejected. In reality, there is no food.

Excited to read the baseball scores, Santiago pulls out a newspaper, which he says was given to
him by Perico at the bodega. Manolin goes to get the bait fish and returns with some dinner as
well, a gift from Martin, the café owner. The old man is moved by Martin’s thoughtfulness and
promises to repay the kindness. Manolin and Santiago discuss baseball. Santiago is a huge
admirer of “the great DiMaggio,” whose father was a fisherman. After discussing with Santiago
the greatest ballplayers and the greatest baseball managers, the boy declares that Santiago is the
greatest fisherman: “There are many good fishermen and some great ones. But there is only
you.” Finally, the boy leaves, and the old man goes to sleep. He dreams his sweet, recurring
dream, of lions playing on the white beaches of Africa, a scene he saw from his ship when he was a very young man.

**Day Two**

The next morning, before sunrise, the old man goes to Manolin’s house to wake the boy. The two head back to Santiago’s shack, carry the old man’s gear to his boat, and drink coffee from condensed milk cans. Santiago has slept well and is confident about the day’s prospects. He and Manolin part on the beach, wishing each other good luck. The old man rows steadily away from shore, toward the deep waters of the Gulf Stream. He hears the leaps and whirs of the flying fish, which he considers to be his friends, and thinks with sympathy of the small, frail birds that try to catch them. He loves the sea, though at times it can be cruel. He thinks of the sea as a woman whose wild behavior is beyond her control. The old man drops his baited fishing lines to various measured depths and rows expertly to keep them from drifting with the current. Above all else, he is precise. The sun comes up. Santiago continues to move away from shore, observing his world as he drifts along. He sees flying fish pursued by dolphins; a diving, circling seabird; Sargasso weed, a type of seaweed found in the Gulf Stream; the distasteful purple Portuguese man-of-war; and the small fish that swim among the jellyfish-like creatures’ filaments. Rowing farther and farther out, Santiago follows the seabird that is hunting for fish, using it as a guide. Soon, one of the old man’s lines goes taut. He pulls up a ten-pound tuna, which, he says out loud, will make a lovely piece of bait. He wonders when he developed the habit of talking to himself but does not remember. He thinks that if the other fishermen heard him talking, they would think him crazy, although he knows he isn’t. Eventually, the old man realizes that he has sailed so far out that he can no longer see the green of the shore. When the projecting stick that marks the top of the hundred-fathom line dips sharply, Santiago is sure that the fish tugging on the line is of a considerable size, and he prays that it will take the bait. The marlin plays with the bait for a while, and when it does finally take the bait, it starts to move with it, pulling the boat. The old man gives a mighty pull, then another, but he gains nothing. The fish drags the skiff farther into the sea. No land at all is visible to Santiago now. All day the fish pulls the boat as the old man braces the line with his back and holds it taut in his hands, ready to give more line if necessary. The struggle goes on all night, as the fish continues to pull the boat. The glow given off by the lights of Havana gradually fades, signifying that the boat is the farthest from shore it has been so far. Over and over, the old man wishes he had the boy with him. When he sees two porpoises playing in the water, Santiago begins to pity his quarry and consider it a brother. He thinks back to the time that he caught one of a pair of marlin: the male fish let the female take the bait, then he stayed by the boat, as though in mourning. Although the memory makes him sad, Santiago’s determination is unchecked: as the marlin swims out, the old man goes “beyond all people in the world” to find him. The sun rises and the fish has not tired, though it is now swimming in shallower waters. The old man cannot increase the tension on the line, because if it is too taut it will break and the fish will get away. Also, if the hook makes too big a cut in the fish, the fish
may get away from it. Santiago hopes that the fish will jump, because its air sacs would fill and prevent the fish from going too deep into the water, which would make it easier to pull out. A yellow weed attaches to the line, helping to slow the fish. Santiago can do nothing but hold on. He pledges his love and respect to the fish, but he nevertheless promises that he will kill his opponent before the day ends.

**Day Three**

A small, tired warbler (a type of bird) lands on the stern of the skiff, flutters around Santiago’s head, then perches on the taut fishing line that links the old man to the big fish. The old man suspects that it is the warbler’s first trip, and that it knows nothing of the hawks that will meet the warbler as it nears land. Knowing that the warbler cannot understand him, the old man tells the bird to stay and rest up before heading toward shore. Just then the marlin surges, nearly pulling Santiago overboard, and the bird departs. Santiago notices that his hand is bleeding from where the line has cut it.

Aware that he will need to keep his strength, the old man makes himself eat the tuna he caught the day before, which he had expected to use as bait. While he cuts and eats the fish with his right hand, his already cut left hand cramps and tightens into a claw under the strain of taking all the fish’s resistance. Santiago is angered and frustrated by the weakness of his own body, but the tuna, he hopes, will reinvigorate the hand. As he eats, he feels a brotherly desire to feed the marlin too.

While waiting for the cramp in his hand to ease, Santiago looks across the vast waters and thinks himself to be completely alone. A flight of ducks passes overhead, and he realizes that it is impossible for a man to be alone on the sea. The slant of the fishing line changes, indicating to the old fisherman that the fish is approaching the surface. Suddenly, the fish leaps magnificently into the air, and Santiago sees that it is bigger than any he has ever witnessed; it is two feet longer than the skiff itself. Santiago declares it “great” and promises never to let the fish learn its own strength. The line races out until the fish slows to its earlier pace. By noon, the old man’s hand is uncramped, and though he claims he is not religious, he says ten Hail Marys and ten Our Fathers and promises that, if he catches the fish, he will make a pilgrimage to the Virgin of Cobre. In case his struggle with the marlin should continue for another night, Santiago baits another line in hopes of catching another meal.

The second day of Santiago’s struggle with the marlin wears on. The old man alternately questions and justifies seeking the death of such a noble opponent. As dusk approaches, Santiago’s thoughts turn to baseball. The great DiMaggio, thinks the old man, plays brilliantly despite the pain of a bone spur in his heel. Santiago is not actually sure what a bone spur is, but he is sure he would not be able to bear the pain of one himself. (A bone spur is an outgrowth that projects from the bone.) He wonders if DiMaggio would stay with the marlin. To boost his confidence, the old man recalls the great all-night arm-wrestling match he won as a young man.
Having beaten “the great negro from Cienfuegos [a town in Cuba],” Santiago earned the title El Campeón, or “The Champion.”

Just before nightfall, a dolphin takes the second bait Santiago had dropped. The old man hauls it in with one hand and clubs it dead. He saves the meat for the following day. Although Santiago boasts to the marlin that he feels prepared for their impending fight, he is really numb with pain. The stars come out. Santiago considers the stars his friends, as he does the great marlin. He considers himself lucky that his lot in life does not involve hunting anything so great as the stars or the moon. Again, he feels sorry for the marlin, though he is as determined as ever to kill it. The fish will feed many people, Santiago decides, though they are not worthy of the creature’s great dignity. By starlight, still bracing and handling the line, Santiago considers rigging the oars so that the fish will have to pull harder and eventually tire itself out. He fears this strategy would ultimately result in the loss of the fish. He decides to “rest,” which really just means putting down his hands and letting the line go across his back, instead of using his own strength to resist his opponent.

After “resting” for two hours, Santiago chastises himself for not sleeping, and he fears what could happen should his mind become “unclear.” He butchers the dolphin he caught earlier and finds two flying fish in its belly. In the chilling night, he eats half of a fillet of dolphin meat and one of the flying fish. While the marlin is quiet, the old man decides to sleep. He has several dreams: a school of porpoises leaps from and returns to the ocean; he is back in his hut during a storm; and he again dreams of the lions on the beach in Africa.

**Day Four**

The marlin wakes Santiago by jerking the line. The fish jumps out of the water again and again, and Santiago is thrown into the bow of the skiff, facedown in his dolphin meat. The line feeds out fast, and the old man brakes against it with his back and hands. His left hand, especially, is badly cut. Santiago wishes that the boy were with him to wet the coils of the line, which would lessen the friction.

The old man wipes the crushed dolphin meat off his face, fearing that it will make him nauseated and he will lose his strength. Looking at his damaged hand, he reflects that “pain does not matter to a man.” He eats the second flying fish in hopes of building up his strength. As the sun rises, the marlin begins to circle. For hours the old man fights the circling fish for every inch of line, slowly pulling it in. He feels faint and dizzy and sees black spots before his eyes. The fish riots against the line, battering the boat with its spear. When it passes under the boat, Santiago cannot believe its size. As the marlin continues to circle, Santiago adds enough pressure to the line to bring the fish closer and closer to the skiff. The old man thinks that the fish is killing him, and admires him for it, saying, “I do not care who kills who.” Eventually, he pulls the fish onto its side by the boat and plunges his harpoon into it. The fish lurches out of the water, brilliantly and beautifully alive as it dies. When it falls back into the water, its blood stains the waves.
The old man pulls the skiff up alongside the fish and fastens the fish to the side of the boat. He thinks about how much money he will be able to make from such a big fish, and he imagines that DiMaggio would be proud of him. Santiago’s hands are so cut up that they resemble raw meat. With the mast up and the sail drawn, man, fish, and boat head for land. In his light-headed state, the old man finds himself wondering for a moment if he is bringing the fish in or vice versa. He shakes some shrimp from a patch of gulf weed and eats them raw. He watches the marlin carefully as the ship sails on. The old man’s wounds remind him that his battle with the marlin was real and not a dream.

An hour later, a mako shark arrives, having smelled the marlin’s blood. Except for its jaws full of talonlike teeth, the shark is a beautiful fish. When the shark hits the marlin, the old man sinks his harpoon into the shark’s head. The shark lashes on the water and, eventually, sinks, taking the harpoon and the old man’s rope with it. The mako has taken nearly forty pounds of meat, so fresh blood from the marlin spills into the water, inevitably drawing more sharks to attack. Santiago realizes that his struggle with the marlin was for nothing; all will soon be lost. But, he muses, “a man can be destroyed but not defeated.”

Santiago tries to cheer himself by thinking that DiMaggio would be pleased by his performance, and he wonders again if his hands equal DiMaggio’s bone spurs as a handicap. He tries to be hopeful, thinking that it is silly, if not sinful, to stop hoping. He reminds himself that he didn’t kill the marlin simply for food, that he killed it out of pride and love. He wonders if it is a sin to kill something you love. The shark, on the other hand, he does not feel guilty about killing, because he did it in self-defense. He decides that “everything kills everything else in some way.”

Two hours later, a pair of shovel-nosed sharks arrives, and Santiago makes a noise likened to the sound a man might make as nails are driven through his hands. The sharks attack, and Santiago fights them with a knife that he had lashed to an oar as a makeshift weapon. He enjoyed killing the mako because it was a worthy opponent, a mighty and fearless predator, but he has nothing but disdain for the scavenging shovel-nosed sharks. The old man kills them both, but not before they take a good quarter of the marlin, including the best meat. Again, Santiago wishes that he hadn’t killed the marlin. He apologizes to the dead marlin for having gone out so far, saying it did neither of them any good.

Still hopeful that the whole ordeal had been a dream, Santiago cannot bear to look at the mutilated marlin. Another shovel-nosed shark arrives. The old man kills it, but he loses his knife in the process. Just before nightfall, two more sharks approach. The old man’s arsenal has been reduced to the club he uses to kill bait fish. He manages to club the sharks into retreat, but not before they repeatedly maul the marlin. Stiff, sore, and weary, he hopes he does not have to fight anymore. He even dares to imagine making it home with the half-fish that remains. Again, he apologizes to the marlin carcass and attempts to console it by reminding the fish how many sharks he has killed. He wonders how many sharks the marlin killed when it was alive, and he
pledges to fight the sharks until he dies. Although he hopes to be lucky, Santiago believes that he “violated [his] luck” when he sailed too far out.

Around midnight, a pack of sharks arrives. Near-blind in the darkness, Santiago strikes out at the sounds of jaws and fins. Something snatches his club. He breaks off the boat’s tiller and makes a futile attempt to use it as a weapon. When the last shark tries to tear at the tough head of the marlin, the old man clubs the shark until the tiller splinters. He plunges the sharp edge into the shark’s flesh and the beast lets go. No meat is left on the marlin.

The old man spits blood into the water, which frightens him for a moment. He settles in to steer the boat, numb and past all feeling. He asks himself what it was that defeated him and concludes, “Nothing . . . I went out too far.” When he reaches the harbor, all lights are out and no one is near. He notices the skeleton of the fish still tied to the skiff. He takes down the mast and begins to shoulder it up the hill to his shack. It is terrifically heavy, and he is forced to sit down five times before he reaches his home. Once there, the old man sleeps.

**Day Five**

Early the next morning, Manolin comes to the old man’s shack, and the sight of his friend’s ravaged hands brings him to tears. He goes to fetch coffee. Fishermen have gathered around Santiago’s boat and measured the carcass at eighteen feet. Manolin waits for the old man to wake up, keeping his coffee warm for him so it is ready right away. When the old man wakes, he and Manolin talk warmly. Santiago says that the sharks beat him, and Manolin insists that he will work with the old man again, regardless of what his parents say. He reveals that there had been a search for Santiago involving the coast guard and planes. Santiago is happy to have someone to talk to, and after he and Manolin make plans, the old man sleeps again. Manolin leaves to find food and the newspapers for the old man, and to tell Pedrico that the marlin’s head is his. That afternoon two tourists at the terrace café mistake the great skeleton for that of a shark. Manolin continues to watch over the old man as he sleeps and dreams of the lions.

**Summary retrieved from:** [http://www.sparknotes.com/lit/oldman/section1.rhtml](http://www.sparknotes.com/lit/oldman/section1.rhtml)
Appendix Q: Analysis

The old man and the sea analysis

1. Why does the old man kill the Merlin?
2. Santiago claims that a man can be "destroyed but not defeated." How do we define each of these terms? What’s the difference? Is one more tolerable than the other? Can you apply this statement in real life?.
3. The Old Man and the Sea is, essentially, the story of a single character. Indeed, other than the old man, only one human being receives any kind of prolonged attention. Discuss the role of Manolin in the novella. Is he necessary to the book?
4. What is the old man’s attitude towards the sea? Does he respect it? Does it have any influence? Does he compare the sea with something else?

Appendix R: Survey

Encuesta

Por favor no escriba su nombre en la encuesta puesto que se trata de una investigación anónima. No se sienta obligado a responder si se siente incomodado por las preguntas o indispuesto. Agradezco mucho por tomar su tiempo para completar esta encuesta, su esfuerzo es altamente apreciado.

1. ¿Le gusta el inglés?
   a. Sí
   b. No

2. ¿Cual habilidad del inglés considera más difícil de aprender?.
   a. Auditiva
   b. Oral
   c. Escuchar
   d. Escribir

3. ¿Cómo se siente cuando el profesor lo corrige o lo/la evalúa?
   e. Acepto con respeto sus sugerencias
   f. Siento nerviosismo y ansiedad
   g. Me siento más cómodo con mis compañeros.
   h. Otro:
      __________________________________________________________
      __________________________________________________________

   __________

4. Como se siente hablando en inglés con el profesor?
   f. Excelente
   g. Bien
   h. Regular
   i. No muy cómodo
   j. Otro: __________

5. Es la primera vez que participa en actividades de interacción utilizando otra lengua?
6. Aparte de la horas dadas en la universidad, dedica tiempo extra para el estudio del Inglés?
   a. Si
   b. No

7. Considera la materia inglés como parte importante de su proceso de aprendizaje?
   a. Si
   b. No
   Porque?______________________________________________________________
              ______________________________________________________________

8. Que otras estrategias utiliza para el aprendizaje del Inglés?
   a. Televisión
   b. Música
   c. Películas
   d. Otro:____________

9. Que tan activa es su participación en Clase?
   d. Muy Activa
   e. Poco activa
   f. Nunca participo

10. Explique brevemente su experiencia en actividades de evaluación y corrección ejecutadas por el docente.

   _____________________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________________

11. Durante las actividades de interacción en clase, considera que se siente mejor interactuando con sus compañeros de clase?
    d. Si
    e. No

12. Describa brevemente que sentimientos expresa cuando interactúa con el profesor.
13. Considera que hablar con fluidez es más importante que comprender unidades gramaticales.

a. si

b. no
### Appendix S: Learning Logs

#### Learning log 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>S11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Las actividades de nombramiento con mis compañeros que me parecieron...</strong></td>
<td>Importantes, ya que al socializarme nos faltaba más en el entorno. Buenas, ya que esto hace que se reconozcan entre sí como parte de mis compañeros y se fomenten las interacciones.</td>
<td>Agradables, las personas que me han escuchado y me han hecho sentir parte de la clase.</td>
<td>En una actividad con objetivos claros y nítidos, ya que podemos expresar, compartir y expresarnos mejor de manera lúdica hacia nuestros compañeros.</td>
<td>Fueron muy interesantes, ya que nos animaron a que descubriésemos nuevas formas de trabajo grupal.</td>
<td>Interesantes, ya que de esta manera me he mejorado y he accedido a ponerme en el lugar del otro.</td>
<td>Interesantes, ya que nos animaron a que descubriésemos nuevas formas de trabajo grupal.</td>
<td>Fueron muy interesantes, ya que nos animaron a que descubriésemos nuevas formas de trabajo grupal.</td>
<td>Interesantes, ya que me hizo reflexionar sobre los temas y las conexiones.</td>
<td>Interesantes, ya que me hizo reflexionar sobre los temas y las conexiones</td>
<td>Interesantes, ya que me hizo reflexionar sobre los temas y las conexiones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codes**
- Self-reflection
- Self-reflection
- Reflective Practice
- Self-reflection
- Self-reflection
- Reflective Practice
- Self-reflection
- Reflective Practice
- Self-reflection
- Self-reflection
- Self-reflection

**El ambiente con mis compañeros fue...**
- Envolvente, ya que se hizo sentir la interacción y el compromiso entre los compañeros.
- Normal, el ambiente se sintió tranquilo y todos participaron activamente.
- Excellente, el ambiente se sintió animado y todos mostraron su compromiso.
- Bueno, porque está bien organizado, pero es necesario mejorar en la participación de todos los compañeros.
- Excellente, el ambiente se sintió abierto y participativo.
- Agradable, todos hablamos y el ambiente fue bueno.
- Excellente, el ambiente se sintió abierto y participativo.
- Agradable, todos hablamos y el ambiente fue bueno.
- Excellente, el ambiente se sintió abierto y participativo.
- Agradable, todos hablamos y el ambiente fue bueno.

**Codes**
- Comfort sensation
- Comfort sensation
- Comfort sensation
- Comfort sensation
- Comfort sensation
- Comfort sensation
- Comfort sensation
- Comfort sensation
- Comfort sensation
- Comfort sensation

**Consideré que mi nivel de fluidez...**
- A una persona que ha leído bien y ha entendido lo que ha leído, diría que está en su punto de partida.
- Aby mejorado aunque debemos seguir mejorando.
- Fuera de lugar debido a la falta de conocimientos y una buena preparación.
- Fue un poco regular, ya que no hice lo que se esperaba.
- Bueno, aunque no es el que esperaba.
- Médico, ya que no lo esperaba, pero es muy importante no tener malos hábitos y mejorarlo.
- Mejorado, seguramente seguiremos mejorando a lo largo del tiempo.
- Mediante buena fiabilidad.
- Normal, está bien pero no en el punto de partida.

**Codes**
- Enhanced perception of fluency
- Enhanced perception of fluency
- Enhanced perception of fluency
- Enhanced perception of fluency
- Enhanced perception of fluency
- Enhanced perception of fluency
- Enhanced perception of fluency
- Enhanced perception of fluency
- Enhanced perception of fluency

**La continuidad hablado mucho después de la implementación...**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fairly good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Gallon</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Influence of affective**
- Normal
- Good
- Fairly good
- Very good
- Excellent

**General Data**, **Learning Log 1**, **Learning Log 2**, **Learning log 3**, **Learning log 4**, **Learning log 5**, **Questionnaire**, **Rut 1**
## Learning log 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompts</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las actividades de corrección con mis compañeros me parecieron.....</td>
<td>Muy buenas ya que ellos se interesaron en saber más acerca del tema.</td>
<td>Adquisitas para así poder ir mejorando y perfeccionando nuestro vocabulario y</td>
<td>Buenas ya que podemos corregir algunos errores.</td>
<td>Buenas ya que podemos mejorar teniendo en cuenta nuestras defencias.</td>
<td>Muy didácticas por lo que podemos participar todos para que haya un mejor aprendizaje.</td>
<td>Buenas, por que podemos seguir aprendiendo de nuestros errores</td>
<td>Prácticas, por que compartimos información y aprendemos más</td>
<td>Muy buenas por que así puedo mejorar en la utilización de verbos en L1, 2a y 3a persona con la ayuda de mi compañero de aula</td>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El ambiente con mis compañeros fue.....</td>
<td>Agradable</td>
<td>Divertido</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Expectativo</td>
<td>Buena</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>Bueno, por que todos pudimos participar con respeto.</td>
<td>Para mi mejora a la vez pasada ya que ahora prestamos mejor atención</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puedo que mi nivel de fluididad a.....</td>
<td>Considerando el nivel el cual estoy, he mejorado en mi forma de pronunciar.</td>
<td>Aumento, puesto que con las correcciones anteriores pude mejorar.</td>
<td>Mejorado, gracias al aumento de vocabulario.</td>
<td>Mejorado, ya que no tuve interrupciones de mis novieces.</td>
<td>Mejorado, aun que me sentía nervioso.</td>
<td>Mejorado, espero seguir aumentando mi nivel.</td>
<td>Mejorado, por que que se ha practicado las correcciones anteriores las cuales ayudaron a tener una mejora.</td>
<td>Aumento, ya que aumenta mi conocimiento de vocabulario</td>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La confianza hablando inglés después de la implementación fue...</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Bueno, por que me sentí tranquilo.</td>
<td>Mejor ya que estuve más preparado.</td>
<td>Aumento, por que tuve encuentas las correcciones que me hicieron y estas fueron puestas</td>
<td>Aumento, por que que me sentí tranquilamente a la hora de exponer.</td>
<td>Buena</td>
<td>Buena, por que me sentí tranquilo que puedo manejar la lengua con más facilidad</td>
<td>Mejor, ya que me siento más tranquilo delante de...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Learning log 3

#### Prompts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>S11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Las actividades de corrección con mis compañeros me parecieron...</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agradables por que permítieron aclarar ciertos errores con buen carácter.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Buenas, aún que olvide algunos detalles lo hice con buen criterio.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fue agradable porque pude expresar mis inquietudes sin temor a equivocarme.</strong></td>
<td><strong>En esta clase, hubo mucho respeto a pesar de las diferencias de pensamiento.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fueron buenas por que no me quedaron dudas que me quede sin resolver.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Muy buenas prácticas, ya que nos dimos cuenta de como convivir con otros.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codes**
- Clarifying ideas
- Comfort sensation

---

| **El ambiente con mis compañeros fue...** | **Muy agradables, ya que todo se resolvió con respeto.** | **Divertido porque compartimos un buen momento en medio de risas.** | **Fue bueno aun que me sentí incomodo por que tuve algunas dificultades.** | **Confuso, habían muchas diferencias y muy pocas coincidencias en las ideas a la hora de corregir.** | **Increíble, aprendimos muchas cosas interesantes entre nosotros después de las correcciones.** | **Bueno, ya que establecimos una muy buena relación.** |

**Codes**
- Gaining confidence
- Self-reflection
- Reinforcing social skills

---

| **Idera que mi nivel de fluidez a...** | **En este momento, he aumentado significativamente al mejorar en aspectos como expresión, pronunciación y vocabulario.** | **Mantengo mi nivel pero sé que seguiré mejorando en el mismo lugar.** | **Mejoré y siento esperar a aumentar mis expectativas.** | **Mejoré y logré una mejora cada vez más.** | **Mejoré, desarrollando un conocimiento amplio en la forma de expresarme.** | **Mejoré gracias al interés que le puse a este punto.** |

**Codes**
- Enhanced perception
- Enhanced
- Enhanced

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>General Data</strong></th>
<th><strong>Learning Log 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Learning Log 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Learning Log 3</strong></th>
<th><strong>Learning Log 4</strong></th>
<th><strong>Questionnaire</strong></th>
<th><strong>Rule</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompts</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>S6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las actividades de corrección con mis compañeros me parecieron....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El ambiente con mis compañeros fue.....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oír que mi nivel de fluidos....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La conferencia hablando con el mi médico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Data / Learning Log 1 / Learning Log 2 / Learning log 3 / Learning log 4 / Learning log 5 / Questionaire / Rule 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning log 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompts</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>S11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las actividades de corrección con mis compañeros me parecieron...</td>
<td>Muy buenas y que gracias a estas logramos aprender mas.</td>
<td>muy acertadas ya que es muy importante que en muchos aspectos sean mejores nuestras propuestas.</td>
<td>muy importantes ya que estos nos hacen mejorar en muchas cosas y aprender de nuestros compañeros.</td>
<td>Practicás, logramos intercambiar conocimientos y con que nos escojimos cada uno.</td>
<td>muy dinámicas ya que está evidente que para hacerlo se han hecho.</td>
<td>Coherentes ya que nos dimos cuenta de lo que es lo correcto y no lo que es.</td>
<td>actividades, por que se intercambie opiniones con todos.</td>
<td>muy adecuadas para nosotros ya que nos dimos cuenta de nuestras errores.</td>
<td>Muy buena.</td>
<td>sobresalientes ya que pudimos aclarar cada uno de nuestros errores.</td>
<td>Muy buena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El ambiente con mis compañeros fue...</td>
<td>Muy bien ya que todos tuvieron una muy buena condición a la hora de aprendizaje.</td>
<td>Muy bueno ya que hubieron muchas diferencias de perspectiva estas se resolvieron.</td>
<td>Muy entretenido ya que los compañeros se tomo un tiempo para hacer lo mejor posible.</td>
<td>Muy divertido y a la vez muy eficaz.</td>
<td>Muy buen.</td>
<td>Divertido.</td>
<td>Muy buen.</td>
<td>Divertido.</td>
<td>Muy buen, logramos tener un buen manejo de las actividades.</td>
<td>Bueno ya que todos los que nos convencieron.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La confianza hablando Ingles después de la implementación fue...</td>
<td>Muy buena ya que hice que mejorara mucho mas mi pronunciación y estos</td>
<td>Muy buena ya que lograste mejorar el aspecto de mis nervios y podré relacionarme mas con</td>
<td>buena, por que lograste mejorar mi aspecto.</td>
<td>Muy buena.</td>
<td>Mejor, tuve mas habilidad al pasar el tiempo.</td>
<td>Grandioso, ya que me sentí más seguro y segura.</td>
<td>Muy buen.</td>
<td>Fue mucho mejor tras corregir cada error.</td>
<td>Pienso que estudie y no hubo más errores de</td>
<td>Muy buena.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Las actividades de evaluación con mis compañeros me parecieron...        | Agradables ya que logramos socializar varios puntos de vista. | Buenas ya que no se encontró competitividad. | Adecuadas ya que así logramos estar en cuenta de varios aspectos. | Buenas ya que así conocimos o que ellos se conocieron. | Convenientes. | Buenas y plazo que deberíamos seguir. | Muy buenas ya que así nos parecieron muy prácticas que logramos tener una ayuda extra para poder aprender. | Muy buenas ya que así nos ayudaron los profes en que se interesaron, ya que logramos un gran aprendizaje. | Muy buena. | }
Appendix T: Rubrics

Rubric before implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Demonstrated Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Uses a variety of vocabulary and expressions, uses a variety of structures with only occasional grammatical errors, speaks smoothly, with little hesitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Uses a variety of vocabulary and expressions, but makes some errors in word choice, uses a variety of grammar structures, but makes some errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uses limited vocabulary and expressions, uses a variety of structures with frequent errors, or uses basic structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uses only basic vocabulary and expressions, uses basic structures, makes frequent errors, hesitates too often, when</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>S11</th>
<th>S12</th>
<th>S13</th>
<th>S14</th>
<th>S15</th>
<th>S16</th>
<th>S17</th>
<th>S18</th>
<th>S19</th>
<th>S20</th>
<th>S21</th>
<th>S22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rubric end of the implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>S11</th>
<th>S12</th>
<th>S13</th>
<th>S14</th>
<th>S15</th>
<th>S16</th>
<th>S17</th>
<th>S18</th>
<th>S19</th>
<th>S20</th>
<th>S21</th>
<th>S22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uses only basic vocabulary and expressions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uses basic structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Uses a variety of structures with occasional errors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Uses a variety of vocabulary and expressions, but makes some errors in word choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rubric for Oral fluency End of the Implementation**

- Uses a variety of vocabulary and expressions
- Uses a variety of structures with only occasional grammatical errors
- Speaks smoothly with little hesitation that does not interfere with communication

- Uses a variety of vocabulary and expressions, but makes some errors in word choice
- Uses a variety of grammar structures, but makes some errors
- Speaks with some hesitation, but it does not usually interfere

- Uses limited vocabulary and expressions
- Uses a variety of structures with frequent errors, or uses basic structures with only occasional errors
- Speaks with some hesitation, which often interferes

- Uses only basic vocabulary and expressions
- Uses basic structures
### Appendix U: Questionnaire results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>S11</th>
<th>S12</th>
<th>S13</th>
<th>S14</th>
<th>S15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¿Cuáles son las actividades que necesitan ser realizadas y que te ayudan a mejorar tus errores?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Después del proceso de corrección y evaluación, ¿mejoraste en cuanto a tu nivel de inglés?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Cómo te sientes en comparación con respecto a los compañeros?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tu profesor realiza una buena tarea en la clase?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tu profesor es justo en la evaluación?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros están unidos y en equipo?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son cooperativos y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros te ayudan en la tarea?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son creativos y originales?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son responsables y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son respetuosos y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son amables y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son organizados y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son trabajadores y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos amigos y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en la tarea y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en la evaluación y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en los trabajos y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en los exámenes y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en la tarea y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en la evaluación y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en los trabajos y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en los exámenes y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en la tarea y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en la evaluación y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en los trabajos y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en los exámenes y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en la tarea y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en la evaluación y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en los trabajos y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Sientes que tus compañeros son buenos en los exámenes y trabajan bien juntos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>