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Abstract

This action research study examines the effects of the Cooperative Learning strategy Think–Group-Share on speaking skills and interaction of two large groups of A1 seventh graders. The strategy chosen allowed students to speak and interact within small groups. Fifty-six learners participated in this process through varied tasks that enhanced their oral skills based on vocabulary development. Participants carried out eight sessions for two and a half months. During the intervention, two data analysis procedures were used: a quantitative approach aimed at providing statistical measures of the outcomes of this study, and a qualitative method within the frame of the Grounded theory which was valuable to identify categories. Data analysis showed that learners’ language skills increased throughout the intervention. The strategy provided students with more opportunities to interact and to use the language with their partners and teachers. Moreover, this situation enabled students to improve their self-confidence and, consequently, their ability to speak in English. They were also able to be more self-directed by improving their personal competences and identifying personal strengths and weaknesses. The significance of the results relies on the fact that the CL learning becomes an instructional method that could be implemented in different contexts with large groups and mixability students.
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Resumen

Este estudio de investigación acción examina los efectos de la estrategia de Pensar-Agruparse-Compartir del Aprendizaje Cooperativo en las habilidades orales y de interacción de dos grupos grandes de estudiantes de grado séptimo nivel A1. La estrategia elegida permitió a los estudiantes hablar e interactuar en grupos pequeños. Cincuenta y seis estudiantes de nivel A1 participaron en este proceso a través de tareas variadas que mejoraron sus habilidades orales con base en el desarrollo de vocabulario. Los participantes llevaron a cabo ocho sesiones en un período de dos meses y medio. Durante la intervención, se utilizaron dos procedimientos de análisis de datos: un enfoque cuantitativo destinado a proporcionar medidas estadísticas con base en los objetivos de este estudio, y un método cualitativo enmarcado en la teoría Fundamentada que fue valioso para identificar categorías. El análisis de datos mostró que la progresión del lenguaje de los estudiantes aumentó a lo largo de la intervención. Esto proporcionó a los estudiantes más oportunidades para interactuar y usar el idioma con sus compañeros y profesores. Además, esta condición permitió a los estudiantes mejorar su autoconfianza y, en consecuencia, su capacidad para hablar en inglés. También fueron capaces de ser más autodirigidos al mejorar sus competencias personales e identificar fortalezas y debilidades.

La importancia de los resultados se basa en el hecho de que el aprendizaje CL se convierte en un método de instrucción que podría implementarse en diferentes contextos con grupos grandes y estudiantes de habilidades mixtas.

**Palabras clave y expresiones:** Aprendizaje Cooperativo, Estrategia Pensar-Agruparse-Compartir; Desempeño Oral; Interacción Oral; Aprendizaje Autodirigido.
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Chapter one: Introduction

1.1 Introduction to the Study

The Colombian General Education Law, Ley 115 (Ministry of National Education [MEN], 1994) fostered a variety of changes in the educational system in the country. Part of this process is the adoption of the National Bilingual Program to implement English as a foreign language in the education system in the entire country by implementing the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages\(^1\) (Council of Europe, 2001), which introduces proficiency levels based on international standards to measure the individuals’ performance level in the Colombian context. Accordingly, the program “Colombia Very well!”\(^2\) (MEN, 2014a) was established in the country and its primary objective was the development of bilingualism in educational institutions.

However, to accomplish the government’s goal, educators have had to deal with a variety of constraints that affect students’ language development, such as low academic levels, scarcity of resources in schools, and the number of students per class, among others. In this regard, one of the aspects that called the teacher-researchers’ attention was large group size, which is one of the obstacles for developing the speaking skills in public schools in Colombia. This phenomenon

---

\(^1\) CEFR stands for the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, designed in 2001 as a way to provide common criteria in Europe about what learners are expected to learn and the skills they would need to communicate in a second language.

\(^2\) The Colombia Very Well! 2015 – 2025 National English Program, seeks for students in the entire educational system to communicate in English better, in order to have better access to work and professional opportunities. Official website: http://www.colombiaaprende.edu.co/html/micrositios/1752/articles-343287_recurso_1.pdf
makes it difficult for students to interact and speak with others and for language teachers to provide learners with opportunities to enhance their oral skills.

Accordingly, this issue stands in the way of teaching and learning, and they increase when the aim of those processes is for students to be proficient in English. For instance, difficulties are evident when tasks involving speaking are carried out. Many students feel they are not playing an active role since they do not always take part in student-student or teacher-student interactions. In consequence, some pupils believe that they are not important, and others just switch off and get distracted, making any speaking task a secondary priority.

To tackle this situation, the teacher-researchers that carried out the study aimed their research at implementing the CL strategy Think-Group-Share that is a centered-student one encourages learners to help each other and involves them in their own learning process.

1.2 Rationale

Large classes are a common issue at schools in Bogotá. That may have some implications for the students’ learning process. Some of those could be the lack of opportunities to interact and to speak in class, which are disadvantageous for students in developing speaking skills. This situation makes students reluctant to speak, so they may prefer to be silent instead of participating. In English Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, it has also been evidenced that students are reluctant to use the English language they learned; this is an obstacle for teachers to improve learners’ Speaking Performance. Nunan (1999) suggests that this reluctance may be due to prior learning experiences, lack of motivation (effort plus desire), task difficulty, and psychological and affective factors. It has been observed that learners participate easily in tasks
that involve other skills such as writing, reading, or listening, but they show their unwillingness when the activities have to do with speaking. A needs analysis (Appendix A) conducted in 2016 allowed the teacher-researchers to determine the factors that affected students’ speaking skill in the foreign language and the role vocabulary learning played in that process, which revealed students’ Speaking Interaction and Speaking Performance troubles in the foreign language, because of many students per class. Bearing this in mind, this situation led teacher-researchers to find in Cooperative Learning (CL) the option to deal with large English classes.

The central idea CL develops is that a class is divided into smaller groups where each student helps the others achieve a core goal on which each one will be evaluated individually (Johnson & Johnson, 1991). This is thus a consistent strategy to deal with large size classes and to encourage speaking because it provides learners with more opportunities to use language with a small number of students. As a result, CL offers a variety of tools to improve speaking through this interaction. CL is an instructional method that is useful in enhancing the acquisition of English speaking skills and improving students’ attitudes in large classes.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

The aims of the national English language policy include mandatory English in schools, and by 2025, 50% of graduates from secondary education should reach a B1 level, according to the document “Formar en lenguas extranjeras: ¡el reto!” (Basic Standards for Competences in Foreign Languages: English. Teach in Foreign Languages: the Challenge!) (MEN, 2002). This represents a significant responsibility for English teachers because the effectiveness of English teaching in Colombia in public education is affected by several conditions: large class sizes, few
English lessons, lack of resources and the lack of testing and practice outside the classroom (British Council, 2015).

Being aware of the current circumstances, the teacher-researchers considered relevant to analyze a study conducted by Sanchez (as cited in British Council, 2015), since it reported that just seven percent of Colombians graduate from High School with a basic or higher level of English. Likewise, a survey done in Colombia by the British Council (2014) to assess the productive skills (speaking and writing) revealed that forty-three percent of the respondents attributed their poor speaking level to lack of practice. Nineteen percent of the participants said they had not been learning English long enough, while thirteen percent felt that speaking was harder than writing or reading English, and twelve percent attributed this to the fact that curriculum was not focused on speaking.

Considering not only the national context needs but also the teacher-researchers’ experiences as public-school teachers, the needs analysis allowed them to confirm that seventy-eight percent of their students considered that learning English as a foreign language is a valuable experience their educational, personal and professional purposes. However, they were concerned about the few opportunities they had to speak English with their peers and English teachers. Also, fifty-seven percent of the students found that large groups made it difficult to interact with their peers, sixty percent affirmed that they had difficulties hearing their peers because of the noise in the classroom and seventy percent felt they did not have the opportunity to participate in class. The responses to the questionnaire also revealed that sixty percent of the students did not speak in the target language because of their lack of knowledge of grammar structures and vocabulary which
was considered an obstacle to take an active part of their English classes. Finally, seventy-two percent of students commented that they felt insecure when speaking in front of their classmates because they were afraid of making mistakes.

Considering the previous findings and the demands of the local language policies, the teacher-researchers looked for a strategy that would facilitate students’ speaking skills in two public schools in Bogotá. In the search, CL emerged as the strategy that might support this process since sixty-nine percent of the students indicated that working with others allowed them to use the language more freely, to learn from those who were more proficient and to provide feedback to each other.

Consequently, this research wanted to examine the effects of the CL strategy *Think-Group-Share*, which is an adaptation of the Think-Pair-Share strategy (Kagan, 1994), on seventh graders’ whose constraints regarding their Speaking Performance and interaction were evident, for reasons such as large classes, which limited their opportunities to interact, poor vocabulary and grammar to participate in class, and poor self-confidence.

Based on the previous information, the project brought together four areas of research: Cooperative Learning, Speaking Performance, Speaking Interaction and Large Groups to answer the leading question that guided the research, which is described in the next section.

1.4 Research Question
How might the implementation of the Cooperative Learning strategy Think-Group-Share affect the Speaking Performance and interaction of a large group of A1 seventh graders in two public schools?

1.5 Objectives

1.5.1 Main objective. To analyze how the implementation of the Cooperative Learning strategy Think-Group-Share influences seventh graders’ Speaking Performance in terms of vocabulary range and interaction in two large groups at two public schools.

1.5.2 Specific objectives.

1) To examine the influence of the Cooperative Learning strategy Think-Group-Share on students’ Speaking Interaction and Speaking Performance.

2) To determine how the Cooperative Learning strategy, Think-Group-Share affects the students’ speaking opportunities in a large group.

3) To explain how students become aware of their learning role in the improvement of their Speaking Performance to become more self-directed learners.

This chapter evidenced the necessity of providing students with opportunities to help them participate in a large group, interact with others and use the language in the classroom. Moreover, English as a foreign language is an important experience not only for the school purposes but also for students’ personal lives and professional future. Therefore, enhancing oral skills in these groups of learners through CL could help them to use the language they know, increase their self-confidence and improve their interactions to reach the language goals through the cooperative group work.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

This section will examine the main constructs which frame this study: Cooperative Learning (CL), Speaking Performance (SP), Speaking Interaction (SI) and Large Groups (LG). These concepts represent the basis of this study, which addresses students’ SP and SI in two large high school groups of students. Some theoretical underpinnings are illustrated as well as earlier studies related to this research topic.

2.1 Developing Speaking Skills in the Foreign Language Classroom

This study focuses on productive skills, interaction, and the need to improve vocabulary in students with a low English level. According to Celce-Murcia (2001) and Nunan (2003), speaking in the EFL classroom is the most difficult skill to be developed. One of the facts that support this idea is that students are more concerned about speaking than the other skills (reading, writing and listening), so they feel more anxiety when activities are related to their performance in this skill (Bilash, 2009). From this perspective, Nunan (1999, p. 231) states that the “reluctance to speak on the part of students was seen as one of the teachers’ biggest challenges.” In order to face this challenge, teachers should continually address speaking in the EFL classroom.

Regarding the importance of developing speaking skills, Harmer (2007) argues that this skill is important for three main reasons: first, activities focused on speaking provide learners with rehearsal opportunities to practice real-life speaking in the safety of the classroom. Second, speaking tasks that put into practice the language students know, provide feedback not only for the students but also for the teacher, because both have the chance to evaluate how successful the
learning and teaching processes are. Third, it is necessary to provide learners with as many opportunities as possible to interact in the classroom, so that they will be able to make use of what they learn. Accordingly, “learners should be given the maximum number of opportunities possible to practice the target language in meaningful contexts and situations” (Nunan, 1999, p. 241).

2.1.1 Defining Speaking. To talk about how to develop speaking skills, there is a need to define the term from several perspectives. Brown (1994) and Burns, Gollin and Joyce (1997) have defined speaking as a productive skill in which the speaker makes choices of lexicon and topics according to his level and needs. Similarly, Thornbury (2005) considers that speaking involves the knowledge of vocabulary and highlights the speaker’s knowledge of grammar and pronunciation. In fact, Richards and Renandya (2002) emphasize that the nature of speaking involves producing appropriate language that needs to be understood. Finally, Cameron (as cited in Sari, 2014) affirms that speaking implies the active use of the language to express meaning so that other people can understand it, which becomes a process of transferring information between the speakers and listeners.

In the same manner, the CEFR states that speaking is an ability that involves multiple competencies as well as knowledge and a processing factor. In this regard, Levelt (as cited in Galaczi and Khalifa, 2009, p. 23) remarks that “the knowledge factor relates to a wide repertoire of lexis and grammar which allows flexible, appropriate, precise construction of utterances in real time.” Similarly, the processing factor involves a set of procedures for pronunciation, lexis, grammar and established phrasal ‘chunks’ of language which enable the speaker to conceive,
formulate and articulate relevant, appropriate responses. These definitions summarize in part the scope speaking may reach, since speaking not only involves the factors mentioned above, but it is also framed in a contextualization of language use for English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) (Galaczi and Khalifa, 2009). These authors also explain that “spoken language production is seen as a situated social practice which incorporates reciprocal interaction with others, as being purposeful within a specific context” (p. 23).

2.1.1.1 Speaking Performance. Considering that SP was chosen as the focus of this study, the teacher-researchers begin by defining this term from different perspectives, and then, describing its relationship with vocabulary.

Based on the theory related to SP, different terminology is used to refer to this concept. The CEFR treats spoken performance and oral production equally since both refer to the speaker’s language production or contribution. From Koizumi’s point of view (2005) the terms SP and oral production are synonyms considering that they comprise production areas dealing with language use. In addition, Bygate (1987) states that SP refers to the active use of language knowledge. Similarly, McNamara (as cited in Koizumi, 2005) defines it as the actual instances of language use in real time as well as something that could be observed. From this perspective, McNamara (1996) emphasizes that SP is affected by language users and the language task. It is either prepared or spontaneous and comprises “production (forming messages), conceptualization (putting messages in forms) and articulation (pronouncing and expressing them)” (p.14). In this regard, Brown (2004) argues that these features constitute self-initiated or pair work practice. This research project deals with both since the phenomenon under study is closely associated
with the production of utterances and the size aspect which is related to the amount of vocabulary and the use of that vocabulary to interact.

Taking into consideration that SP is closely related to language use at different levels, the CEFR has listed and specified a set of language descriptors to assess performance on the basis of what learners can do with the language. For this study, A1 level deals with the students’ ability to use a repertoire of isolated words and basic sentences or phrases about familiar situations (Council of Europe, 2001).

To allow A1 level students to improve and succeed in their SP in the language classroom, Brown and Yule (1983) suggest two types of tasks teachers can use to encourage learners to produce language: monologs and short dialogs. The language standards of the Colombian Ministry of Education (2006) and the CEFR refer to monologs and conversation as categories to assess speaking. According to Cambridge (2015), monologs are extended turns of speech without interruption, as used in presentations and descriptions. The Council of Europe (2006) also defines monologs in low levels as non-interactive speech, generally a prepared text that describes an experience; family, people, living conditions, routines and interests.

Moreover, a dialog (transactional language) “is a conversation that is carried out for the purpose of conveying or exchanging specific information; it is an extended form of responsive language” (Brown, 2007, p. 329, as cited in Sari, 2014, p. 15), which involves two interlocutors or more and can be both unprepared and planned. In low levels, a dialogue entails the learner’s ability to make an introduction, to ask how people are, and to handle very short social exchanges.
2.1.1.1 Vocabulary Knowledge: a feature of the Speaking Performance. Vocabulary knowledge plays a significant role not only in the EFL classroom but also in developing language skills. Many authors have researched this issue. For instance, Pittelman and Heimlich (1991) state that vocabulary knowledge is important in understanding both spoken and written language. Also, Nunan and Bailey (2009) underline the importance of vocabulary as a fundamental aspect of language development and a crucial component in speaking. According to Levelt (as cited in Koizumi, 2005, p. 58), “vocabulary has a central position in forming an utterance with appropriate meanings and with syntactic, morphological, and phonological structures.” He also emphasizes that no speech can be produced without vocabulary since it is indispensable to SP. According to Alqahtani (2015), “vocabulary knowledge is often viewed as a critical tool for foreign language learners because a limited vocabulary in a second language impedes successful communication.” (p. 22). Similarly, the CEFR (2001) describes vocabulary as “the lexical competence, knowledge of, and ability to use, the vocabulary of a language, it involves lexical and grammatical elements” (p. 110).

Even though several definitions of vocabulary have been proposed as shown above, for this study, vocabulary is considered as:

1. The words of English used by students in a speaking task, including single items and phrases or chunks of several words which convey a meaning, the way individual words do (Nation, 2011).
2. A fundamental issue in language learning because it plays a vital role in speaking when learning a foreign language at low levels since the lack of that knowledge is a significant obstacle for L2 learners to overcome (Huckin as cited in Alqahtani, 2015).

3. In students with a basic level of English, it is seen as the use of a repertoire of isolated words and phrases related to and concrete situations (CEFR).

2.1.1.1.2 Productive vocabulary. In this study, vocabulary will be focused on production since it refers to the words that the learners understand and use correctly in speaking. It involves the words that learners recognize and understand and the ability to speak at the appropriate time. Therefore, this kind of vocabulary can be defined as productive vocabulary since it entails an active process because the learners can produce the words to express their thoughts to others (Webb as cited in Alqahtani, 2015).

According to Nation (2011), there is a receptive vs. productive, and size vs. depth classification of vocabulary. This study mainly analyzes vocabulary knowledge from two viewpoints: production and size. The former is closely related to SP, and it is “the knowledge to produce a word when one speaks and writes” (Nation, 2005, p 585). In the current study, productive vocabulary knowledge is defined as “knowledge to produce vocabulary forms” (Koizumi, 2014, p. 21). The latter type is also called breadth, which is a quantitative dimension of vocabulary knowledge. Regarding this, Nakanishi & Shimamoto (as cited in Koizumi, 2015) state that vocabulary size refers to the number of words a person knows.

2.1.1.2 Speaking Interaction. Keeping in mind that spoken language production is a practice which involves reciprocal interaction with others (Galaczi and Khalifa, 2009), it is necessary to
define SI for the EFL context. According to River (as cited in Aggouni, 2015), SI “includes not only the expression of one’s thoughts, but it also involves a reciprocal turn-taking between the listener and the speaker” (p.10). Similarly, Louma (2004) considers that a conventional SI involves two or more people talking about a common interest in a situation to pass the time, share opinions or get something done. In this kind of interaction, both speakers perform several tasks at the same time, they also play both roles, as a speaker and as a listener. Thus, they construct the event together and share the right to influence the outcomes which can be both shared and individual (p. 20).

Based on the definitions listed above and the scope of this study, SI is bi-directional and jointly constructed by the participants; the contributions produced are supported by means CL activities (CEFR, 2006). With respect to interaction at low levels, the CEFR understands SI as the students’ ability to maintain simple exchanges of information on familiar topics in a straightforward way where communication is totally dependent on repetition at a slower rate of speech, rephrasing, and repair.

2.2 Cooperative Learning: A Successful Teaching and Learning Approach

Based on the teacher-researchers’ experience as English educators, and facing situations such as teaching in crowded classrooms, the students’ lack of opportunities to participate, and their need to improve speaking, the CL approach has been identified as the means to improve the mentioned skill in learners and to deal with constraints such as LG.

Throughout the available literature related to CL, theorists have defined it considering several features that prove it is an effective teaching strategy in different instructional settings.
Definitions seem to agree that CL is not only a teaching strategy but a student-centered instructional model (Sharan, 1994). In this respect, Felder and Brent (2007) affirm that it consists of students working in groups on an assignment or project, under conditions in which criteria are fulfilled. In addition, Emmer and Gerwels’ (2002) state that CL facilitates group achievement of common learning goals. Similarly, Johnson and Johnson (2013) agree with the same idea, but they emphasize that each member of the group will be evaluated individually. Likewise, Kagan & Olsen (1985) state that in CL, learning depends on the social exchange of information among learners in the group.

Having presented the previous definitions, for the current research, CL is conceived as a student-centered approach that involves learners grouped in mixed-ability teams that help and depend on each other to meet a common goal. According to Johnson and Johnson (2013), in the ideal classroom, all students would learn how to work cooperatively with others, compete for fun and enjoyment, and work autonomously. Therefore, it could be a successful teaching strategy in which small groups allow students to work together to maximize their own and each other’s learning in cooperative situations.

To fully understand how CL works and the way it should be implemented, it is mandatory to describe its principles, teaching strategies, teacher and students’ roles, the way to form teams, its need in large classes, and its importance for speaking. Therefore, the following sections of the chapter describe the mentioned aspects in detail.

2.2.1 Cooperative Learning principles. The teacher-researchers consider that placing students in groups and expecting them to be able to work together will not necessarily promote
cooperation; it is necessary to count on the interrelated factors to guide the teamwork. Several researchers have called such factors CL principles, which are the basis for outstanding group work. For instance, Gillies (2014), refers that when students work with others might struggle when identifying what to do to accomplish the task, and getting involved in their learning process; which supports the need of specific elements to regulate and succeed in their group work.

In this respect, Johnson and Johnson (2008) formulated a Learning Together model which comprises five necessary conditions under which CL is productive. For this study, the following principles are considered due to the novelty of its implementation in the context where this research project was carried out (Figure 1).

*Figure 1. Cooperative Learning principles*
Other authors such as Kagan (1994) and Slavin (2014) share similar principles with Johnson and Johnson’s model since they agree with individual accountability and positive interdependence as important aspects to ensure group cooperation and learning.

Initially, positive interdependence is seen as a primary element of cooperative classrooms. It occurs when individuals encourage and facilitate each other’s efforts not only to complete their part of the work but to ensure that other group members contribute to accomplishing the group’s goals (Gillies, 2014). Therefore, it promotes reciprocal interaction among individuals, which stimulates each group member’s productivity and achievement. Johnson & Johnson found that in CL groups, students are required to interact verbally with one another on learning tasks (as cited in Gillies, 2014). Team members must support each other to achieve the goal.

Secondly, individual accountability, as defined by Gillies (2014) emerges when students accept responsibility for their part of the task and the achievement of the group goal. Responsibility means that students ask for assistance either from their teacher or their peers, do their best work, share their ideas, learn as much as possible, take their tasks seriously, help the group operate well, and take care of one another (Johnson & Johnson, 2009). Likewise, all students in a group are held accountable for doing their share of the work and for mastering all the material to be learned.

The third principle considered in this study is group processing. It refers to the assessment of CL which focuses on students’ feedback of the learning process. It requires group members to assess their roles and contribution to the success of all tasks. It centers its attention on positive behaviors and actions rather than on negative ones and requires students to think about the way
they learn. Thus, members: a) reflect on which members’ actions were helpful and unhelpful, and b) make decisions on which actions to continue or change. The teacher can then monitor the distinct groups during the learning activities and provide feedback on what has been observed. “The purpose of group processing is to clarify and improve the effectiveness members have when carrying out the needed process to achieve the group goals.” (Johnson & Johnson, 2009).

Another principle is promotive interaction, which, according to Johnson & Johnson (1990), involves group members encouraging and facilitating each other’s efforts as they work together. According to this, students required to listen to each other, exchange ideas and offer explanations to assist understanding.

In relation to the principle of Group Autonomy, Sharan, (1994) and Slavin, (1995) emphasize that it can diminish teacher talking, and Cohen (1994), considers that group autonomy encourages problem-solving, so learners have the choice to take responsibility for their learning process. According to Thomson (1998), CL is a useful strategy because students can work together; they interact developing autonomy and cooperation, as a result, students learn how to negotiate, to solve problems, and to develop another kind of abilities.

2.2.2 Cooperative Learning—Teaching strategies. Although the current study emphasizes on the CL strategy *Think-Group-Share*, researchers and practitioners identify several CL teaching strategies to facilitate its implementation. According to Kagan (1994, p.4:11), each structure “performs at least one function better than any other structure, knowledge of each structure is essential if a teacher is to be as efficient as possible in reaching the range of learning objectives”.
Accordingly, educators are required to provide their students with structures that encourage further learning. Additionally, as Felder, & Brent (2007) state, CL can be implemented in a variety of tasks that can be provided to learners, such as, laboratories, projects, and lecture lessons, amongst others.

For this research, it was chosen a CL thinking skill strategy, which is a type of strategy according to Kagan’s classification (1994). The objective of this kind of strategy is “to have students be able to create and exchange novel, unique, set-breaking ideas to low consensus questions” (Kagan, 1994, p.11:1). For this study, researchers have selected the Think-Pair-Share strategy that promotes a generative and reflective thinking skill (Kagan, 1994, p.11:2).

According to Darsini, (2013) the Think-Pair-Share strategy is useful to encourage students’ time on task and listening to each other. In this strategy, students are paired, then a problem or a specific situation is presented to the students; they have some time to think on their own about possible answers for a limited amount of time; they discuss their answers with another pair, and finally the teacher calls on students to share with the class the answer they have developed with their partners.

However, the teacher-researchers have designed a variation of the Think-Pair-Share strategy to benefit the research. Therefore, the strategy that is the focus of this study was called Think-Group-Share (TGS). The variation is evidenced in the teams’ organization since in the TGS strategy students are not paired, they think on their own, and when they discuss their answers, they do it with a whole group of four.
2.2.3 The teachers’ and students’ role in Cooperative Learning. Researchers consider that in the CL classroom, teachers should adopt the role of facilitators, encouragers, and models. In this respect, Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec (1991) declare that apart from the usual roles a teacher performs in CL situations, some complementary ones are presented (Figure 2).

*Figure 2. Complementary Teacher Roles in Cooperative Learning Situations.*
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On the other hand, in Kagan’s (1994) point of view, students in cooperative teams are more active, self-directed, and expressive; factors that might be associated with achievement gains.

For this study, four roles with specific functions were determined to cope with students’ needs and to consider their academic and behavioral characteristics. Figure 3 illustrates the group member roles in the formal cooperative grouping.
Self-Directed Learning in Cooperative Learning. Recently, Self-Directed Learning (SDL) has become a significant premise for language comprehension as it draws attention to students’ learning process (Du, 2013). In this regard, Knowles (1975), states that SDL involves:

A process in which individuals take the initiative, with or without the help of others, in diagnosing their learning needs, formulating learning goals, identifying human and material resources for learning, choosing and implementing appropriate learning strategies, and evaluating learning outcomes. (p.18).

Based on the previous information and considering that CL implies the help of others, it is possible to affirm that this instructional method fosters SDL. “CL provides the basis to develop face-to-face promotive interaction as well as interpersonal and small group skills while obtaining subject matter knowledge at the same time” (Felder and Brent, 2007, p.11).
For Hiemstra (1994) the importance of SDL lies in the fact that learners are given the power to take more responsibility for different decisions connected with their learning endeavors. In this respect, Kagan (1994, p.3:2) states that “students in CL classrooms become more internal in their sense of control in contrast to students in traditional classrooms who feel more externally controlled,” which evidences common aspects between CL and SDL.

In addition, Dickinson (1987) includes autonomy as a fundamental concept in self-direction since learners become the center of their own learning processes, reducing the involvement of a teacher or an institution. About this, Bick-Har (2013) says that “cooperative learning is a student-centered, instructor-facilitated instructional strategy in which a small group of students is responsible for its own learning and the learning of all group members”, which, again, shows the interrelation between SDL and CL.

For this study, SDL is understood to foster individual students’ abilities to enhance their vocabulary range and SP as well as to serve as a support to other students in becoming independent learners through group work.

2.3 The Challenge: Large Groups

With the significant development of the national government policies in education, the rates of public enrollment have gone up during the last years in Colombian state schools. This situation has led to an increase in the number of students in secondary education, which becomes a key concern for English teachers who deal with classrooms containing many students (Medina and Briñez, 2002). According to Santamaría and Salas (2011), one of the most common constraints a large class involves is related to discipline issues, which represent a challenge
because of the diversity in the classroom: a wide range of abilities, ages, and learning styles (Forero, 2005). This situation tends to concern teachers who cannot easily give students the individual attention they need (Nan, 2014). It has also been proved that effective language interaction is another challenge to cope with since large classes do not favor communication in the classroom (Jin & Cortazzi, 2013).

To deal with this situation, Nan (2014) suggests CL as a creative and efficient teaching model that not only focuses attention on group work but also encourages learners to participate actively in learning tasks. CL is the kind of student-centered approach that develops students’ abilities to learn independently to meet their need for learning in the form of group work (Nan, 2014). The current needs analysis revealed that many students affected learners’ interaction and SP. In this regard, CL provides students with more opportunities to speak, participate and assist each other, particularly when they are assigned a specific role and responsibilities within a group.

### 2.4 State of the Art

Local and international studies have been carried out to explore how CL enhance learners’ SP and interaction in LG. All of them have demonstrated that learners who have the opportunity to work cooperatively, feel more confident when speaking in a foreign language and feel engaged when doing it. Additionally, they develop their social skills, reach higher levels of achievement, work actively, strengthen their self-confidence and enjoy the English learning process.

In 2007, Prieto conducted a study to examine how learners improve their oral production skills in English through CL strategies. Basically, the findings demonstrated that implementing
CL strategies improved students’ attitude towards group work and the skill of speaking. Furthermore, working and learning with others allowed them to improve their oral production and to change their concept of group work through the implementation of roles.

Additionally, an action research study on encouraging interaction by applying CL carried out by González (2001), revealed important findings for this study. It was found that cooperative work and activities that allowed students to interact strengthened students’ oral skills since they could express better and felt more comfortable when using English to communicate with their teachers and classmates.

Moreover, in a qualitative study carried out by Fatma (2012) to explore the effectiveness of implementing CL in the classroom to develop license master and doctorate students’ oral skill, learners reported improvement in their speaking skills by learning cooperatively in small groups, which confirmed the study’s hypothesis since the implementation of this learning technique allowed learners to interact within a cooperative atmosphere. However, this research also revealed that working in CL groups might also generate noise in the classroom and promote groups’ conflicts.

In 2012, Ramdana conducted a research project to find out whether teaching speaking through CL can improve students’ speaking ability. Findings showed that students improved their pronunciation and vocabulary. In addition, they were able to practice the English language in contexts different to the classroom.
Fauzia (2012) examined the effectiveness of using CL strategy to improve students’ speaking ability. The result of the project revealed that students achieved better scores on the speaking English test. Moreover, CL motivated learners to use English in their speech. It was concluded this strategy could improve students’ language skills to learn a foreign language, including pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and comprehension. The previous study is useful to our interest since it matches the present research project and the pertaining constructs.

Rhenals and Molina (2014) developed an action research study about how the implementation of oral communication strategies through cooperative work activities fosters communicative skills of a group of A1 university learners. The implementation of communication compensatory strategies such as circumlocution, approximation, use of all-purpose words and non-linguistic signals using spoken activities in the EFL classroom encouraged students to improve their oral competence and performance. The strategies applied caused a positive impact on the performance, development, and attitude of the students under study. Regarding group work and cooperation, it was found that the learners felt motivated while sharing and supporting ideas each other. This means that using communication compensatory strategies and working in groups reflected a great benefit for the students.

Equally important, Koizumi (2005) examines how size and depth of productive vocabulary knowledge had an impact on SP (i.e., fluency, accuracy, syntactic complexity, and lexical complexity). The participants in this study were Japanese learners of English at a basic level. To determine the focus of this project, two studies were conducted. The first one a pilot
study examined relationships between productive vocabulary knowledge and SP focused on “size” of productive vocabulary knowledge. The second study explored the relationships between “size and depth” of productive vocabulary knowledge and SP. These studies demonstrated the following two points. First, in some tasks, learners who had larger and deeper productive vocabulary knowledge were able to have a better SP in relation to vocabulary when producing monologs and comparisons. Second, size of productive vocabulary had to do more with accuracy in a task.

With regards to LG, Peterson and Miller (2004) conducted a research study related to the quality of students’ experiences during CL and large-group instruction. Lectures and cooperative work tasks were implemented through the intervention. As a result, it was determined CL had a positive impact on students’ learning experience and large group instruction was crucial to provide learners with core principles, information and the support needed to reach the group and the task goals. The results of this study also indicated the importance of using group work and students’ roles to facilitate the students’ opportunities to participate in the various stages of the class.
Chapter 3: Research Design

This chapter presents a description of the procedures involved in this research project: the type of study, the current context, the participants, the teacher-researchers’ role, a brief description of the data collection instruments administered, and the ethical considerations involved. Additionally, information about the validation and piloting of the instruments is included.

3.1 Type of Study

This study was designed under parameters of qualitative/quantitative/mixed methods action research approach. “This type of inquiry requires teachers to identify a concrete problem, think and plan appropriate actions to address the concern, and reflect on data gathered through the intervention” (Nunan and Bailey, 2009, p. 229). According to Burns (2009), “action research is the combination and interaction of two modes of activity – action and research” (p. 258). The action refers to an ongoing social process in a social context that implies an intervention, which is aimed at improving and changing a specific situation. The type of research entails systematic observation and analysis of the improvements, findings, and outcomes to make further changes.

In accordance with the procedures established in AR, this study contemplates the implementation of this approach by following a cyclical and spiraling process proposed by Kemmis and McTaggart (as cited in Burns, 2011). Based on that, the authors stated the project stages (see Figure 4).
Given the fact that data collected in this study come from both quantitative and qualitative approaches, “the researcher bases the inquiry on the assumption that collecting diverse types of data best provides an understanding of a research problem” (Creswell, 2003). Qualitative data were gathered through teacher-researchers’ and students’ journals and audio-recordings which collected detailed views from participants. Quantitative data were obtained through questionnaires, rating charts, and tests.

3.2 Context

This research study took place at two state schools in Colombia, Bogotá. These educational institutions offer pre-school, primary and secondary education to students with low and middle socioeconomic backgrounds. These institutions face some common difficulties such as lack of
appropriate didactical resources to work with in class, small classrooms, LG (28 to 40 per classroom), and students’ lack of motivation towards English language learning, among other issues.

Regarding the learners’ English schedule, school A is currently in the process of becoming bilingual, based on the guidelines stated in the local program “Bogotá Bilingüe” (Bilingual Bogota). For this reason, students take five hours of English instruction per week. The school has an immersion room where students have classes with native teachers. In school B, the amount of time students come in contact with English classes is insufficient, since students only take three hours of instruction per week and there is no other program that supports foreign language learning. The instruction provided in English language lessons involved the four communicative skills, the target language is used when presenting a topic, reviewing vocabulary or practicing an exercise, and the Spanish language is used for clarification and code-switching.

3.3 Participants

Initially, the participants of this study were seventy students from seventh grade; however, due to their health conditions, discipline problems, and constant traveling, fourteen students were not included in this sample. As a result, fifty-six students participated in this project: twenty-eight students from each school. They were teenagers aged between 12 and 16. All the participants were ranked A1 in English level of proficiency according to the CEFR. Most of them mentioned that speaking was the hardest skill to achieve, and that was reflected in their low level of English proficiency in the classroom activities, tests and on the National Examinations. Despite these issues, many students wanted to improve their speaking skills as they consider
them very useful to achieve better academic results and to grow professionally as well. The teacher-researchers attempted to work on promoting this skill through the CL strategy TGS.

3.4 The Teacher’s Role

Throughout the study, the teacher-researchers played the role of participant-observers. It implied designing, monitoring, observing and recording situations or events that took place in the classroom. Bearing in mind that the teachers conducted an action research study, this kind of role requires teachers to be active, critical and committed participants in the research process (Burns, 2010).

3.5 Ethical Considerations

To protect the participants’ identity, some ethical considerations were addressed as part of the research process. From the beginning of this study, it was required to inform the principals, students and their families about the objectives of this project. Firstly, a request form sent to the principals of both schools to obtain the permissions. Secondly, a consent letter was sent to the students’ parents or responsible adults to obtain their approval. Thirdly, the teacher-researchers emphasized the right of the participants had to take part or to decline when asking them to participate in the study. Finally, the participants were guaranteed that the information obtained through the project was going to be confidential.
3.6 Data Collection Instruments

To answer the research questions, this section provides a brief description of the instruments used in the pedagogical intervention. Due to the characteristics of the study, these instruments were quantitative and qualitative in nature (Table 1).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students’ questionnaire to assess cooperative learning to improve speaking</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>- To explain how students become more aware of their learning role in the improvement of their SP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Pre- and Post-tests</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>- To get to know students’ vocabulary range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To get to know to what extent students improve their SP and SI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria to assess speaking performance and interaction tests</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>- To get to know students’ vocabulary range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To get to know to what extent students improve their oral interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ journal: A five-minute reflection and Students’ journals: “A five-minute reflection” Thinking about the learning and teaching process</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>- To keep a record of the teaching and learning process, in terms of CL impact on students’ improvement of their speaking skill and vocabulary range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking performance vocabulary range rating chart</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>- To measure the repertoire of isolated words, and short and basic phrases or sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ audio recordings</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>- To keep a record of students’ speaking productions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instruments presented above were applied in different moments of the project and for various purposes considering the research questions and objectives as shown in Table 1. At the
same time, researchers attempted to identify at least three instruments that could give an answer to each objective to validate data (see Table 2).

Table 2

**Instruments to Collect Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objective</th>
<th>Instruments to collect data for each objective</th>
<th>Instruments applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) To examine the influence of the Cooperative Learning strategy Think - Group - Share on students' speaking interaction and speaking performance.</td>
<td><strong>Teacher Journal: A five-minute reflection</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Speaking Performance - Vocabulary Range Rating Chart</strong></td>
<td><strong>Criteria to assess</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Speaking Performance and Interaction Tests</strong> (Pre and Post Tests &amp; Mid-term evaluations)&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;- To keep a record of the teaching and learning process, in terms of CL impact on students improvement of their speaking skill and vocabulary range.&lt;br&gt;- To identify strengths, weaknesses, and things to improve.&lt;br&gt;- To know the extent to which CL learning helps students to improve their speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) To determine how the Cooperative Learning strategy Think - Group - Share affects the students' speaking</td>
<td><strong>Speaking Performance - Vocabulary Frequency Grid</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Teacher's Journal: A five-minute reflection</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Student's Journal: A five-minute reflection</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Purpose:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- To keep a record of the teaching and learning process, in terms of CL impact on students speaking opportunities in</td>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- To assess the extent to which CL improves their speaking&lt;br&gt;- To determine how students perceive the effect of CL on their speaking opportunities in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6.1 Description.

3.6.1.1 Questionnaire to assess Cooperative Learning to improve speaking. This instrument was implemented to collect information at the beginning and at the end of the intervention. It allowed researchers to gather the students' experiences, feelings, and perceptions on CL as a classroom strategy. According to Nunan and Bailey (2009) “questionnaires are defined as a series of questions or statements to which the respondents are to react; either by writing out their answers or selecting from among existing answers” (p.130).
For this study, a 10 closed-item questionnaire was designed. The range of questions was determined by the researchers and rated on a five-point Likert scale that measured how students perceived each statement (Nunan and Bailey, 2009). The questions were grouped into 4 categories in accordance with the CL strategy TGS, as follows: 1. Individual contributions (Think), 2. Achieving learning goals (Group), 3. Group members’ productivity (Share), 4. Group assessment.

This questionnaire was administered to the participants of the study before and after the implementation of the strategy to analyze the quantitative values of the data gathered during those moments. Since there were two researchers in two different contexts, they designed a protocol to administer it and support its validity at the same time; it also facilitated the application and led teachers at both schools to run the same stages in the moment of application (see Appendix B).

3.6.1.2 Speaking Pre- and Post-tests. They were implemented at the beginning and at the end of the intervention. The Pre-test was used to diagnose the students’ SP in terms of vocabulary range and oral interaction and the Post-test was applied to contrast the results obtained before and after the pedagogical intervention. For this study, the tests were adapted from the Key English Test for schools and based on the students’ grade curriculum and the MEN standards.

According to Bailey (1998), this type of test provides an observable and measurable output since these involve the learners’ response in the target language to communicate or express their
ideas. A protocol was designed to apply the pre- and post-tests, the tests were identical on both occasions and they were administered under equal conditions.

For the design of both tests two sections were considered: the first section, “Interaction in a conversation”, included ten questions related to familiar topics such as family, friends, free time activities and routines. The teacher-researchers asked each student, on average, four questions, and the responses were recorded as well as the teachers’ impressions of the test-takers. The second section, “monolog”, included five cards with common topics: my daily routine, my family, my favorite character, my best friend, and my house. In this section, students were given a card, and they had one minute to think and one minute to speak about it. A five-point Likert scale was used to measure the students’ SP. During the pre- and post-stages, the teacher-researchers repeated the same procedures according to the protocol designed for this purpose (see Appendix C).

The quality of SP was analyzed based on the following criteria: vocabulary range, SP, and SI. The teacher-researchers described elements of these criteria and produced an overall grade for each students’ performance.

3.6.1.3 Teachers’ and students’ journals. To document learners’ and teachers’ experiences, journals are a useful tool since they can provide information on the language learning experience. According to Wallace (1998), journals “provide an effective means of identifying variables that are important to individual teachers and learners, they enhance awareness about the way a teacher teaches, and a student learns, they enable the researcher to relate classroom events and examine trends emerging for them” (p. 63). For this project, the teachers’ and students’
journals were kept during the intervention as a method to collect qualitative data. This instrument was important because it contained synchronous notes of observations and personal considerations which were valuable in capturing significant thoughts, feelings, and perceptions during the entire process. The journals were designed based on SP (vocabulary range), SI, SDL, and CL features. Each aspect comprised a set of questions regarding the teachers’ and students’ experiences during the lesson training. The teacher-researchers designed a format for the journals in the form of a record in which information such as date, time, class, objectives, work done, self-evaluation, specific concerns, notes for follow up, were all included (see Appendix D). Journals were, thus, not just about gathering data but encouraging change by challenging participants to reflect on their views and to engage in action.

3.6.1.4 Audio recordings. This instrument was used to keep track of the students’ production in the Pre- and Post-tests and in the SP tasks. Having a recording of the learners’ speech might be useful to check for details and to be able to review it as many times as needed.

3.6.1.5 Speaking Performance Vocabulary Frequency Grid. This instrument was used to assess the extent to which CL improve students’ speaking skill. The teacher-researchers designed a format for the students’ oral participation to keep a record of the frequency to which students make use of the vocabulary studied.

3.6.1.6 Vocabulary Range Rating Chart. This instrument was selected to measure students’ repertoire of isolated words, and short and basic phrases or sentences. Individually students were asked to write the words they knew before each lesson and at the end of it.
3.6.2 Validation and piloting. This research study used both qualitative and quantitative methods. Since the effectiveness of research depends on the degree of reliability, quality, and validity of the instruments used, it was fundamental to ensure these met the following criteria; appropriate length, coherence, and absence of bias. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007) explain that validity concerns the extent to which an instrument (test, questionnaire or rubric) measures what it is intended to measure. Moreover, Cohen et al. (2007), explain that a major source of reliability in instruments not only derives from their design, but also from the multiple ways in which participants have been prepared before they are exposed to those instruments. To address this issue, the teachers-researchers designed a protocol for students and teachers which provided a detailed description of the procedures involved before, during and after their implementation of each instrument. This protocol aimed at facilitating the instruction in which the instruments can be interpreted by learners and administered and scored by teachers. To ensure understanding of the procedures involved aspects such as the purpose of the instrument, time, material required, the monitoring process and some general directions were included, these were written in a clear and easy to follow manner. To guarantee the security of each instrument, the validity of results, and avoid bias; administrators were encouraged to follow the protocol structure and to avoid behaviors that might interfere with the students’ answers. For instance, giving examples during the test development or indicating whether the answers are correct or incorrect. The protocol designed considered some contextual limitations such as noise, time and place.

Bearing in mind these considerations, the instruments used during the intervention stage were previously piloted and tested with a group of 7 teachers and 10 students from both schools.
Piloting was a crucial process to identify weaknesses, strengths and other issues that could affect the participants’ and teachers’ understanding as well as the quality of outcomes of this research study.

To corroborate the validity of this study, triangulation was considered as a key aspect. According to Cohen et al. (2007), triangulation intends to provide a full explanation of behaviors by studying them from different points of view; it involves the use of more than one method (quantitative and qualitative) in the pursuit of a specific purpose. Triangulation is a useful technique since it provides a precise analysis of different pieces of information to study an event or fact. For triangulation purposes in the current project, journals, questionnaires and Pre- and Post- tests were the instruments to analyze the collected data by taking into consideration the following perspectives; what the students and teachers saw and perceived from the intervention (teachers’ and students’ journals), what the students’ work evidenced (audio recordings and Pre- and Post- tests) and how the students understood and assessed the process (questionnaires).

The selection of instruments used to collect data was aimed at meeting the research question and the intended objectives. The instruments applied provided not only an accurate register of the students’ thoughts and outcomes throughout the process but also the teachers’ impressions of the students’ progress and the impact of the pedagogical intervention.
Chapter 4: Pedagogical Intervention and Implementation

This chapter describes the pedagogical intervention that was carried out to implement a CL strategy to develop participants’ speaking skill within a large class. Thus, it gives an account of the stages set by the teacher-researchers to facilitate the implementation of the CL strategy TGS, which was selected as the most suitable strategy to address the A1 English language students’ learning needs. As Pressley (1992) suggests, this kind of strategies may enhance students’ learning when they have many opportunities to elaborate on ideas through speaking. This pedagogical intervention occurred over a four-month period during the second semester of 2016. It involved six well-defined stages that enhanced the participants’ speaking regarding performance and interaction.

4.1 Implementation

Six sequenced stages were defined to facilitate students’ language development within a CL environment, Appendix E explains each of the sections of the pedagogical intervention, these are: training on CL, teaching and learning under the CL approach, getting ready for the first speaking task, reinforcing how CL works, getting ready for the second speaking task and getting prepared for the final speaking task. The stages chosen allowed the researchers not only to train students in the new learning-teaching strategy but also to develop their speaking skills through several tasks and moments. Appendix F summarizes the research timeline, where the stages of the intervention are described, as well as its dates, objectives, and instruments implemented. After having presented the six stages of the pedagogical intervention, the five sections considered for the lesson plans are described below.
4.2 Lesson Planning

To implement each stage, teacher-researchers designed four 120-minute lesson plans that considered not only the time frame set for the implementation (hours) but also specific goals, topics, and subtopics that guided the intervention. The topics of the lesson plans were selected considering the language curricula of both schools and the Basic Standards for Competences in Foreign Languages: English. Teach in Foreign Languages: the Challenge! (MEN, 2006). The topics addressed were: 1) Cooperative Learning; 2) The family; 3) Description of people’s appearance and personality, and 4) Daily routines.

To construct the lesson plans, the teacher-researchers used, as a basis, the form designed by Bryan & Acero (2012) from Universidad de La Sabana. Each lesson plan has five sections (see Figure 5) that contributed to reaching the objectives of the research and facilitated the planning since the same stages were repeated during the lessons promoting the internalization of the CL strategy (see Appendix G).

*Figure 5. Sections of the Lesson Plans*

![Diagram of lesson plan sections](image)

The text below describes what each section of the lesson plans consisted of.
4.2.1 Activation. The objective of this section was to start the class in a meaningful way, by helping students to recall previous lessons. According to Zull (2002), prior knowledge is related to what an individual already knows, and the relationship between learners’ background knowledge and their achievement is paramount since it establishes the platform, the schema, and the required vocabulary.

4.2.2 Preparation. The objective of this section was to introduce the topic. It is an important moment to activate interest and to motivate learners. Likewise, they were also able to know the benefits of each lesson.

4.2.3 Presentation and Model Analysis. The objective of this section was to provide language input to students and to help them become familiar with the topic of the lesson. Learners were shown a model of the task they were expected to perform later in the process. It provided learners with a general sense of what they would have to do and what language they would have to use. That model was compared to the goals of the lesson to clarify what they had to accomplish.

4.2.4 Practice. This stage objective was to carry out activities to reach the language and the CL goals. At this phase, students started to prepare their task, by working individually using the Think part of the strategy. For this independent work, students were provided with a template that helped them develop their description, monolog, and dialog. After working individually, participants could improve their work by receiving their teammates’ feedback through the TGS strategy.
4.2.5 Evaluation. Its objective was to determine students’ SP in terms of vocabulary range. Specific criteria to assess the Speaking Tests was considered to evaluate each lesson plan task. Additionally, to have a record of the number of words students learned, the Speaking Performance-Vocabulary Range Rating Chart was applied at the end of each lesson plan. Finally, learners shared their production with the rest of the class, reflected upon the work done, and discussed their cooperative work.

With this pedagogical intervention, the students experienced a different methodology in the English class. Students felt supported by each other within the CL groups and became more active learners. The speaking tasks within the frame of CL provided opportunities to share ideas, interact, exchange information, reinforce the other skills and reflect on their own learning process. As part of the implementation, different social skills such as respect, tolerance, and patience, were also enhanced through cooperation.
Chapter 5: Data Analysis

5.1 Introduction

This chapter illustrates the analysis and interpretation of the qualitative and quantitative data obtained from the participants of this research study. The purpose of this stage was to evaluate the extent to which the implementation of the CL strategy TGS could help to promote speaking skills in students from two schools. Two data analysis procedures were used: a quantitative approach aimed at providing statistical measures of the outcomes of this study, and a qualitative method within the frame of the Grounded theory approach was considered valuable to identify the emerging categories. To this purpose, this chapter starts with a description of the data management procedures, the quantitative and the qualitative analysis.

Information obtained from this data analysis sheds light to address both research objectives and the question of this project: How does Cooperative Learning promote speaking skills in A1- level students in two Colombian public schools?

5.2 Data Management Procedures

In this research study, quantitative and qualitative data were gathered and considered. The analysis of the quantitative data was based on the information collected through the Pre- and Post- tests, the CL questionnaire, and the SP tasks. This analysis was aimed at measuring the learners’ responses about their SP through the instruments applied before, during and after the intervention (the results are expressed in percentages and in a numerical scale). The results obtained are illustrated in figures that present the students’ answers and the items which
indicated significant changes between the pre- and post-tests, the SP tasks and the CL questionnaire applied at the end of each stage of the intervention.

The analysis of the qualitative data was carried out with the information of students’ and teachers’ journals. In this regard, Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) affirm that “the researcher begins with the data and through analysis (searching for salient themes or categories and arranging these to form explanatory patterns) arrives at an understanding of the phenomenon under investigation” (p. 421).

5.2.1 Validation. For this study, the validation of quantitative data was elicited from the data analysis of data gathered and the organization of the same one “In quantitative data, validity might be improved through careful sampling, appropriate instrumentation and appropriate statistical treatments of the data” (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007, p.133).

In relation to qualitative data, it was necessary to stage the data into categories that emerge from the coding procedure as data reduction process into more simple pieces of information. To validate the qualitative data, teachers-researchers considered as a basis “the honesty, depth, richness, and scope of the data achieved.” (Winter 2000 as cited in Cohen et al., 2007, p- 133)

It is important to highlight triangulation as a key procedure to validate information obtained in this research study since it facilitates the contrasting process of quantitative and qualitative data. In relation to this, “it also entails the cross-checking of the consistency of specific and factual data items from various sources via multiple methods at different times” (Guba & Lincoln 1989; Patton 1990). For this study, the teachers-researchers tested the consistency of findings obtained from the different data collection instruments by displaying, analyzing and
contrasting them. This procedure allowed the identification of common patterns and to establish a correlation between the learners, instruments and coding process.

5.2.2 Data analysis methodology. Once the implementation stage of the present research study was finished, the researchers initiated a process of organizing the data collected which consisted of “(a) preparing the data for analysis, (b) analyzing the data, and (c) interpreting the data” (Marczyk et al. 2005, p. 198). For this research study, the grounded theory approach was the methodology used to analyze data, and it was developed in the following three phases. In the first phase, the quantitative data was organized, presented and interpreted into tables and bars for the different analytical instruments. In the second phase, to identify common patterns, the teacher-researchers looked for trends to determine such patterns, and, based on them, they identified specific categories obtained from qualitative sources that were achieved through open, axial, and selective coding of the information collected. Finally, the data obtained from the different instruments was contrasted to find the relationship among concepts.

5.2.2.1 Quantitative analysis. To answer the research question and objectives the teacher-researchers carried out a quantitative analysis of the information collected, which allowed the identification of meaningful differences in the students’ SP and interaction before and after the implementation of the strategy. In this regard, a revision of the vocabulary range was carried out to analyze the students’ vocabulary repertoire before the Pre-test, in the Pre-test, during the speaking tasks, and in the Post-test.

To analyze data, one of the primary aspects considered to describe the students’ SP was vocabulary range, because of the importance that vocabulary knowledge involved for language
use (Nation and Waring, 1997). To keep a record of the students’ repertoire of words, the instrument vocabulary range rating chart was implemented to determine the number of words they knew before and after the intervention (Appendix H). These results are expressed in terms of the average scores achieved by students before, during and after the pedagogical intervention.

The statistical analysis revealed that the participants of this study improved their repertoire of words during the implementation. As can be seen in Figure 6, the number of words that students produced at the end of each lesson substantially exceeded the initial registration. Although the values represented in the graphs are quite similar, the group achieved better in task 2, descriptions. On the other hand, in task 3, daily routines, students scored lower. The statistical analysis also revealed that the participants’ vocabulary improvement reached an average of 18.9 words in task 1, 2 and 3, which represents a 58% higher achievement in comparison to the participants’ initial production.

*Figure 6. Vocabulary Range Average Scores*
In relation to the Pre- and Post-test repertoire of words, the participants also demonstrated improvement from a general average of 5.5 in the Pre-test to 21.6 words in the Post-test, as can be seen in Figure 7. It is interesting to note, however, that the initial score in the pretest is lower than the initial score of the first task which might indicate that the vocabulary was less familiar to the students. The average of the final score is also higher than the averages presented after the implementation of the tasks which might indicate that they did learn much of the vocabulary that appeared on the Post-test. In short, the average score in vocabulary range increased and there was less dispersion because of the students’ mastery of more words.

*Figure 7. Pre- and Post-tests Vocabulary Range Average Score*

Aside from the results in vocabulary range, the Pre- and Post-tests were also crucial to measure the students’ SP before and after the intervention stage; here, broader criteria were considered, such as the number of words and, the production of basic sentences and phrases in
form of a monolog, a description and a dialog (see Appendix I). The values obtained on the Pre- and Post-tests were crucial to determine the impact of the CL strategy TGS on students’ SP. To provide a more precise description, changes in the average, the standard deviation, and the minimum and maximum values were the statistical measures applied to the data on both tests. These statistical calculations allowed the comparison of the results obtained and the identification of substantial improvements in the students’ SP after the intervention. Figure 8 presents how the students performed before and after the intervention.

*Figure 8. Pre- and Post-tests Statistical Values*

As can be noticed, the results obtained in the Post-test were considerably higher in relation to the initial measurement. The average increased to a value of 3.8, which shows a substantial difference between the Pre- and the Post-tests; it also indicates that the dependent variable was
positively affected by the independent variable, which evidences the positive impact on the students’ SP after implementing the TGS strategy. The results show that all the students performed better after the process. This is especially noticeable in the students whose very low initial scores nearly doubled after the intervention. In relation to the standard deviation as a measure of dispersion, it decreased to 0.5, showing improvement, since the group’s scores were somewhat closer to the central tendency (Nunan, 1999).

Effect of task on Speaking Performance. Accordingly, the SP notably improved in relation to the initial measurement, indicating that the results obtained after the eight-week intervention had a positive impact on students’ SP; the participants not only used a wider repertoire of words but were also able to produce more elaborated sentences or phrases, which reveals a considerable and effective use of words evidenced in the improvement of the scores and the lower dispersion.

To assess the students’ SP throughout the pedagogical intervention, not just at the beginning, and the end, three speaking tasks were applied to keep a record of the learners’ progress. The speaking tasks aimed at providing learners with opportunities to produce basic sentences and phrases through the repetition and the rephrasing of short monologs, descriptions and simple dialogs. In the speaking tasks the increase in vocabulary, the greater opportunities to speak and to interact through the CL strategy TGS helped learners to improve their speaking skills in terms of performance and interaction. Figure 9 and 10 illustrate the written outline of the first and second speaking task.
Figure 9. Draft Speaking Task Family

Figure 10. Draft Speaking Task Description

In Figure 11 a quantitative measure of the outcomes produced is provided.
According to the analysis of the graph, the average score obtained in the questions set in the pre-test, 3.3 increased to 3.7, a result that supports the positive effect that the CL strategy TGS had on the students’ SP. In relation to the three speaking tasks, it was also noticed that not only the maximum but also the minimum average scores improved in the students’ oral presentations, showing gradual progress while students received training in the CL strategy. It is also important to notice that the average scores achieved in the third task and the Post-test show almost the same performance values, which evidence a consistent result. In relation to the standard deviation, it slightly increased in the third task and in the Post-test; some students’ scores were lower and quite far from the group’s tendency.

To sum up, after the pedagogical intervention, many students achieved higher scores in the speaking tasks and in the Post-test in relation to the Pre-test. These changes corroborate the
positive impact of the CL strategy TGS on the enhancement of SP; vocabulary, grammar knowledge, and opportunities to speak.

To assess the groups’ perceptions in relation to the CL through the intervention. A group questionnaire was implemented to describe the average scores for the TGS strategy as Figure 12 illustrates.

*Figure 12. Scores on Group Questionnaire to Assess the CL Strategy TGS*

![Graph showing scores on Group Questionnaire to Assess the CL Strategy TGS](image)

The statistical analysis of the group questionnaire to assess CL to improve speaking showed that the students’ overall perceptions of the CL strategy TGS were positive with a score of 4.0. The questionnaire structure comprised 10 questions divided into three sections according to the CL strategy: TGS. Figure 12 illustrates the CL strategy TGS average scores for each section and the overall score. These scores are based on four questions asked in this section that were related to setting group’s learning goals, speaking goals and the process of sharing conclusions with the class.
According to the results, the *Think moment* revealed an average score of 3.9 in those items related to the roles assigned, the individual contributions to the speaking task, and the members’ support to learn vocabulary and to complete the speaking task. Even though this section was lower in comparison with the other moments, it is still a good result since it is closer to the 4.0 tendency and because students made their contributions to the speaking task.

On the other hand, the *Group moment* contributed to the group’s speaking goal set for the lessons, their understanding of the task proposed and their interest in providing feedback. It was seen that this last section of the questionnaire achieved the highest score in the intervention 4.1.

In relation to the *Share moment*, the graph evidences an average of 4.0, where the aspects assessed in this section had to do with reporting out the students’ outcomes, thoughts and the pieces of language learned with the class and completing the speaking task. In general, the result was positive since the group reported that the members shared their final production with the group following the instructions given by the teacher. Besides, it was found that most members took advantage of the group share activity to fulfill the task.

To have a more precise description of the results achieved Figure 13 shows the average scores obtained for each question; the ten questions respond to every moment of the TGS strategy.
According to this, questions 7 and 8 obtained the highest value of 4.5. Those questions were related to the group contributions to the class since each group shared their conclusions, answers, and results with the entire class, which were the result of each group’s positive interdependence when working for a common goal, and individual accountability when doing their part of the work. Questions 1 and 5 got a score of 4.0, which also shows significant improvement in relation to the other questions. Many students found that their groups complied with their roles, set a learning goal, and took advantage of the group share moment. “In sharing their ideas, students take ownership of their learning and negotiate meanings rather than rely solely on the teacher’s authority” (Cobb et al. 1991). Regarding questions 2, 4 and 6, with similar final values, 3.9 and 3.8, it is important to highlight that the Think moment results were significant not only for each individual but also for the next moments of the TGS strategy since students prepared their ideas and contributions to solve the question or task proposed. Question 10 related to the provision of
feedback to each member of the group revealed the weakest value, 3.5 in comparison with the other items of the questionnaire.

To measure the SI, it was necessary to analyze the average of the interactions each learner produced. A speaking frequency grid (Appendix J) was implemented to help the teachers-researchers to determine whether students had increased their oral interventions during the lessons. In this respect, it was demonstrated that the participants progressively increased the number of interactions (see Appendix K). Figure 14 illustrates the average scores per lesson. There was a significant improvement in the students’ average scores after the TGS strategy training.

*Figure 14. Speaking Interaction Average Scores*

![Interventions average scores graph](image)

This revealed that students were able to maintain simple exchanges of information on familiar topics in an easier way where communication is completely dependent on repetition at a slower rate of speech, rephrasing, and repair. In this regard, this was possible because students
had the opportunity to interact with their peers and teacher because of the group and share moments of the TGS strategy.

5.2.2.2 Qualitative analysis. The principles of the Grounded theory were applied to suit the issue under study and facilitate its subsequent interpretation and analysis. This process was carried out through the coding of the data to have a clear focus on the information to be analyzed. Cohen et al. (2007) define coding as the deconstruction of the “data into manageable chunks to facilitate an understanding of the phenomenon in question” (p. 493). For this project, the three types of coding from the grounded theory were used: open, axial and selective.

Initially, information from the different instruments was coded and organized according to patterns identified. Then, resulting groups of data became categories.

5.3 Categories

5.3.1 Introduction. In this segment, the teacher-researchers explain the way the data collected was analyzed and interpreted. Subsequently, they found patterns in the data, emerging categories, categories, and subcategories according to the data management procedures and category mapping. Open, axial, and selective coding, were the stages that were carried out to reduce the data. Categories and subcategories are supported with literature and evidenced through excerpts from the participants’ comments.

5.3.1.1 Category mapping. To determine categories, a coding process was carried out. This process happened in three stages where codes derived from data. Open coding was the first stage in the category mapping process. The teacher-researchers broke down data to determine initial
concepts and categories; to do so, color coding was implemented. To distinguish connected or similar comments by the teachers and students participating in the study.

The second stage was axial coding, where the teacher-researchers used the concepts and categories identified during the open coding stage to confirm that all relevant aspects were considered and to determine the relationships evidenced among those concepts and categories.

The final stage was selective coding, where three broad categories were selected as the leading ones that integrate the five subcategories found, then a summary table was created where the participants’ excerpts were classified (see Table 3).

Table 3
Categories and Subcategories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Learning to promote interaction</td>
<td>Adopting roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidating the group for better practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing competence in language use</td>
<td>Learning more repertoire of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using survival expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using the language rather than just learning it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving towards self-directed learning</td>
<td>Improving personal competences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying personal strengths and weaknesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 Analysis of categories.

5.3.2.1 Description of categories. Once the data analysis and the category mapping were done, three main categories were identified: 1) Cooperative Learning to promote interaction, 2)
Increasing competence in language use, and 3) Moving towards Self-Directed Learning. They emerged in response to the research question: How might the implementation of the Cooperative Learning strategy Think-Group-Share affect the Speaking Performance and interaction of a large group of A1 seventh graders in two public schools?

5.3.2.1.1 Category 1: Cooperative Learning to promote interaction. This category refers to the students’ disposition to listen to each other and exchange ideas to improve their understanding of a task. It is also based on the CL principle promotive interaction that maximizes language output and the opportunity students must do real work together.

5.3.2.1.1.1 Subcategory 1: Adopting roles. This subcategory describes the importance students attributed to adopting the roles in the CL practice. In this regard, Coggeshall (2010) states that “it is important to assign roles to not only give the students a job but to also make sure the group can monitor their own behavior and work.”

Excerpt 1 - Students’ journal 5 - Participant 9 - School A

“Cumplir con mi rol como Coach me ha ayudado a desempeñarme mucho mejor en el habla de inglés pues le puedo ayudar a mis compañeros en lo que no entienden.”

(Fulfilling my role as a Coach has helped me to perform much better when speaking English because I can help my partners in which they do not understand).

Excerpt 2 - Students’ journal 7 - Participant 27 - School B

“Me siento bien porque nos colaboramos mutuamente hay orden y control cuando cada uno tiene una función. El grupo da buenas ideas y cooperamos para desarrollar la actividad.”
Esta estrategia me ha servido porque con esto puedo socializar con mis compañeros de grupo.”

(I feel good, because we help each other mutually, there is order and control when each one has a function. The group gives good ideas and we cooperate to develop the activity. This strategy has been useful for me because I can help my group mates to socialize).

Excerpt 3 - Students’ journal 6 - Participant 22 - School B

“Les ayude a mis compañeros, ser coach es bueno y cuando les ayudo a organizar en lo que puedo me sentí muy bien porque me dijeron que el trabajo es más organizado.”

(I helped my partners, being a coach is good, and when I help them to organize what I can I feel very good because they told me the work was more organized.)

Excerpt 4 - Teachers’ journal 3 - School A

“Students are now more aware of their roles; they are trying to perform their functions. Students were really engaged, they talked to each other by using their roles’ expressions.”

In the previous excerpts, it was evident that the participants perceived their roles helped them not only to improve their SP but also to help the members of the group perform better in the speaking tasks. It was also noticed that taking ownership of team’s roles allowed students to use English since they needed it to communicate their ideas and to interact with their peers and the teacher. Besides, in the excerpts data revealed the roles supported the groups’ engagement in their learning process. Based on the previous information, Kagan (1994) affirms that it is possible to get higher achievement through CL than through competitive or individualistic learning structures. According to this author, this is possible in all subject areas, in almost every
task, and across all age levels. Hence, roles provided learners with tools to exchange information and share ideas, they could also regulate the group proper functioning and the development of the group’s members’ duties. It was also described the way students’ understanding of their functions caused some benefits to the CL group dynamics. Finally, students were able to lead the group to achieve not only the academic goals but also the CL interrelated factors that guided teamwork.

5.3.2.1.1.2 Subcategory 2: Consolidating the group for better practice. In this subcategory, the data informed teacher-researchers about the impact that CL had on students’ SI, SP, team members’ performance, and the identification of group work as a strategy to practice and learn more. In this regard, through a self-assessment process, participants recognized that the TGS strategy was effective for learners to enhance their speaking skill. In this regard, Kagan (1994), states that “in the cooperative classroom most content related student talk occurs either in pairs within teams or in the small group. Team-members are supportive, hoping their teammates will perform well. If there is correction, it is in the process of negotiation of meaning, not in the process of evaluation” (p. 3:6)

Excerpt 5 - Students’ journal 4 - Participant 28 - School B

“Los niños de mi grupo y yo somos diferentes y casi no nos hablábamos, pero hemos aprendido a trabajar en grupo y entendernos.”

(The kids of my group and me are different and we hardly talk, but we have learned to work in a group and to understand each other).

Excerpt 6 - Students’ journal 5 - Participant 13 - School A
“Como me siento al trabajar ahora es excelente, estamos usando correctamente el Think, Group, Share.”

(I feel excellent when working, we are using the Think Group Share properly).

Excerpt 7 - Students’ journal 8 - Participant 27 - School A

“Me sentí muy bien porque cada vez hablo mucho más y más rápido se me ocurren más cosas y las palabras me ayudan en todo.”

(I felt really good because I speak more and faster each time, I come up with more things, and words help me in everything).

Excerpt 8 - Students’ journal 6 - Participant 10 - School B

“Me gusta hablar porque me siento más segura y si practico, mejoro más y me da menos pena me divierto con mi grupo y me rio si me equivoco.”

(I like to speak and I feel more secure, if I practice, I improve more, I feel less ashamed, I have fun with my group and if I make a mistake I laugh).

For this subcategory, the participants were able to recognize, evaluate and reflect upon the fulfillment of everyone’s part of the work to implement the TGS strategy, Yager, Johnson & Johnson (1985), relate such team members’ actions to group processing which is defined as “reflecting on a group session to describe what member actions were helpful and unhelpful and to make decisions about what actions to continue or change.” (p. 390). Learners’ reflections revealed the positive effect of teamwork on students’ SP and SI. As it is shown, the use of the CL strategy provided students with more opportunities to speak with the members of the group and the teacher. In this regard, the inclusion of structured group work helped students to speak
more and better. Furthermore, the participants showed a degree of satisfaction, confidence and security to work with others.

The *Cooperative Learning to promote interaction* category provides evidence of a notable change: students tried to speak and interact within their CL groups, and they assumed their roles (leading, guiding, organizing, and supporting each other). Participants’ positive interdependence improved through the process, according to Gillies (2013) it “exists when students perceive that they are linked to other members in the group in such a way that they cannot succeed unless they all do, and they must coordinate their efforts with each other to complete the task”. It was also possible to see that students’ individual accountability increased as well, it was evident in the following aspects: (a) assuming the responsibility for part of the task; (b) letting the group know about their progress; (c) reporting on the group’s progress to the whole class” (Gillies, 2013).

They took an active role in their learning groups, using a strategy they did not know and a language they thought they were not able to use.

5.3.2.1.2 *Category 2: Increasing competence in language use.* Here, participants shared their perceptions and feelings of success, language achievement, effective group work and willingness to learn. These issues are associated with the assumption that vocabulary plays a paramount role in speaking since no speech can be produced without it. In this respect, Wilkins (1972) confirms that “while without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed” (pp. 111–112). Additionally, the participants connected it to the way they could improve their English level little by little. At first, they identified and used isolated words, then,
by increasing their vocabulary range, they were able to produce basic phrases and then more elaborated sentences. They finally produced monologs and dialogues. In this regard, Nation (2010) explained, “vocabulary knowledge enables language use, language use enables the increase of vocabulary knowledge, knowledge of the world enables the increase of vocabulary knowledge and language use and so on” (Nation & Waring, 1997). Based on that, if the previous process was taking place, the students’ level of confidence increased as well.

5.3.2.1.2.1 Subcategory 1: Learning more repertoire of words. It has been evident that vocabulary has become a consistent feature and an important indicator of SP in second language learning (Koizumi and In’nami, 2013). The teacher-researchers agree with this fact, since vocabulary represents a key factor for the development of SP in this study, especially in a low-level context, where it has become a common constraint for A1 learners, whose limited vocabulary repertoire constitutes an obstacle to oral communication.

The Learning more repertoire of words category was built on the basis that “the greater vocabulary knowledge enhances substantially the speaking skill” (Koizumi and In’nami 2013, pag.911). In the current study, the growth of vocabulary was evidenced throughout the students’ comments as seen in the following excerpts.

Excerpt 9 - Students’ journal 1 - Participant 20 - School A

“Me siento feliz el vocabulario que he aprendido me ha ayudado a poder hablar de mi familia en inglés.”

(I feel happy the vocabulary that I have learned has helped me to be able to talk about my family in English.)
Excerpt 10 - Students’ journal 5 - Participant 25 - School A

“He aprendido muchas palabras durante las últimas clases y siento que puedo decir más cosas en las actividades de la clase y que el grupo me entiende”.

("I have learned many words in the last classes and I feel that I can say more things in the activities of the class and that the group understands me.")

Excerpt 11 - Students’ journal 4 - Participant 20 - School B

“He mejorado mucho en el uso del vocabulario y de las expresiones en clase, en esta última clase he tratado de hablar y utilizar el vocabulario de la familia, aunque a veces se me olvida, he mejorado demasiado.”

(I have improved a lot the use of the vocabulary and the expressions in class, in this last class I have tried to talk and use the family vocabulary, however sometimes I forget about it, I have improved a lot.)

As excerpts show, learners reported improvement in their SP due to an increase in their vocabulary repertoire. As data revealed, with the implementation of the strategy TGS learners were able to use their repertoire of words and expressions to communicate. A fact that contributed to improving the quality of their communication because they could use the vocabulary in the speaking task, in consequence, their will to speak and to interact in class increased.

The previous excerpts reveal the importance participants found in vocabulary to improve their speaking skill not only for the class but also for their lives. On this subject, Alqahtani (2015) advocates that “to understand the language, vocabulary is crucial to be mastered by the
learner. Vocabulary mastery is needed to express our ideas and to be able to understand other people's sayings.” Therefore, students saw a direct relationship between increasing their vocabulary and getting more opportunities to succeed in their academic and personal fields. Meanwhile, learners identified a positive influence in acquiring more vocabulary to speak more and better. In relation to this, Schmitt (2010) affirms that “vocabulary learning is an incremental process, both for sheer numbers of words and for specific lexical items (p. 19).

5.3.2.1.2.2 Subcategory 2: Using survival expressions. This subcategory refers to the expressions students used to ask for and give information, to make requests and to exchange ideas, according to Ali & Sullivan (2016), “Survival English is a term used to refer to the essential English phrases and expressions a learner needs to know to survive, i.e. live or work, in an English-speaking environment.”. Students demonstrated they increased their use of survival expressions as classes advanced, so they considered such expressions were useful for them to rely on more linguistic resources to interact.

Excerpt 12 - Students’ journal 2 - Participant 14 - School A

“Las expresiones sí nos han servido para preguntar entre nosotros y los demás, y nos sirven para expresarnos mejor en inglés y entender los temas.”
(The expressions has been useful to ask each other and to express ourselves in English in a better way, and to understand others.)

Excerpt 13 - Students’ journal 6 - Participant 14 - School B

“Realmente siento que he aumentado la frecuencia y la velocidad al utilizar las expresiones y el vocabulario, casi me las he aprendido todas.”
(I really feel that I have increased the frequency and speed when using the expressions and vocabulary, I am about to learn all of them good job.)

Excerpt 14 - Students’ journal 2 - Participant 1 - School A

“Hemos aprendido las expresiones que debemos usar si necesitamos ayuda ‘can you help me?’ y otras, también hemos utilizado varias de estas junto a nuestro grupo.”

(We have learned the expressions we must use if we need help, ‘puedes ayudarme?’ we have also used some of them with our group.)

Excerpt 15 - Teacher’s journal 4 - School B

“Some students reported they felt they were using English; some others were motivated since they could use other words to give and ask for information.

Excerpt 16 - Teachers’ journal 4 - School A

“They used their roles’ expressions and the survival English expressions to talk to their teammates and teacher. Students use the TGS strategy in order to answer the questions posted about the family in order them to remember what was done the previous class. They interacted by using the strategy mentioned.”

Excerpts described the positive influence the survival expressions and the vocabulary learned had on students’ understanding, interaction and communication because these instilled feelings of fulfillment and goal achievement. “The ability of your students to communicate comfortably and easily in a new environment is key to their future success in this environment. Their growing confidence and sense of security will ensure that they not just survive, but also thrive and eventually succeed in their academic studies.” (Ali, B. & Sullivan, K., 2016). Considering that
those expressions provided students with resources to survive in the classroom and to interact not
only with the teacher but also with their classmates, they felt they were able to use English to
communicate, which provided them with a sense of satisfaction. Students started using the
expressions studied in their journals. Therefore, the sense of improvement appeared to influence
students’ interest in learning. Students’ thoughts also expose their learning experience as an
effective and progressive process; words, expressions, frequency, and speed achieved.

The teacher-researchers highlighted the importance that vocabulary had on the students’
motivation to improve their speaking because the repertoire of vocabulary studied helped them to
carry out the tasks and to participate in the classroom situations. With the development of the
strategy planned, each lesson students gained more confidence in their vocabulary and expressions,
which promoted their participation and interaction during the process.

5.3.2.1.2.3 Subcategory 3: Using the language rather than just learning it. This subcategory
emerged from the students’ interest in using the vocabulary they learned to interact. Data showed
that students’ SP was witnessed through their ability to produce simple phrases and sentences. In
the students’ journals, most of them mentioned the specific words, phrases, and sentences they
learned and were able to produce each class to communicate and carry out the different speaking
tasks.
Excerpt 17 - Students’ journal 4 - Participant 29 - School B

“He podido utilizar diferentes frases para describir a mi familia en inglés y para entender lo que otros dicen.”

(I have used different phrases to describe my family in English and to understand what others say.)

Excerpt 18 - Students’ journal 5 - Participant 13 - School A

“Ahora puedo hacer oraciones en inglés y decírselas a la profesora y a los compañeros en clase.”

(Now, I can make sentences in English and tell them to the teacher, and to my classmates as well.)

Excerpt 19 - Teachers’ journal 4 - School A

“They used their roles’ expressions and the survival English expressions to talk to their teammates and teacher. Students use the TGS strategy in order to answer the questions posted about the family in order them to remember what was done the previous class. They interacted by using the strategy mentioned.”

Excerpt 20 - Teachers’ journal 4 - School B

“They maintained an active exchange and used basic structures to communicate their ideas. A large number of students played an active role in the speaking exercises; they used the vocabulary of the lesson as well as the survival English expressions”.

Students’ opinions illustrate the strategy applied helped them to improve their skills to produce and understand more elaborated pieces of language. As it is seen, with the development of
the strategy planned, each lesson students gained more confidence in their vocabulary and expressions, which promoted their participation and interaction during the process. The previous excerpts evidence that students who learned more vocabulary were able to use survival expressions and construct more elaborate structures which could mean that they were more confident, and their learning was better.

The participants of this study had the opportunity of improving their vocabulary to interact with their classmates and teacher and consequently, they began to feel confident as they were able to express themselves and to communicate with others as well.

5.3.2.4 Category 3: Moving towards Self-Directed Learning. In this category, it is possible to notice that SDL is a key component of CL since it focuses attention on a reflective process that took place in different moments of the intervention. Students’ and teachers’ journals served as an instrument to involve students in SDL. According to Cicero (2006), learning journals promote students in making sense of their learning process, engaging critical thinking and improving course performance. Students identified journals as an opportunity to recognize their language strengths and weaknesses as well as a mean to assess their individual and group performance and interaction.

5.3.2.4.1 Subcategory 1: Improving personal competences. This subcategory refers to the students’ sense of improvement in relation to the abilities of working with others within the frame of CL, getting higher achievements in SP and SI, and carrying out personal and collective actions upon the fulfillment of everyone’s part of the work, which was evident in the students’ commitment to implementing the TGS strategy. Students’ sense of improvement was related to
the fact of taking responsibility for their own learning and the learning of all group members (positive interdependence and face-to-face promotive interaction) to achieve the language goals and the CL group goals. It was also demonstrated in their SP and SI since students expanded not only their oral skills but also their interaction skills. Finally, students implemented individual and group actions to get all the stages of the TGS strategy done.

Excerpt 21 - Students’ journal 4 - Participant 20 - School B

“He mejorado mucho mi habilidad para comunicarme en clase. En esta última clase he tratado de hablar y utilizar el vocabulario de la familia, aunque a veces se me olvida, he mejorado demasiado.”

(I have improved my ability to communicate in this class. In this last class, I have tried to speak and to use the family vocabulary, although sometimes I forget it, I have improved a lot).

Excerpt 22 - Students’ journal 6 - Participant 5 - School A

“Ahora tomo la iniciativa y no me de tanta pena de hablar en inglés.”

(Now, I take the initiative and I am not ashamed of speaking).

Excerpt 23 - Students’ journal 6 - Participant 28 - School B

“Hoy fui muy autónoma, ya que hice todo el trabajo por mí misma, hice mi tarea y las actividades de grupo, me siento más independiente de la profesora ya que ella no va estar toda la vida.”
(I was very autonomous today because I did all the work by myself, I did tasks and group activities, I feel more independent from the teacher because she is not going to be with me all of my life).

Excerpt 24 - Students’ journal 6 - Participant 23 - School B

“Estudio el vocabulario y los temas vistos para mi aprendizaje y el de los demás”.

(We have been as autonomous as possible).

Excerpt 25 - Students’ journal 1 - Participant 16 - School A

“Yo contribuyo con mis compañeros aportando ideas que nos puedan ayudar.”

(I help my partners, by giving them ideas that can be helpful).

Students commented that their communication skills in English improved, in part, because they were able to take the initiative to speak in English by using the resources given in class. Moreover, they expressed that their group processing skills increased since they felt more autonomous and independent to carry out the group activities. It is evidenced that the TGS strategy was appealing to learners, increasing their motivation and responsibility towards their own and others’ learning process. It was evident they were committed to the speaking task since they expressed that they made a significant effort to accomplish the goals proposed.

5.3.2.4.2 Subcategory 2: Identifying personal strengths and weaknesses. It involves a conscious and reflective process in relation to the constructs of this study: SP, SI, the CL strategy TGS, and LG. Students thought and commented about their achievements, interest in improving, opportunities to get better, and the need to generate actions they could carry out to make progress on the different issues of this research project.
Excerpt 26 - Students’ journal 1 - Participant 16 - School A

“Mis fortalezas es que tomo las cosas con cabeza fría y unas de mis debilidades es que hablo mucho, un aspecto a mejorar es poner más atención.”

(My strength is that I have a cool head, and one of my weaknesses is that I talk a lot, I need to improve my attention).

Excerpt 27 - Students’ journal 5 - Participant 9 - School A

“Mi desempeño oral en el habla de Ingles es bueno y también he cumplido mi rol como Coach.”

(My oral performance speaking English is good and I have also fulfilled my role as a coach).

Excerpt 28 - Students’ journal 6 - Participant 4 - School B

“Tenemos que trabajar más en la interacción para mejorar el inglés.”

(We have to work more in interaction to improve English).

Excerpt 29 - Students’ journal 7 - Participant 8 - School B

“Me falta más vocabulario y tengo que mejorararlo pues quiero tener más expresiones y hablar mejor en todo.”

(I lack vocabulary and I have to improve it because I want to have more expressions and talk better about everything).

The previous excerpts evidence students’ self-awareness of their learning process which is key to become more self-directed learners. When determining their own strengths and
weaknesses, students were able to identify the issues they needed to improve to perform the TGS strategy appropriately, so that they could enhance their SP and SI at the same time. Students not only assessed their progress in their speaking skills but also their social skills. Excerpts make emphasis on their ability to carry out their roles within the groups and the help they provided each other when developing the speaking tasks. And finally, learners were also aware of the aspects they needed to improve since they realized that setting learning goals, paying more attention, interacting, and acquiring more vocabulary were issues they had to reinforce.

In short, the category *Moving towards Self-Directed Learning* reflects the process students carried out to increase their autonomy through the implementation of the CL strategy TGS. Working in groups under the CL principles helped learners to expand their abilities to be more self-directed focusing their attention in two main aspects: *Improving personal competences*, where participants of this study manifested their willingness to enhance aspects such as teamwork skills and their SP and SI through the use of CL, and *identifying personal strengths and weaknesses*, where learners were able to identify their own aspects to improve and the ones they are good at in relation to their performance as members of a CL team and their speaking development.

Findings provided by the data collected through qualitative and quantitative methods showed that training on CL promoted the needed conditions to strengthen the students’ speaking skills based on a consolidated group work, regarding roles, and the provision of feedback. This was also revealed that the CL principles allowed learners to become more self-directed with respect
to their autonomy within the groups, the expansion of their personal competences and their reflective process during the intervention.

To conclude, information obtained through categories showed that students were able to work cooperatively and to speak and interact in small groups based on vocabulary development. Through this process, it was revealed that learners’ language skills increased, since they had the chance to use English to communicate with their classmates and teachers. As a result, students’ self-confidence was stronger, and consequently their speaking skills, they became more self-directed and developed personal skills.
Chapter 6: Conclusions and Pedagogical Implications

This chapter presents relevant conclusions, pedagogical implications, limitations and opportunities for further research which resulted from the analysis of the data collected for this study. It was demonstrated that the implementation of the Cooperative Learning strategy Think-Group-Share enhanced seventh graders’ Speaking Performance in terms of vocabulary range, and their Speaking Interaction. This segment is also intended to extend an invitation to other researchers to increase their knowledge of the CL strategy studied as a vehicle to improve the Speaking Performance and Speaking Interaction of students in Large Groups.

6.1. Comparison of Results with Previous Studies’ Results

The use of CL was positive to enhance the participants’ Speaking Performance and Speaking Interaction, it also helped to enlarge learners’ interest, self-confidence, and participation in the English class. It was found that the implementation of the CL strategy Think-Group-Share had a positive impact on seventh graders’ Speaking Performance and interaction. The current study attempted to provide students with opportunities to overcome some of the limitations they had. First, by means of increasing their vocabulary repertoire as well as the production of basic sentences about familiar topics, and second by increasing their opportunities to maintain simple exchanges of information within the CL groups through varied speaking tasks. Cooperation was a major issue, since learners were provided with training sessions to work, learn and share with others; students took advantage of the cooperative experiences they had during the intervention process to enhance their speaking skills by giving them specific language input. Moreover, CL goals were set to guide group work towards a
common target to determine their language learning and Speaking Performance in terms of vocabulary repertoire and interaction in Large Groups. As noticed in this project, previous studies have been reviewed about the impact CL had on students’ speaking skills.

Fatma (2012) found that teachers who implemented CL in the classroom in small groups developed learners’ oral skill and confirmed that the implementation of CL technique involved a structure group work, which increased feelings of solidarity, supportiveness, and success among learners, enhanced responsibility and the efforts of every member to accomplish the group goals. Related results were found in this research study since training on CL promoted group cohesion, students took ownership of roles and pursued the group goals. As the strategy provided students with more opportunities to interact and to use English with their partners and teachers their self-confidence improved and, in consequence, their ability to speak in the target language.

To explore the relationship between productive vocabulary knowledge and Speaking Performance, Koizumi (2005) examined how size and depth of productive vocabulary knowledge were related to Speaking Performance. It was demonstrated that novice learners of English who achieved larger and deeper productive vocabulary knowledge were able to generate a greater number of pieces of language and better Speaking Performance when they produced monologs, descriptions, and comparisons. In the same vein, the current study corroborated that students who increased their repertoire of words not only improved their vocabulary, but also the production of basic sentences at a low rate of speech, which was evidenced in the elaboration of short and simple descriptions, monologs and dialogs.
Likewise, Prieto (2001) conducted a study to improve oral interaction in English through CL in seventh graders. A variety of activities of sensitization were implemented to create stable working groups to increase oral interaction and oral production. It was noticed that students who improved their oral skills understood that one way to succeed was practicing speaking with others, interacting with their teacher and partners and learning from them. The opportunity to help and to learn from their partners allowed them to have something to share and something to be valued in the group. Moreover, students’ awareness of their responsibility increased through the speaking process when they realized communication involved an active exchange where they were able to teach others. In this regard, this study also found a significant improvement in the students’ amount of interactions as the CL and language issues of the lesson plans were taught. It was revealed that students’ ability to maintain simple exchanges increased during the intervention, as they got familiar with the topics, the survival expressions, and the CL strategy, they used more frequently the language for asking and giving information. Lastly, working cooperatively strengthened learners’ interactions, which not only helped increase their knowledge but also diminished their dependency on the teacher’s assistance.

Thus, it was evidenced that the implementation of CL in a large group helped students to have more opportunities to speak and interact. In this sense, roles played a crucial function since learners were provided with tools not only to exchange information but also to regulate the proper performance of the group and the development of each members’ duties. The way students understood their role within the group facilitated the organization and guidance of
teamwork. Besides, the participants showed a degree of satisfaction, self-confidence, and security working with others. Peterson & Miller (2004), also found that the implementation of CL principles in a large group facilitated students’ interaction and a higher level of engagement with the class since students’ organization and provision of roles maximized their learning opportunities to achieve the group work task.

Finally, teaching English in LG by implementing CL increased learners’ opportunities to interact and to use the language with their teacher and peers, which in turn enabled them to improve their self-confidence and, in consequence, their ability to speak in English. Furthermore, training on CL principles encouraged learners to become more self-directed and autonomous which increased their interest in group work.

6.2 Pedagogical implications

Even though the benefits of using CL bring to a classroom are research-based, it is still evident that few teachers and learners have been involved in a CL experience. According to Panitz (n.d), there are several reasons why teachers do not use CL methods; many teachers think they lose the academic and disciplinary control of the group if they assign more responsibilities to students (the provision of roles and varied functions within the groups). Since CL promotes interactions and regular exchanges of information, the use of this instructional method demands more time than in a teacher-centered classroom, which is also another reason why this method is not frequently used. It is also important to notice that training on CL does not necessary allows groups to work faster or better immediately. As participants of this study became acquainted with how CL works, they understood that working together was the key to reaching the learning
goals. It is important to consider that in this case; the CL strategy *Think-Group-Share* the teacher needed to be the first model to follow.

The findings of this study suggest that the CL strategy *Think-Group-Share* can be successfully put into effect in the language classroom to enhance Speaking Performance, interaction and Self-Directed-Learning with basic students in Large Groups. This instructional method required the continuous practice of the CL principles, so learners were able to see the advantages of working with others. When introducing the CL strategy to the class instruction students’ autonomy, interaction, group cohesion, teamwork, and the speaking skills substantially increased throughout the intervention. It was proved that CL promoted students working in groups to achieve a common goal, assuming a specific role within the group was of paramount importance for them, not only to succeed in a single language class but also to follow a language process all through the different sessions. Therefore, the implementation of speaking tasks improved learners’ Speaking Performance in terms of vocabulary range and interaction in relation to their amount of interventions per class. In consequence, learners’ self-confidence, and their willingness to learn and to interact with others increased.

Based on the results obtained in this research project, teachers-researchers recommend that students who lack Self-Directed-Learning skills should be provided with appropriate instruction and training. The use of the CL strategy *Think-Group-Share* promoted chances for students to have control over their learning process since it involved a learning routine. Moreover, the implementation of strategy training sessions helped students get acquainted with the CL strategy, which not only addressed vocabulary learning, but also a more conscious
learning process taking into consideration the students’ needs. Finally, the results of this project proved that the objectives were fulfilled since the influence of CL and speaking tasks enhanced the vocabulary development.

6.3 Limitations of the present study

One of the major constraints of this study was related to time. Given that there are a variety of planned and unplanned activities in schools, the pedagogical intervention was affected by that issue, which made it last longer than it was planned. Some activities coincided with the English class schedule, so teacher-researchers faced the need to cancel classes.

Another significant difficulty this research study grappled with was associated with student attrition. Notwithstanding that they were eager to participate in this research process, some drawbacks were beyond the teacher-researchers’ control, such as long medical leaves, school transfers, school shift changes, and constant absences.

In addition, due to the group size, it was quite difficult for researchers to apply the pre- and post-tests. Although these were previously piloted, it took more time than expected to carry them out. Besides, bearing in mind that students were taken out from other classes to implement the tests, teacher-researchers had to deal with technological and logistics issues, since they struggled to count with appropriate spaces regarding physical space and time.

Lastly, to assess the students’ progress it would be necessary to further research as well use an instrument that could provide more accurate evidence of the students’ Speaking Performance and Speaking Interaction results after the intervention process.
6.4 Further research

Even though results were significant for the current study, it is necessary to continue examining the effectiveness of the CL strategy *Think-Group-Share* for a longer period to validate its impact on students’ Speaking Performance and interaction. Further research should look for whether related results could be obtained in other contexts and with other language abilities. Likewise, it would be useful to try CL strategies different from *Think-Group-Share*, which could foster learners’ speaking skills.

6.5 Conclusions

The findings provided by this study evidence the CL strategy *Think-Group-Share* could benefit students’ speaking skill in terms of performance (vocabulary range) and interaction, especially when working with Large Groups, which is a common constraint of Colombian public schools. Training on CL before and during the intervention made possible for students to get acquainted with this instructional method since they were given the necessary tools to establish a learning routine that allowed them to get familiar with the language. Training sessions would contribute to the achievement of the language goals as well as to increase their self-confidence and autonomy to learn a foreign language while working with others. In addition, to develop an effective CL process, it is necessary to foster teacher-learner cooperation since it could reduce the problems that impede the success of implementing CL in the classroom. This might be one of the challenges not only for teachers and students in a local context but also to those who belong to national and international learning communities.
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Appendices

Appendix A. Needs Analysis

Cuestionario dirigido a los estudiantes

Instrumento de Investigación

Enhancing the Speaking Performance and Interaction of A1 learners in Large Groups through the Cooperative Learning Strategy Think-Group-Share at two Colombian Public Schools

Nombre: ___________________________________________ Grado: ______________________ Fecha: ___/___/___

Apreciado estudiante, el siguiente cuestionario tiene el objetivo de recoger información acerca del proceso de aprendizaje con otros y su habilidad oral en la clase de inglés. Su participación será de gran ayuda para los propósitos de esta investigación; la información suministrada será utilizada únicamente con fines investigativos por XXX profesoras de inglés y estudiantes de la Universidad la Sabana en la Maestría en Didáctica de la enseñanza del inglés para el aprendizaje auto dirigido. Sus respuestas son de gran importancia, por lo tanto, le pedimos contestarlas con base en su experiencia. Recuerde que este cuestionario no es una evaluación, de manera que no existen respuestas incorrectas. Dicha información será manejada con confidencialidad. Agradecemos su participación y colaboración en esta investigación.

Apreciado estudiante:

Le solicitamos llenar el siguiente cuestionario, podrá expresar sus percepciones frente al uso de la estrategia de aprendizaje cooperativo grupal para el desarrollo de las habilidades orales del idioma inglés.

Gracias.

Sección 1: Información personal

1. Genero
   a. Hombre
   b. Mujer

2. Edad.............

3. ¿En dónde vive? ......................
Sección 2: Hablando inglés en el salón de clase

4. ¿Por cuántos años ha estudiado inglés?............

5. Hablar inglés en el salón de clase es:

   a. Muy fácil  
   b. Fácil  
   c. Difícil  
   d. Muy difícil  

   Explique brevemente su respuesta…………………………………………………………………………………...

6. De 1 a 4 evalúe la habilidad del idioma inglés que con mayor frecuencia práctica en clase. Siendo 1 la mayor frecuencia y 4 la menor.

   a. Lectura  
   b. Escritura  
   c. Habla  
   d. Escucha  

   Explique brevemente su respuesta…………………………………………………………………………………...

7. Evalúe su habilidad de habla en el idioma inglés en la clase de acuerdo con los siguientes criterios:

   a. Superior  
   b. Alto  
   c. Medio  
   d. Bajo  

8. ¿Con qué frecuencia habla en la clase de inglés?

   a. Siempre  
   b. Casi siempre  
   c. A veces  
9. ¿En qué momento usa el inglés en la clase?

a. Cuando el profesor le hace alguna pregunta  

b. Cuando se encuentra en una actividad de clase  

c. Cuando debe hablar con algún compañero  

¿Otro? ¿Cuál?.......................................................................................................................

10. Cuando necesita hablar en inglés, usted prefiere:

a. Hablar con sus amigos  

b. Hablar con su profesora  

c. Hablar con otros niños  

d. Hablar con un solo compañero(a)  

11. Su sentimiento cuando habla en inglés es de:

Miedo  
Ansiedad  
Seguridad  
Confianza  
Inseguridad  
Tranquilidad  

12. ¿Considera que existen factores que afectan su desempeño oral en la clase de inglés?

Si  
No  

¿Si su respuesta es sí, qué factores afectan su desempeño en las actividades orales?
a. Falta tiempo de preparación de la actividad  

b. Siente temor de cometer errores en la pronunciación  
c. Su vocabulario es escaso  
d. Siente temor de las observaciones que pueda hacer el profesor  
e. No cuenta con el conocimiento suficiente para expresar sus ideas  
f. Carece de autoconﬁanza / seguridad  
g. Presión por tener un buen desempeño  
h. Apoyo o falta del mismo por parte de quien escucha  
i. Preocupación por cometer errores  
j. Temor a las críticas o sentirse avergonzado  
k. No saber que decir  
l. Temor de hablar en público  

13. ¿Qué tipo actividades prefiere que se hagan en la clase de inglés?  
a. Diálogos  
b. Monólogos  
c. Discusión  
d. Describir  
e. Otra, por favor especiﬁque:..............................................................................................................

14. ¿Qué tanta importancia considera que tiene el vocabulario para el desarrollo de su habilidad oral?  
a. Muy importante  
b. Importante  
c. poco importante  
d. Nada importante  

15. Considera que su vocabulario en las actividades de la clase de inglés es:  
a. Amplio
b. Suficiente

c. Escaso

d. Bajo

16. ¿En las actividades de la clase de inglés usted emplea el vocabulario aprendido

a. Siempre

b. Casi siempre

c. Algunas veces

d. Nunca

Sección 4: Grupos Grandes

17. ¿Encuentra dificultades cuando trabaja con otros compañeros de manera grupal?

a. Siempre

b. Casi siempre

c. Algunas veces

d. Nunca

18. Considera que el número de estudiantes en la clase de inglés le permite:

a. Participar en cada clase varias veces

b. Aprender de y con sus compañeros

c. Interactuar con varios compañeros y no siempre con los mismos

d. Atender las instrucciones de la profesora

e. Escuchar las intervenciones de sus compañeros

Sección 5: El profesor como asistente para mejorar la habilidad oral

19. El profesor (a):
a. Resuelve ver las preguntas o dudas que surgen en clase
b. Organiza grupos de trabajo cooperativo
c. Genera conciencia frente a habilidades que requiere el trabajo en grupo
d. Promueve oportunidades para hablar en la clase de inglés

20. ¿Se le ha dado la oportunidad de evaluar su habilidad de habla?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opción</th>
<th>Marcador</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Siempre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Casi siempre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Algunas veces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Nunca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sección 6: Aprendizaje cooperativo**

21. Siente que el trabajo en grupo le puede facilitar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opción</th>
<th>Marcador</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Realizar y responder más preguntas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Aprender a escuchar diferentes opiniones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Evaluar el desempeño de sus compañeros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Desarrollar habilidades sociales para relacionarse con otros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. ¿Cuál de las siguientes técnicas de trabajo en la clase de inglés le gusta más?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opción</th>
<th>Marcador</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Trabajo en grupos pequeños (hasta 4 estudiantes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Trabajos en grupos grandes (más de 4 estudiantes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Trabajo individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Trabajo en parejas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explique brevemente………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

23. ¿Cómo cree usted que aprende mejor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opción</th>
<th>Marcador</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Solo(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. En parejas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. En grupos de tres o más</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. ¿Al trabajar en grupo ha tenido roles dentro del mismo?

Si ☐  No ☐  Si su respuesta es sí, ¿cuál o cuáles? .................................................................

25. ¿Considera que el trabajo con otros estudiantes le podría ayudar a mejorar sus habilidades para hablar en la clase de inglés?

Si ☐  No ☐

¿Por qué?................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

26. ¿Encuentra dificultades cuando trabaja con otros compañeros de manera grupal?

a. Siempre ☐

b. Casi siempre ☐

c. Algunas veces ☐

d. Nunca ☐

Muchas gracias por su participación en este estudio.

Adapted from “Enhancing Students’ Oral Proficiency through Cooperative Group Work," by S. Boussiada, 2010.
Appendix B. Questionnaire to Assess CL to Improve Speaking

PROTOCOL TO ADMINISTER

Purpose: To explain how students become more aware of their learning role in the improvement of their speaking performance.

Time: 15 minutes.

Administration moment: At the end of each lesson.

Material: Sheets of paper per student (photocopies).

Introduction:
This instrument assesses students’ perceptions of Cooperative Learning to improve speaking. Students solve this rubric individually.

This instrument takes place in the classroom and last 5 minutes per student. Students are required to bring a pen or a pencil. The rubric has four categories; the first category is related to “achieving learning goals”, the second category is related to “individual contributions”, the third one is related to “group members’ productivity” and the last one is related to “group assessment”.

The teachers-researchers have a kind and positive attitude toward students.

Monitoring students
To administer this instrument, the teachers-researchers review the following directions before the day of the implementation and follow them exactly during its administration.

Direction: Rate from 5 to 1 (5 being excellent and 1 being poor) each of the following aspects related to cooperative to improve speaking. Read the questions that will guide you to select the corresponding score.

The teacher-researchers provide a clear explanation of the purpose of the instrument and its structure. Every student in the class must understand what she/he is expected to do. During the administration, students work individually.

To guarantee this instrument security, and to ensure the validity of its results, the teacher-researchers are not able to assist students by giving them hints or examples during the test development, (explaining, paraphrasing or interpreting vocabulary). For any reason they indicate students whether their answers are correct or incorrect and extra time will not be provided in any case.

To keep evidence of this procedure, the test will be written in 2 separate sheets of paper.

To finish
The teacher-researchers collect the sheets of paper and thank students for their time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperative learning assessing criteria</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs improvement</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual contributions (THINK) 1.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Did each member comply with the role assigned?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Did each member of the group take advantage of the individual THINK activity to be prepared for the speaking task?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did each member of the group help other members to complete the task assigned (speaking task and learn more vocabulary)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achieving learning goals (GROUP) 2.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Did each member of the group set his or her own learning objective?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did the work in cooperative groups help the group member establish a common learning goal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Did the contribution of each member of the group help each individual to achieve the speaking goals set for the lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Did the members of the group share their conclusions, results or answers with the class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group members’ productivity (SHARE) 3.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Did members of the group report out (share) with the entire class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Did members take advantage of the grupal SHARE activity to complete the task assigned (speaking task and learn more vocabulary?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Did members of the group give feedback to each other to improve the speaking task performance?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Appendix C. Pre- and Post-tests

PROTOCOL TO ADMINISTER THE SPEAKING TESTS

Introduction

The teacher-researchers:

Introduce themselves: name, and the purpose of the test.

“Today you will take part of a Speaking test. In this test you will be assessed on your vocabulary and speaking skills. You will be asked to describe, answer or provide information according to three different situations. Be aware that this test is not graded.

Testing the environment, materials and time

This test is intended to measure the speaking skill and the vocabulary of seventh-grade students. The test takes place in the classroom and lasts 3 to 5 minutes per student. Students are not required to bring any materials. The test has three sections; in the first part “interaction in a conversation”, students are asked some questions related to familiar topics, it takes about 1-2 minutes. In the second part “monologue”, students are given 1 minute to speak about a familiar topic. In the third part of the test “picture description”, students are told to make a description, it takes 1 minute.

The teachers-researchers have a kind and positive attitude toward students.

The set of materials for this test including prompt cards, pictures, a rubric and a record Sheet.

Monitoring students

To administer the speaking test, the teachers-researchers review the following directions before the test administration.

The teacher-researchers provide a clear explanation of the purpose of the test and the sections of it. Every student in the class must understand what she/he is expected to do. During the test administration, students are interviewed individually while the group is with other teacher.

To guarantee test security, and to ensure the validity of test scores, the teacher-researchers are not able to assist students by giving them hints or examples during the test development, (explaining, paraphrasing or interpreting questions). For any reason they indicate students whether their answers are correct or incorrect and extra time will not be provided in any case.

To keep evidence of this diagnosis, the test will be recorded by using Audacity or the cell-phone voice recorder.

For this purpose, teachers will start recording by saying:

- Date
- This is (Teacher-researcher’s name)
- I am with (Student’s name)
- This is the first speaking test

The teacher-researchers must NOT provide the following assistance in any case:

- give hints or examples during the test development
- explain, paraphrase or interpret questions
• indicate to students whether answers are correct or incorrect
• remind students about related work completed in class
• provide extra time.

To finish the test
Thank student for his time. Say his/her name.

SPEAKING TEST
PROTOCLO PARA ESTUDIANTES

En esta semana su habilidad oral en el idioma inglés será diagnosticada por medio de un test. El propósito de este test es evaluar el vocabulario en inglés que usted posee. Se le pedirá que describa, hable e interactúe en un diálogo. *Este test no será parte de la evaluación de la asignatura, y los resultados serán utilizados para propósitos de investigación y mejoramiento de las actividades de clase.*

Para presentar este test por favor lea las instrucciones que aparecen a continuación:

- Usted permanecerá con el docente de otra asignatura, asistirá a la clase en salón y el horario indicado martes 8:00-10:00 am salón 17.
- Llevará los materiales de esta asignatura y realizará las actividades como usualmente lo hace.
- Usted recibirá un número que será su turno para presentar el test (1,2,3,7,9,20 etc.).
- En el transcurso de la clase un estudiante de grado 11 llamará a dos estudiantes según su turno comenzando por el 1 y 2. Esté atento al llamado y diríjase al salón indicado.
- El test lo presentará individualmente y no requiere que lleve materiales.
- El test durará aproximadamente 5 minutos.
- Responda a cada una de las preguntas y tareas de la mejor manera posible. Recuerde que los resultados no serán tenidos en cuenta para la evaluación o notas finales del curso.
- Cuando finalice el test regresará al salón de clase y continuará con sus actividades.
- Durante el test no podrá contestar llamadas y si porta celular, este deberá estar apagado o en modo silencio.
- El test será grabado para tener evidencia de su competencia en el idioma inglés.
- La docente conducirá el test en inglés.

Estructura del test
A continuación, encontrará la descripción de cada sección del test de inglés. Si tiene alguna inquietud de una o de todas las secciones del test por favor pregunte a la docente.

**Tiempo: 5 minutos**

**Organización:**

**Sección 1:** Interacción en la conversación. La docente le hará al menos 4 preguntas relacionadas con temas que estudiados tales como familia, actividades cotidianas, etc.) Tiempo aproximado: 1 minuto

**Sección 2:** Monólogo. Usted deberá hablar en promedio un minuto de una temática familiar (la familia, actividades cotidianas, el colegio, etc.) Tiempo aproximado: 2 minutos

**Sección 3:** Descripción de imagen. Usted realizará la descripción de lo que se ven en las imágenes y de lo que sucede. Tiempo aproximado: 1 minuto
SPEAKING TEST

Purpose: to diagnose the speaking performance in terms of vocabulary range and oral interaction.
Time allotted: 5 minutes

SECTION 1: INTERACTION IN A CONVERSATION (Between the student and the teacher)

Time: 1-2 minutes
(Be friendly and smile.)
Say:

Hi, student’s name.
I am going to start recording our test.
Today is (date). This is (Teacher-researcher’s name). I am with (Student’s name). This is our first speaking test.

Start the test by saying:

In this part of the Speaking test, you will be asked some questions related to familiar topics.
Ask at least 4 or 5 questions. Choose them according to the need.

1. Can you tell me about your family? How many members are there? Who are they?
2. What is your favorite subject? Tell me why you like it.
3. What do you like to do in your free time? Why do you like ----?
4. What do you usually do in your school?
5. Can you tell me about your favorite hobby / activity? Tell me why you like it.
6. Can you tell me about the city where you live? Do you like living in this city? Why? Why not?
7. What do you do on Saturdays? What time do you ……?
8. What’s your favorite clothing? Can you explain why you like wearing ……?
9. What are you wearing today?
10. What’s your favorite computer game? Tell me why you like it.
11. What do you use the internet for?

SECTION 2: MONOLOGUE

Time: 2 minutes
Now I am going to give you a card with a topic. Take 1 minute to think about it and then speak for about a minute.
CARD 1
MY DAILY ROUTINE
You will have 1 minute to speak about your daily routine

- What do you do every day?
- What do you do on your weekends?
- What does your mother do during the week?

CARD 2
MY FAMILY
You will have 1 minute to speak about your family

- How many members are there in your family? Who are they?
- What do they do?
- What do you like doing with them?

CARD 3
MY FAVORITE CHARACTER
You will have 1 minute to describe your favorite character

- Who’s your favorite famous person? Who do you admire the most?
- What does he/she do?
- Why do you like her/him?
- What does she/ he look like?

CARD 4
MY BEST FRIEND
You will have 1 minute to describe your best friend

- Who’s your best friend?
- What does he/she do?
- Why do you like her/him?
- What does she/ he look like?
CARD 5
MY HOUSE

You will have 1 minute to describe your house.

- Do you live in an apartment or in a house? Who do you live with?
- How many rooms/floors are there?
- What does your house look like?
- What does your bedroom look like?

SECTION 3: PICTURE DESCRIPTION

Time: 1 minute

In this section you will receive a picture.

Say:

(Student’s name), what is this? The teacher points (the rug) (the bookshelf)

Who is he? (the teacher)

What is he doing? (the student in red)

What is he wearing? (the girl in green)

What do you think he is ...?

What is on the table?

How many children are there?

Which is the globe?

Where is the teacher?

Where is the rug?

Where are they?
Picture 1

Retrieved from http://2.bp.blogspot.com/-EO7zQTvz05o/TsMS ỦPJBI/AAAAAANU/1As7G_WDc-w/s320/salon.jpg

Picture 2

ENHANCING SPEAKING SKILLS THROUGH COOPERATIVE LEARNING
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Appendix D. Teachers’ and students’ journals.

TEACHERS’ JOURNAL: A five-minute reflection

PROTOCOL

Purpose:
- To keep a record of the teaching and learning process, in terms of CL impact on students’ improvement of their speaking skill and vocabulary range.
- To identify strengths, weaknesses and things to improve.
- To know the extent to which CL learning helps students to improve their speaking.
- To know what students think about CL as a learning strategy.
- To know what students think about their speaking.

Time: 5 minutes.

Material: A separate sheet of paper per lesson / digital.

Administration moment: At the end of each class.

Direction: For your reflection consider some of the following questions:

Introduction
This instrument keeps a record of students’ insights of the learning and teaching process. Students complete the chart individually at the end of each lesson.

This instrument takes place in the classroom and last 5 minutes per student. Students are required to bring a pen or a pencil. This journal has three sections, section one “Cooperative Learning”, section two “speaking performance vocabulary range”, and section three “Speaking Interaction”.

The teachers-researchers have a kind and positive attitude toward students.

Monitoring this process
To administer this instrument, the teachers-researchers review the following directions before the day of the implementation and follow them exactly during its administration.

Direction: Use this journal for your reflection about your process considering some of the questions posted.
To guarantee this instrument security, and to ensure the validity of its results. For any reason the teacher-researchers will share this instrument with students and neither will ask them to provide information or their interpretation of his process.

To keep evidence of this procedure the journal will be register on sheets of paper or digital form.

**TEACHERS’ JOURNAL: A five-minute reflection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Students’ reaction</th>
<th>Concerns /problems</th>
<th>Other comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COOPERATIVE LEARNING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a student - centered approach that comprises learners grouped in mixed -ability teams that help and depend on each other in order to achieve a common goal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKING PERFORMANCE: VOCABULARY RANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It refers to the student’s ability to use a repertoire of isolated words and short and basic phrases or sentences that are related to familiar situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKING INTERACTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This refers to the students’ ability to maintain simple exchanges. Interactions are simple and with the use of basic structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What happened? What I need to improve for the next session?
STUDENTS’ JOURNAL “A five-minute reflection”: Thinking about learning and teaching process

PROTOCOL

Purpose:
- To allow students to become more aware of their role within their learning process.
- To provide learners with opportunities to reflect upon their speaking performance and learning role within a group.
- To encourage students to monitor their process.
- To know what students think about CL as a strategy to improve speaking performance.
- To know what students think about their speaking performance (vocabulary).

Time: 5 minutes.

Material: A sheet of paper per student (photocopies).

Administration moment: At the end of each class.

Introduction

This instrument keeps a record of students’ insights of the learning and teaching process. Students fill in the chart individually at the end of each lesson.

This instrument takes place in the classroom and last 5 minutes per student. Students are required to bring a pen or a pencil. This journal has three sections, section one “Cooperative Learning”, section two “speaking performance vocabulary range”, and section three “Speaking Interaction”.

The teachers-researchers have a kind and positive attitude toward students.

Monitoring students

To administer this instrument, the teachers-researchers review the following directions before the day of the implementation and follow them exactly during its administration.

Direction: Use this journal for your reflection about your process considering some of the questions posted.

The teacher-researchers provide a clear explanation of the purpose of the instrument and its structure. Every student in the class must understand what she/he is expected to do. During the administration, students work individually.

To guarantee this instrument security, and to ensure the validity of its results, the teacher-researchers are not able to assist students by giving them hints or examples during the test development, (explaining, paraphrasing or interpreting questions). For any reason they indicate students whether their answers are correct or incorrect and extra time will not be provided in any case.

To keep evidence of this procedure, the test will be written in 2 separate sheets of paper.
To finish
The teacher-researchers collect the sheets of paper and thank students for their time.

STUDENTS’ JOURNAL “A five-minute reflection”: Thinking about the learning and teaching process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER FOR YOUR REFLECTION</th>
<th>MY OBSERVATION YOU CAN ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKING PERFORMANCE: VOCABULARY RANGE (Desempeño oral: vocabulario)</td>
<td>For my reflection: (para mi reflexión)</td>
<td>❖ Feelings (sentimientos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❖ Vocabulary learning process (proceso de aprendizaje de vocabulario)</td>
<td>❖ Improvement opportunities (oportunidades para mejorar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❖ Cooperative learning (aprendizaje cooperativo)</td>
<td>❖ Other ideas to comment about (otras ideas para comentar)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It refers to your ability to use a repertoire of isolated words and short and basic phrases or sentences that are related to the topics studied in class.

(Se refiere a tu habilidad para usar un repertorio de palabras y frases básicas y cortes u oraciones que están relacionadas con los temas de clase).
**SPEAKING INTERACTION**
*(Interacción oral)*

It refers to your ability to maintain simple exchanges of information on topics you have studied in class.

You can repeat some words, speak at a slow rate of speech, rephrase and repair.

*(Se refiere a la habilidad intercambiar información de temas que has estudiado)*

- Use of expressions from the Survival English expressions. *(Uso de las expresiones “survival English expressions”).*
- Use of English with partners and teacher. *(Uso del inglés con los compañeros y profesora).*
- Use of vocabulary to develop the speaking activities. *(uso del vocabulario para desarrollar las actividades de habla).*
- Things to improve. *(aspectos a mejorar).*
- Times to speak in the class
- Times to speak in the Cooperative Learning groups.

**SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING**
*(Aprendizaje autónomo)*

It refers to your ability to take the initiative and responsibility of your vocabulary learning process and speaking performance.

- Setting learning goals
- Identifying strengths and weaknesses.
- Self-assess my speaking
- Self-evaluate my work in the group,
- Things to improve. *(aspectos a mejorar).*

**COOPERATIVE LEARNING**

It is when you and your partners work in a group to help each other prepare a speaking task.

- My feelings working with others. *(mi sentir frente al trabajo con otros)*
- My contribution to the speaking performance task *(think – group-share strategy). My contribución en la tarea de habla por medio de la estrategia THINK- GROUP-SHARE).*
### Appendix E. Pedagogical Intervention

#### STAGE 1: TRAINING ON CL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESSON AND TIME</th>
<th>PURPOSES</th>
<th>TOPIC AND SUBTOPICS</th>
<th>SECTIONS DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lessons 1 and 2 (4 hours) | - To sensitize students about CL.  
- To make students aware about CL advantages on their learning process.  
- To help | COOPERATIVE LEARNING  
- Survival English  
- Group work  
- CL strategy: TGS | ACTIVATION  
1. Survival English  
- Introduction of survival expressions to communicate in English.  
2. Getting your first impression  
- Think-Group-Share: Teacher and students’ discussion on previous experiences on work in groups.  
3. Cooperative Strategy  
*Think-Group-Share: Questionnaire about cooperative work.* | - Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection  
- Individual Questionnaire to Assess Cooperative Learning to Improve Speaking |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COOPERATIVE LEARNING</th>
<th>PREPARATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To assign roles to students according to their abilities.</td>
<td>1. Focus students’ attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Think-Group-Share</em>: Key Questions about geese to introduce the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Think-Group-Share</em>: Key questions about the video.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Seating arrangement and teams formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teams conformation according to English skills and discipline issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Students’ roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Students choose roles and know their functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Cooperative Learning Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Think-Group-Share</em>: Activity to set Cooperative Learning rules and define positive characteristics of a good group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Setting the lesson goals:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Cooperative Brainstorming”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lesson goals presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Think-Group-Share</em>: Questions about the lesson goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection
### STAGE 2: TEACHING AND LEARNING UNDER THE CL APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESSON AND TIME</th>
<th>PURPOSES</th>
<th>TOPIC AND SUBTOPICS</th>
<th>SECTIONS DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRESENTATION AND PRACTICE**

1. Introduction to the topic: “Analysis of a model”
   - Think-Group-Share: Analysis of classroom environment (pictures on the walls) to identify Cooperative Learning principles.

2. Modeling the task: Think Group Share strategy
   - Think-Group-Share: Discussion about the importance of Cooperative Learning principles.

**EVALUATION**

1. Group reflection
   - Think-Group-Share: Reflection on Cooperative Learning principles.

2. Discussion and Reinforcement
   - Think-Group-Share: Assessment on cooperative learning work within the groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 3 and 4 (4 hours)</th>
<th>THE FAMILY</th>
<th>ACTIVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - To teach students how to be responsible not only for learning the material being taught but also for helping teammates learn. | - Survival English | 1. Survival English
- Introduction of survival expressions to communicate in English. |
| | - Review: Cooperative Learning | 2. Getting your first impression
- Recalling of the previous lesson through questions. |
| | | 3. Cooperative Strategy
- *Think-Group-Share*: Discussion about the questions related to Cooperative Learning |
| | THE FAMILY | PREPARATION |
| | - Lesson goals | - Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection |
| | | Focus students’ attention
- *Think-Group-Share*:
  - Introduction of the topic: Do you have a big family? |
| | | 2. Setting the lesson goals: “Cooperative Brainstorming”
- Lesson goals presentation
- *Think-Group-Share*: Questions about the lesson goals. |
| | THE FAMILY | PRESENTATION AND MODEL ANALYSIS |
| | - The monolog | 1. Introduction to the topic: “Analysis of a model”
- *Think-Group-Share*: Introduction to the topic “Analysis of a model”: E-mail “About my family”.
- *Think-Group-Share*: The monolog and its characteristics. |
| | | - Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection |
| | | - Speaking Performance – Vocabulary Range Rating Chart |
| | | - Speaking Performance |
## 2. Modeling the task: Monolog
- Modeling a monolog.

### Vocabulary Frequency Grid

### STAGE 3: GETTING READY FOR THE FIRST SPEAKING TASK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE FAMILY</th>
<th>PRACTICE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Preparing for the speaking task  
- Checking and analyzing the model. |  |  |
| 2. Autonomous work  
- Template “My family”. |  |  |
| 3. Improving the autonomous work  
- *Think-Group-Share*:  
  Checking and improving students’ monologs. |  |  |
| 4. Feedback  
- Rehearsing of monologs. |  |  |

- Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection
- Rubric to Assess Speaking Performance and Interaction Tests
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE FAMILY</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>- Teacher's Journal: A Five-minute Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Teamwork</td>
<td>1. Speaking Task: Monolog</td>
<td>- Group Questionnaire to Assess Cooperative Learning to Improve Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Final Monologue.</td>
<td>- Students’ Journal: A Five-minute Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Group reflection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Think-Group-Share: Reflection on cooperative work as a team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Discussion and Reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Think-Group-Share: Assessment on Cooperative Learning work within the groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE FAMILY</td>
<td>FIRST SPEAKING TASK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Monolog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAGE 4: REINFORCING HOW CL WORKS**

<p>| LESSON AND TIME | PURPOSES | TOPIC AND SUBTOPICS | SECTIONS DESCRIPTION | DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS |
|-----------------|----------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                 |          |                      |                       |                            |                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons 5 and 6 (4 hours)</th>
<th>PEOPLE’S APPEARANCE AND PERSONALITY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ACTIVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- To comprehend and accept that everyone in the group needs to master the common set of information and/or skills.</td>
<td>- Survival English</td>
<td>1. Survival English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review: The family</td>
<td>- Introduction of survival expressions to communicate in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lesson goals</td>
<td>2. Getting your first impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Think-Group-Share</em>: Teacher and students’ recall of the topic studied the previous lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cooperative Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Think-Group-Share</em>: Questions about the family.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEOPLE’S APPEARANCE AND PERSONALITY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PREPARATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Lesson goals</td>
<td>1. Focus students’ attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Think-Group-Share</em>: Introduction of the topic: What does your best friend / family member / famous person look like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Setting the lesson goals: “Cooperative Brainstorming”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lesson goals presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Think-Group-Share</em>: Questions about the lesson goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEOPLE’S APPEARANCE AND PERSONALITY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTATION AND MODEL ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The description</td>
<td>1. Introduction to the topic: “Analysis of a model”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Think-Group-Share</em>: Introduction to the topic “Analysis of a model”: Description “What does he look like?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Think-Group-Share</em>: The description and its characteristics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection

- Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection

- Speaking Performance – Vocabulary Range Rating Chart

- Speaking Performance
## STAGE 5: GETTING READY FOR THE SECOND SPEAKING TASK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEOPLE’S APPEARANCE AND PERSONALITY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRACTICE</th>
<th>Vocabulary Frequency Grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Adjectives of appearance and personality</td>
<td>1. Preparing for the speaking task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Checking and analyzing the model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Autonomous work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Template “What does he look like”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Improving the autonomous work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Think-Group-Share</em>: Checking and improving students’ descriptions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rehearsing of descriptions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection
- Rubric to Assess Speaking Performance and Interaction Tests
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEOPLE’S APPEARANCE AND PERSONALITY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Speaking Task: Description</td>
<td>Group Questionnaire to Assess Cooperative Learning to Improve Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Final Description.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Group reflection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Think-Group-Share: Reflection on cooperative work as a team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Discussion and Reinforcement</td>
<td>Students’ Journal: A Five-minute Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Think-Group-Share: Assessment on Cooperative Learning work within the groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE’S APPEARANCE AND PERSONALITY DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>SECOND SPEAKING TASK</td>
<td>Rubric to Assess Speaking Performance and Interaction Tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAGE 6: GETTING PREPARED FOR THE FINAL SPEAKING TASK**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons 7 and 8</th>
<th>DAILY ROUTINES</th>
<th>ACTIVATION</th>
<th>- Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4 hours)</td>
<td>- To produce a dialogue in which they can speak about their daily routines.</td>
<td>1. Survival English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To determine students’ language learning in terms of vocabulary range and speaking performance</td>
<td>- Introduction of survival expressions to communicate in English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Survival English</td>
<td>2. Getting your first impression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review: People’s appearance and personality description</td>
<td>- Think-Group-Share: Teacher and students’ recall of the topic studied the previous lesson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAILY ROUTINES</td>
<td>3. Cooperative Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lesson goals</td>
<td>- Think-Group-Share: Questions about descriptions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARATION</td>
<td>1. Focus students’ attention</td>
<td>- Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Think-Group-Share: Introduction to the topic: What time do you wake up on school days?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Setting the lesson goals: “Cooperative Brainstorming”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lesson goals presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Think-Group-Share: Questions about the lesson goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAILY ROUTINES</td>
<td>PRESENTATION AND MODEL ANALYSIS</td>
<td>PRACTICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - The dialogue  | 1. Introduction to the topic: “Analysis of a model”  
- *Think-Group-Share*: Introduction to the topic “Analysis of a model”: Dialogue “Peter’s and John’s daily routine”.  
- *Think-Group-Share*: The dialogue and its characteristics.  
2. Modeling the task: Description  
- Modeling a dialogue. | 1. Preparing for the speaking task  
- Checking and analyzing the model.  
2. Autonomous work  
- Dialogues script  
3. Improving the autonomous work  
- *Think-Group-Share*: Checking and improving students’ dialogues.  
4. Feedback  
- Rehearsing of dialogues. |

- Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection  
- Speaking Performance – Vocabulary Range Rating Chart  
- Speaking Performance Vocabulary Frequency Grid  
- Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection  
- Rubric to Assess Speaking Performance and Interaction Tests
### DAILY ROUTINES
- Teamwork

### EVALUATION
1. Speaking Task: Dialogues
   - Final Dialogue.
   - Group reflection
   - *Think-Group-Share*: Reflection on cooperative work as a team.

2. Discussion and Reinforcement
   - *Think-Group-Share*: Assessment on Cooperative Learning work within the groups.

- Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection
- Group Questionnaire to Assess Cooperative Learning to Improve Speaking
- Students’ Journal: A Five-minute Reflection
- Individual Questionnaire to Assess Cooperative Learning to Improve Speaking

### FINAL SPEAKING TASK
- Rubric to Assess Speaking Performance and Interaction Tests
## Appendix F. Research Timeline

### AR STAGE 1 - PLANNING A CHANGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 24th, 2016</td>
<td>- To obtain the permission and approval from students’ parents or responsible adults and the schools’ principals to carry out this project.</td>
<td>Inform Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 8th, 2016</td>
<td>- To gather information about students’ learning process and their Speaking Performance in the English class.</td>
<td>Needs Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 10th to Jul. 8th, 2016</td>
<td>- To design the pedagogical intervention.</td>
<td>Pedagogical Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 13th, 2016</td>
<td>- To diagnose the speaking performance in terms of vocabulary range and oral interaction.</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AR - STAGE 2 - ACTING AND OBSERVING THE PROCESS AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE CHANGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Stages of the Intervention</th>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 24th / 28th, 2016</td>
<td>1. Training in CL</td>
<td>1 and 2 (4 hours) Lesson Plan 1: Cooperative Learning</td>
<td>- To sensitize students about CL</td>
<td>Individual Questionnaire to Assess Cooperative Learning to Improve Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To make students aware of the advantages of CL for their learning process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To help students become acquainted with TGS as a CL strategy</td>
<td>Group Questionnaire to Assess Cooperative Learning to Improve Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To guide students in the</td>
<td>Students’ Journal: A Five-minute Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s Journal - A five-minute reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aug. 2nd / 4th / 8th, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aug. 2nd / 4th / 8th, 2016</th>
<th>2. Teaching and learning in the CL approach</th>
<th>3, 4 and 5 (6 hours) Lesson Plan 2: The family</th>
<th>process of assuming roles according to their abilities.</th>
<th>Speaking Performance – Vocabulary Range Rating Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To teach students how to be responsible not only for learning the material being taught but also for helping teammates learn</td>
<td>Speaking Performance Vocabulary Frequency Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria to Assess Speaking Performance and Interaction Tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group Questionnaire to Assess Cooperative Learning to Improve Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ Journal: A Five-minute Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s Journal: A five-minute reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Getting ready for the first speaking task</td>
<td>3, 4 and 5 (6 hours) Lesson Plan 2: The family</td>
<td>- To determine their language learning in terms of vocabulary range and speaking performance</td>
<td>Criteria to Assess Speaking Performance and Interaction Tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Lesson Plan Details</td>
<td>Additional Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Aug. 23rd / 25th / 30th, 2016 | 4. Reinforcing how CL works                                                | 6, 7 and 8 (6 hours) Lesson plan 3: People’s appearance and personality description | - To comprehend and accept that everyone in the group needs to master the common set of information and/or skills  
- To produce a description in which they can speak about a famous person, a friend or relative |
|                    |                                                                           |                                                                                      | Speaking Performance – Vocabulary Range Rating Chart                                |
|                    |                                                                           |                                                                                      | Speaking Performance Vocabulary Frequency Grid                                      |
|                    |                                                                           |                                                                                      | Criteria to assess Speaking Performance and Interaction Tests                       |
|                    |                                                                           |                                                                                      | Group Questionnaire to Assess Cooperative Learning to Improve Speaking              |
|                    |                                                                           |                                                                                      | Students’ Journal: A Five-minute Reflection                                         |
|                    |                                                                           |                                                                                      | Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection                                         |
| Sep. 1st / 13th / 15th, 2016 | 5. Getting ready for the second speaking task                             | 6, 7 and 8 (6 hours) Lesson plan 3: People’s appearance and personality description |                                                                                     |
|                    |                                                                           | - To determine their language learning in terms of vocabulary range and speaking performance |                                                                                     |
|                    |                                                                           |                                                                                      | Criteria to assess Speaking Performance and Interaction Tests                       |
|                    |                                                                           |                                                                                      |                                                                                     |
|                     | 6. Getting prepared for the final speaking task                           | 9, 10 and 11 (6 hours) Lesson plan 4: Daily routines                                  |                                                                                     |
|                    |                                                                           | - To determine students’ language learning in terms of vocabulary range and speaking performance |                                                                                     |
|                    |                                                                           | - To produce a dialog in which they can speak about their daily routines             |                                                                                     |
|                    |                                                                           |                                                                                      | Speaking Performance – Vocabulary Range Rating Chart                                |
|                    |                                                                           |                                                                                      | Speaking Performance Vocabulary Frequency Grid                                      |
|                    |                                                                           |                                                                                      | Criteria to assess Speaking Performance and Interaction Tests                       |
|                    |                                                                           |                                                                                      | Group Questionnaire to Assess Cooperative Learning to Improve Speaking              |
|                    |                                                                           |                                                                                      | Individual Questionnaire to Assess Cooperative Learning to Improve Speaking        |
## AR STAGE 3 - REFLECTING ON THE PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 22nd, 2016</td>
<td>- To assess the speaking performance in terms of vocabulary range and oral interaction.</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 22nd to Oct, 22nd, 2016</td>
<td>- To reflect on the effects of the process.</td>
<td>Students’ Journal: A Five-minute Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Performance – Vocabulary Range Rating Chart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G. Sections of the lesson plans (Sample)

LESSON PLAN 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of co-researchers: XXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Code Number: 201324493-201324491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions: Arborizadora Alta IED - Colegio Cundinamarca IED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Class: Day: 3 Month: August Year: 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week No. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame: 110 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/grade: Seventh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students: 40 per class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of students: A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Students will talk about their families by using at least 10 new words about family. They will also use simple sentences with the verbs to be and to have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Learning to Learn Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Students in each team will be responsible not only for learning the material being taught but also for helping their teammates learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Communicative Skill) Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Students will be able to produce a monolog in which they can speak about their family members for about 1 minute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify a topic for the lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Family members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Materials and Resources

| Material 1 Name: Let’s focus our attention | Rationale: This symbol is used to facilitate learners to identify the moment of the class when they have to focus their attention on the task proposed. | Annex 1: Focus symbol. |
| Material 2 Name: About my family | Rationale: This text is presented as a modeling one, which will allow the teacher to introduce the topic to the students. | Annex 2: Text (e-mail) |
| Material 3 Name: Think Group Share Symbol | Rationale: This symbol is used to facilitate learners to identify the moment of the class when they have to use the Think Group Share strategy. | Annex 3: Think Group Share Symbol |
| Material 4 Name: My family | Rationale: This template is used to provide students with a guide in order to write their own texts about their families. | Annex 4: Template |
| Material 5 Name: Dictionaries | Rationale: Students use their English dictionaries to understand unknown vocabulary. | |

Assumed knowledge

- Students may have some ideas about the verb to be and other verbs.
- Students may know some key vocabulary related to the physical description, nationalities, and ages.

Anticipated problems and planned solutions

- Students will feel confused with the kind of language used in the written text.
- Students will be afraid of making mistakes in front of others.
- Students may experience problems working in the groups set due to their personalities.
- Students have the opportunity to work in teams, and help each other in order to overcome the possible stressing moments.

The teacher completes the Teacher’s Journal: A Five-minute Reflection during the class where she keeps a record of students’ reactions, concerns or problems, and other comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s role</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Procedure Teacher and students’ actions</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activator</td>
<td>Activatin</td>
<td>To recall previous lessons</td>
<td>Students get together in their groups.</td>
<td>T-S S-T S-S</td>
<td>20’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher introduces some survival expressions to encourage students to communicate in English.

The ones that are going to be focused in this lesson are:

- We have a question
- Slower, please.
- I/We don’t understand
- Can you repeat that, please?
- How do you spell that?
- Last class we …
- How much time do we have?
- Am I pronouncing this word properly?
- This is my monolog
- What do you think about it?

2. Getting your first impression

Students are called to remember what was done in the last class. Teacher asks some questions to guide them:

- What is Cooperative Learning for?
- Why is it useful for the English class?
- What are the rules to work in Cooperative Learning groups?

Students take notes on their notebooks. Students use the Think Group Share strategy.

Then the presenter reports conclusions to the class. The teacher writes on the board the most important ideas and complements them.

2. Cooperative Strategy

Students use the Think Group Share strategy in order to answer the questions of activity No. 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitator Preparation</th>
<th>To introduce the topic</th>
<th>1. Focus students’ attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T-S S-T S-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher writes on the board the following question:

- “Do you have a big family?”

Students discuss the question by using the Think Group Share strategy in order to answer the previous question.

2. Setting the lesson goals: “Cooperative Brainstorming”

- Teachers write the 2 kinds of goals on the board: a. Language goal and b. Cooperative learning goal.
- Students read the objectives and analyze them in teams by answering some questions given by the teacher.

The teacher asks the following question to students.

- What language do you need to talk about your family? (Vocabulary and grammar).

Students use the Think Group Share strategy in order to answer the previous question.

Then, each team’s presenter reports ideas to the class and the teacher adds more information if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Presentation and Model Analysis</th>
<th>To provide input to students to help them get familiar with the topic of the family.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|             | 1. Introduction to the topic: “Analysis of a model” | Language goal
The teacher displays an e-mail: “About my family” (Annex 2.) and plays the corresponding audio recording. |
The teacher explains to them that a monolog about their families is what she expects students to do at the end of the lesson, but in an oral way.

Then students fill in the first part “Before the CL intervention” of the Speaking Performance - Vocabulary Range Rating Chart

The teacher explains them that one of the functions of the speed captain is also to keep record of the students’ interventions of English, therefore he has to complete the Speaking Performance Vocabulary Frequency Grid during the lesson.

Students use the Think Group Share strategy in order to determine what a monolog is and what its characteristics are.

Then, each team’s presenter reports ideas to the class and the teacher adds more information if necessary.

Cooperative Learning goal
Teacher shows the sign (Annex 3.) that let students know that they have to use the strategy Think Group Share.

Teacher shows the card that guides students to think about the following five questions:

- What is the e-mail about?
- Who writes the e-mail? Who is she writing to?
- Who is Kelly talking about?
- What words does she use to talk about her family?

Students use the Think Group Share strategy in order to answer the previous questions.
Then, each team’s presenter reports ideas to the class and the teacher adds more information if necessary.

### 2. Modeling the task: Monolog

The teacher tells students they have to describe their families as part of the evaluation stage of the lesson.

She gives them some hints on how to present their descriptions:

- They have 1 minute to present it.
- It is important to check their pronunciation before presenting it.
- They have to present their monologs to the members of the team.

The teacher describes her family as a model, in this way students can have an idea of what they are expected to do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>To develop particular activities in order to reach the language goal and the cooperative goal.</th>
<th>T-S</th>
<th>20’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourager</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Preparing for the speaking task</td>
<td>S-T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider of feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students look again at and listen to the e-mail “About my family”.</td>
<td>S-S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individually, students write a similar paragraph about their families, they will follow the model presented in the text. At the end of the lessons they present it in an oral way, as a monolog.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Autonomous work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As a piece of homework, students receive a Template “My family” (Annex 4.), to write a similar text about their families. They have to present it, next class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Improving the autonomous work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Through the Think Group Share strategy students check and improve their texts:

- **Think**: Students adapt the model to their situation. Students can ask questions to the teacher, and the teacher goes around the class to help students.
- **Group**: Students share their texts with the members of the team, give and receive comments.
- **Share**: (This step is part of the evaluation stage.)

The teacher shows students the *Rubric to Assess Speaking Performance and Interaction Tests*, which is used to assess their monolog.

### 4. Feedback

In teams, students rehearse their monologs. The following strategies are used:

- They use mirrors in order to look at themselves.
- They record their monologs in their cellphones and then listen to them in order to improve them.
- Volunteers can ask the teacher for her opinion and suggestions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guide</th>
<th>Summarizer</th>
<th>Scaffolder</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>To determine their language learning in terms of vocabulary range and speaking performance.</th>
<th>1. Speaking Task: Monolog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Share</strong>: Students choose a member of the team, the one they consider has the best monolog and he/she presents it orally to the rest of the class. The grade this student gets is the grade the whole team gets.</td>
<td><strong>T-S</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2. Group reflection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After the group tasks have been completed, students reflect upon how they worked together as a team in relation to the aspects mentioned in the</td>
<td><strong>S-T</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>S-S</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40’</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group Questionnaire to Assess Cooperative Learning to Improve Speaking.

Students use the Think Group Share strategy in order to analyze the previous aspects.

3. Discussion and Reinforcement

Once the analysis is done, each student completes the Students’ Journal: A Five-minute Reflection activity. It is a journal, where they have the opportunity to assess Cooperative Learning, vocabulary range, speaking interaction and performance, opportunities to speak and Self-Directed Learning. It is done through the Think Group Share strategy.

Then, each team’s presenter reports ideas to the class.

The teacher reinforces and complements the information given. She summarizes the key ideas, language, and structures used during the lesson.

See Annex next page to identify key issues to consider when planning.

Annexes

Annex 1.
Dear Yoko,

Let me tell you about my family. I live with my mum, my dad, my big sister and my little brother. We live in California. My mum’s name is Carmen. She’s short and very smart. My dad’s name is David. He’s tall and very talkative. My sister Shania is 14 years old and she loves listening to music. My brother’s name is Michael, he is 3 years old and he loves drawing. We have a pet dog, Brandy. He’s black and white and very friendly.

Write soon and tell me about your family.

Love

Kelly
Annex 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THINK</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>SHARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![Think Image]</td>
<td>![Group Image]</td>
<td>![Share Image]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THINK</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>SHARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![Think Image]</td>
<td>![Group Image]</td>
<td>![Share Image]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4.

My family

Dear _____,

Let me tell you about my family. I live with my ____________, my ____________, my big/little brother/sister and my big/little brother/sister. We live in ____________. My mum’s name is _____________. She’s ____________ and very _____________. My dad’s name is ____________. He’s _____________. My sister/brother ____________ is ____________ years old and she/he loves ____________. My sister’s/brother’s name is ____________, she/he is ____________ years old and she/he loves ____________. We have a/ don’t have any pet dog, ____________. It’s ____________ and ____________ and ____________.

Write soon and tell me about your family.

Love

father____________
## Appendix H. Vocabulary Range Rating Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before the Cooperative Learning Intervention</th>
<th>After the Cooperative Learning Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write below the words, expressions or short sentences I know related to the topic of study Time: 5 minutes</td>
<td>Words, expressions, short sentences I learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ______________________________________</td>
<td>1. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ______________________________________</td>
<td>2. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ______________________________________</td>
<td>3. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ______________________________________</td>
<td>4. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ______________________________________</td>
<td>5. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ______________________________________</td>
<td>6. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ______________________________________</td>
<td>7. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ______________________________________</td>
<td>8. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ______________________________________</td>
<td>9. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ______________________________________</td>
<td>10. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ______________________________________</td>
<td>11. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ______________________________________</td>
<td>12. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. ______________________________________</td>
<td>13. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ______________________________________</td>
<td>14. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ______________________________________</td>
<td>15. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. ______________________________________</td>
<td>16. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ______________________________________</td>
<td>17. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. ______________________________________</td>
<td>18. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. ______________________________________</td>
<td>19. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. ______________________________________</td>
<td>20. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. ______________________________________</td>
<td>21. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. ______________________________________</td>
<td>22. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. ______________________________________</td>
<td>23. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. ______________________________________</td>
<td>24. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. ______________________________________</td>
<td>25. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. ______________________________________</td>
<td>26. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. ______________________________________</td>
<td>27. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. ______________________________________</td>
<td>28. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. ______________________________________</td>
<td>29. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. ______________________________________</td>
<td>30. ______________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students’ revision total: __________________
Teacher’s revision comments:

Students’ revision total: __________________
Teacher’s revision comments:
Appendix I. Results Pre-test, Tasks, and Post-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA TO ASSESS SPEAKING PERFORMANCE AND SPEAKING INTERACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKING PERFORMANCE: VOCABULARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Impression Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLEGIO CUNDINAMARCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I. Speaking Performance Vocabulary Frequency Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group # ____</th>
<th>STUDENTS NAME</th>
<th>Group members</th>
<th># Interventions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix J. Survival English expressions**

### Survival English Expressions

#### COACH

1. Let’s discuss
2. That’s interesting, but let’s get back to our task
3. Your idea is great!
4. Does everyone understand what to do?
5. Let’s start by…
6. Let’s keep to the task we have got to complete
7. Let’s focus or attention

#### SPEED CAPTAIN

1. Let’s get more
2. Let’s hurry
3. We only have five minutes left
4. Time is almost over
5. Time’s up!
6. Shall we move onto the next part, as time is moving on?
7. Let’s try to get this finished, we’ve only got a few minutes left

#### PRESENTER

1. How would you like this to sound?
2. Do you think this sounds good?
3. Shall I start with?
4. How does this sound…?

#### RECORDER

1. Can you explain what you mean?
2. What is your main idea?
3. Focus your idea, please
4. I think I Heard you say _____. Is that right?
5. How would you like me to write this?
6. Wait a second, I’m taking notes
7. Have I written that so it makes sense?
8. So, what you’re saying is…
9. Let’s summarize that

#### GIVING OPINIONS

1. Another example is…
2. I’d like to add…
3. I agree with ____ because…
4. I disagree with _____ because…
5. I’d like to go back to what _____ said about…
6. Can you tell me more?

#### SHARING TIME

1. My group is integrated by …, …,
2. Our group concluded, decided, that…
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESSON PLAN #1 COOPERATIVE LEARNING</th>
<th>LESSON PLAN #2 THE FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How do you say ______ in English?</td>
<td>1. I/We have a question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What’s the meaning of______ in Spanish?</td>
<td>2. Slower, please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher, can you come here, please?</td>
<td>3. I / We don’t understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How do you spell ______?</td>
<td>4. Can you repeat that, please?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How do you pronounce this word?</td>
<td>5. How do you spell that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do I sit here?</td>
<td>6. Last class we …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is this my role?</td>
<td>7. How much time do we have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Our team color is ___</td>
<td>8. Am I pronouncing this word properly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am the ____ (role)</td>
<td>9. This is my monologue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. We are done</td>
<td>10. What do you think about it?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESSON PLAN #3 PHYSICAL DESCRIPTIONS</th>
<th>LESSON #4 PLAN ROUTINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How do you write this?</td>
<td>1. How can I pronounce this word?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can you help me, please?</td>
<td>2. We are done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Can you lend me a _____?</td>
<td>3. Time’s up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can I borrow your______?</td>
<td>4. Listen to each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Can you play it again, please?</td>
<td>5. Is this right / wrong?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Can you check this, please?</td>
<td>6. Use English as much as you can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. You could improve the part where you say...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K. Speaking Performance Vocabulary Frequency Grid Results