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Abstract

Previous studies on technological devices in language improvement have indicated that audio and video features can be useful for oral production improvement. However, little attention has been paid to the self-assessment process that students can do through audio recording and its impact on spoken accuracy. The overall aim of this study was to identify the use of self-assessment strategies and two web 2.0 tools in language accuracy in a group of thirty-nine A2 level students at a public school in Bogota. The data collection process involved participant voice recordings, self-assessment checklists and logs and teacher field notes. After the data analysis and triangulation, there was evidence that students were able to self-monitor their language production, producing richer and more complex utterances. Additionally, computer-based tasks provided students with the opportunity to use and improve their speaking skills outside the classroom. The use of self-assessment strategies within the EFL classrooms represents a big chance to change the dynamics of language learning and teaching. Technology (web 2.0 tools) served as the vehicle for language learning. Consequently, this study evidenced a close relationship between self-assessment strategies and spoken accuracy. The pedagogical implication of this study offers teachers and researchers an opportunity to explore the use of technology and self-assessment as a trigger of language development in the EFL classrooms.

Keywords: Self-assessment, Web (2.0 tools), speaking accuracy
Resumen

Estudios previos sobre dispositivos tecnológicos para mejorar el lenguaje han indicado que los elementos de audio y video pueden ser útiles para mejorar la producción oral. Sin embargo, se ha prestado poca atención al proceso de autoevaluación que los estudiantes pueden hacer a través del uso de grabaciones y su impacto en producción oral. El objetivo general de este estudio fue identificar el uso de estrategias de autoevaluación y herramientas web 2.0 para mejorar las habilidades comunicativas en un grupo de treinta y nueve estudiantes de nivel A2 en una escuela pública de Bogotá. El proceso de recolección de datos implicó: grabaciones de voz de los participantes, rúbricas de autoevaluación y diario de campo del profesor. El análisis y triangulación de datos reveló que los estudiantes fueron capaces de monitorear su producción comunicativa, evidenciando una mejora en el nivel de inglés de los estudiantes. Las tareas basadas en el uso de herramientas web 2.0 ofrecieron a los estudiantes la oportunidad de utilizar y mejorar sus habilidades de conversación fuera del aula. El uso de estrategias de autoevaluación dentro de las aulas de inglés como lengua extranjera representa una gran oportunidad para cambiar la dinámica de la enseñanza y aprendizaje de idiomas. Tecnología como las herramientas web 2.0 sirvieron como vehículo de aprendizaje de idiomas. En consecuencia, este estudio pone de manifiesto la estrecha relación entre las estrategias de autoevaluación y el desarrollo de la habilidad de hablar una segunda lengua. La implicación pedagógica de este estudio ofrece a los profesores e investigadores la oportunidad de explorar el uso de la tecnología y la autoevaluación como desencadenante del desarrollo del lenguaje en los salones de clase.

Palabras claves: Autoevaluación, Tecnología (Web 2.0), habilidades comunicativas.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction to the study

The growth of technology during the recent decades have made foreign language learning a priority. Social interaction around the world has increased. Johnson (2013) highlights that “the planet has become smaller, and the means for moving around easier, so it has become more multicultural and multilingual” (p.5). Hence, twenty-first-century societies require individuals able to communicate with people all around the world effectively. As a result, governments have created regulations and programs to enhance foreign language learning and teaching. In Colombia, the Ministry of Education (MEN) created the project “Colombia Very Well 2015-2025” that attempts to develop its citizen’s competences in English. At the school level, this program suggests that the methodology used in the classroom should emphasize the provision of real communicative experiences to learners.

Despite the fact that new methodologies have been implemented in schools across the country, there is still a need to improve language teaching and the learning process inside the classroom. Although students finish high school having some abilities in reading and writing in a foreign language, in most cases, their speaking performance is low compared with the international standards set by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR, hereafter). Speaking in a second language involves the development of certain types of communication skills. Oral language tends to differ from written language due to its circumstances of production (Bygate, 1987). He implies that rather than an ability that is naturally acquired, learning to speak in an L2 is a skill that needs to be taught. Thornbury (2005) claims that the speaking process involves more than the ability to form grammatically correct
sentences and then pronounce them. Hence, to have more qualified learners, appropriate strategies and practical learning tools are required.

Self-assessment is then one of these strategies, as stated by Donato (2000) that allows bidirectional flow of information in which both teacher and student are involved in the progress of student’s learning. The present study attempts to provide learners with self-assessment opportunities to enhance their speaking accuracy by recognizing their strengths and weaknesses. Participants monitored and assessed their oral production by analyzing a set of recording activities. This project is beneficial not only for English classes but also for any academic challenge students might face.

In recent decades, innovations in information and communication technologies (ICTs) have changed the way people interact and communicate. Furthermore, the development of multimedia technology and its application for teaching (featuring audio, visual, and animation effects) has offered a favorable platform to diversify and explore language teaching practices. Cutting edge technology creates new challenges and duties to teachers and administrators harnessing the advantages of ICTs for teaching/learning a second language is the aim of this research project. It attempts to help learners to Foster their speaking skills by using an interactive platform (Englishcentral.com) and a voice message board (Voxopop™). It is expected that self-assessment strategies help engage students to monitor their own English learning progress, while the use of a voice message board (Voxopop™ ) gives learners the tools to monitor their communication progress as well as to correct minor errors.
1.2 **Rationale of the study**

The participants of this project displayed a high level of interest in improving their verbal ability concerning language accuracy. The needs analysis stage concluded that traditional English teaching practices had reduced students’ learning process to grammar-based classes, hampering the learner’s ability to communicate and interact spontaneously. This form-focused instruction (Ellis, 1997) seems to have a negative impact on student’s oral production. Additionally, a great deal of the teaching processes relies on books and pre-recorded material as sources of input. In this scenario, the teacher’s instruction seems to focus on vocabulary memorization, conjugation rules, grammar, and syntax. Indeed, learners seem to be able to manipulate relatively lengthy and complex constructions that are more likely to be used on written than on spoken language (Thornbury, 2005). Those results led the researcher to implement a strategy that helps students to improve their spoken accuracy.

Self-assessment tasks and audio-recording activities arose as the strategies intended to foster participants’ spoken accuracy by engaging them to speak on a student-friendly environment, allowing them to reflect and become aware of their learning process. Several studies have demonstrated that when learners observe, monitor and assess their work, they improve their reading and writing performance over time (Wilches, 2014; Butler & Lee, 2010; Boisvert & Rao, 2014). With this in mind, this project analyzed the impact of self-assessment strategies on students’ spoken accuracy in simple past statements.
1.2.1 Needs analysis and problem statement

The target demographic for this research is a group of 39 ninth graders (A2 level according to the CEFR), (2001) whose ages vary between 14 and 15 years old. They study at a public school located in Bogota - Colombia. Even though IECS is not a public school, all the students come from the public sector due to an agreement between IECS and the Secretaria de Educacion Distrital de Bogota. The needs analysis process implemented with these students concluded that a majority of the students had speaking difficulties when talking about past events. The situation as mentioned above is evident in the population under investigation. When facing spontaneous oral production, the lack of accuracy on the use of past-inflected verb forms seems to be a constant for the students. This problem tends to be unnoticeable by students due to the lack of self-awareness of their language production.

The English educational approach used in the school is the communicative approach. Likewise, the curriculum establishes that the English classes should promote student interaction with the target language. However, the teacher-researcher has observed that work in the English classroom remains traditional. Teachers tend to focus their classes on grammatical aspects of the English language. Most of the time students work using the textbook provided by the school, and the English classes are based on rote activities. As a result, learners have achieved average grammatical skills while their communicative abilities (oral language production) seem to be hampered.

Two instruments were used to analyze student needs more precisely: interviews and a survey. An initial interview captured data on problems participants had been experiencing with grammatical accuracy when speaking, especially when talking about past experiences. It was found (see interview transcriptions in Appendix A) that students struggled to produce correct
utterances when using past structures. One of the most common problems encountered was that participants tended to use present simple structures when talking about the past. Participants also overgeneralized irregular verbs by adding “ed” endings. They seemed to know only a limited number of irregular verbs together with their past forms. Auxiliary verb omission when asking questions or making negative statements also appeared to be a constant throughout participants’ interview transcripts.

An online survey was used to collect participants’ perceptions about the English class and their performance. Most participants considered the lack of motivation as one of the main problems encountered in their learning. The lack of technology as a learning tool in the English learning process was one of the results of the survey conducted (see Appendix B). Participants also seemed to be unfamiliar with the concepts of self-assessment and autonomy. Throughout their schooling, participants were assessed through traditional procedures in which the responsibility laid most of the time with the teacher. These findings suggested the teacher-researcher focus his attention on creating strategies that foster the student’s awareness of the importance of a self-assessment process to monitor their English language performance.

1.2.2 Justification of problem’s significance

The low level of communicative competence in English might represent an economic issue for the students as they tend to pay for English courses to achieve higher language proficiency. But, most importantly, it forces them to delay their admission process at the university. Recent Colombian scholarship program “Ser Pilo Paga” benefits students from low socioeconomic background to pursue a degree program. This scholarship requires students to be able to cope with the university bilingualism standards as some of the core classes are taught only in English. School students with no scholarship benefit also struggle with the lack of
language proficiency when pursuing a degree program. As universities in Colombia have been requiring students a minimum B1 level (independent users according to the Common European Framework Reference, 2001), students that fail to achieve the required level tend to take additional courses to acquire the competencies needed. Others tend to look for institutions where they can study without this requirement. With this in mind, achieving appropriate competences in English by the end of high school is a crucial goal for students. Both state and private schools in Colombia need to ensure students acquire the necessary level of English to continue with higher education. Having average grammatical skills in writing but being unable to interact accurately orally might not be enough to succeed at a professional level. Moreover, the lack of self-awareness regarding their academic progress might also have a negative impact on students’ professional life.

Furthermore, during the last decade, many Latin-American countries, including Colombia, share the same idea: to become an active participant in a globalized world. This idea implies building a democratic, participatory and responsible society (Light, Manso, & Noguera, 2009). To make this possible, the educational system plays a crucial role. National educational policies must respond to the country’s social needs and interests. Therefore, state and private institutions need to meet the challenges that a globalized world demands, especially in language proficiency. Locating the source of the difficulty and creating strategies to tackle the communicative issues that the population of this project is experiencing could represent a small contribution to the broader goal of creating students able to interact beyond borders, using the English language as a vehicle of communication.
1.2.3 Strategy selected to address the problem

The growing demand for lifelong learners and reflective students suggested a change in the way the education process has been assessed. It is widely accepted that self-assessment is a key learning strategy for autonomous language learning that enables learners to monitor their progress (Harris, 1997). It encourages students to have a clear perception of their growth and it relates learning to individual needs. Thus, the strategy proposed to tackle the problem under investigation suggested the use of self-assessment strategies to foster speaking accuracy, since participants seemed to be unaware of the grammar mistakes they make when talking. As stated by Carter and Nunan (2001), a great deal of the students’ success lies in the assessment process: “Participating in self-assessment can assist learners to become skilled judges of their own strengths and weaknesses and to set realistic goals for themselves, thus developing their capacity to become self-directed” (p. 140).

This strategy would encourage students to appraise their performance accurately enough to avoid relying on a teacher’s perception of their progress. However, taking into consideration the students’ age, context, and the methodology (grammar-based) to which they had been exposed, it is to select a tool that engages students in their learning progress and facilitates the process.

The use of new technologies has served the current education system as the vehicle for cross-cultural interaction (Kozma, 2003). It represents a convenient tool for students’ engagement. Thus, for this study, the teacher-researcher created a website through which the students were to complete a set of activities that included voice recording and self-assessment activities. The use of Web 2.0 tools also helps the researcher address the problematic situation.
1.3 Research question and objective

Based on the previous arguments, the objectives of this study were to determine the influence that the use of self-assessment strategies has on enhancing grammatical accuracy with simple past tenses in speech as well as to determine the effectiveness of using ICT-based tools to improve participants’ accurate use of simple past structures. The corresponding research question was: Does the use of Web 2.0 tools and self-assessment strategies influence grammatical accuracy with simple past tenses in speech with a group of A2 teenage learners? And, if so, how?

1.4 Conclusion

Speaking skills are crucial in the students’ learning process. They help them achieve better educational outcomes and better positioning in their future careers. The use of self-assessment strategies provides students with lifelong learning skills that can be transferred to other fields or subjects. Additionally, technology use emerged as a significant tool for language teaching and learning. Its application provides an opportunity for learners to enhance their communicative skills by individualizing their practice and joining a global community of learners (Carter & Nunan, 2001).

Thus, it is essential to review the literature related to self-assessment strategies and their use on speaking accuracy. The role of technology in students’ language enhancement needs to be also discussed. Those issues would help to set the basis for this action research project.
Chapter 2: Theoretical framework & state of the art

2.1 Introduction

Several studies have shown how communicative activities inside the classroom facilitate spontaneous interaction. Concerning spoken accuracy, Regan, Howard, and Lemee (2009) suggest that accuracy is not necessarily acquired inside the classroom only, but it is also fostered as the interaction between learners and teachers increases by employing online tools and asynchronous activities. With this in mind, the present study had as its primary objective to enhance the students’ spoken accuracy in past tense utterances using self-assessment in audio-recording activities.

Since the deficiency detected in this context was the lack of oral communication accuracy, self-assessment arose as the strategy to address this situation because students had the opportunity to identify and reflect upon their language development. In Gardner’s (1999) words, it provided the student with the opportunity to self-reflect, self-monitor and self-evaluate their learning process. Equally important, technology (audio-recordings) served as a strategy to tackle the problem detected due to its positive impact on students' learning process, in Ojeda’s (2011) words, the intensity of student engagement occurs when technology is integrated into the classroom.

This chapter presents an overview of constructs related to speaking and communicative competence, the role of self-assessment in one’s educational process and the use of CALL (Computer-Assisted Language Learning) in language learning and teaching. Finally, it will thoroughly review the primary studies conducted about the use of self-assessment strategies and technology in speaking enhancement.
2.2 Theoretical framework

2.2.1 Communicative competence and speaking

Communicative competence is a broad term that involves linguistic or grammatical competence. It refers to the ability to use prior knowledge to interpret and produce meaningful insights according to the specific situation (Chomsky, 1965). Similarly, Hymes (1972) argues that communicative competence deals with the knowledge of a language that enables users to convey meaning and to understand others’ messages within concrete situations effectively. Hymes (1972) also highlights that grammatical knowledge is not sufficient for communicating, He suggests that successful communication involves the combination of different abilities such as socio-linguistic skills, lexical knowledge, and discourse (among others). Thus, a competent language user knows when and how to use language independent of actual knowledge of grammar structures (Hymes, 1972). In order words, users need to use the language not only correctly (linguistic competence) but also appropriately (communicative competence). These assumptions echo Canale and Swain’s (1980) ideas about communicative competence as the skill required in communication that synthesized knowledge of vocabulary and sociolinguistic conventions to succeed in communicative events. The perspective mentioned above becomes relevant for this study since it shows the pathway to improve participants’ oral production.

This project is concerned with the development of discourse competence since it refers to “the selection, sequencing, and arrangement of words, structures, sentences, and utterances to achieve a unified spoken text” (Canale & Swain, 1980; p.14) specifically, as pertaining to seeking accuracy. With this being said, the analysis of speaking a skill plays a crucial role in this study due to the need that participants displayed to produce accurate utterances when describing past experiences orally.
2.2.2 Speaking accuracy

According to Hatch (1992), speaking is described as a highly contextualized, environment-dependent, interactive and unplanned performance based on speakers’ competences. Lantolf (1994) went further into the definition, and he describes speaking as “the developmental process that takes place through participation in cultural, linguistic and historically formed settings such as family life, peer group interaction and institutional contexts like schools (p.418). One of the key elements of speaking is grammar accuracy which Odlin (1994) refers to “an internalized system. That is, mental structures that guide everyday linguistic behavior” (p.5). Ommagio (1993) claims that grammar has a direct connection with accuracy which refers to “the acceptability, quality and precision of the message conveyed” (p.17).

Similarly, according to Ebsworth (1998), a chunk or stream of speech should be accurate regarding pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax to fulfill comprehension.

The CEFR (2001) states that the balance between grammar accuracy and speaking skills determines the speaker’s proficiency level in terms of performance and competence. In Nunan’s (1999) words, the ability to function in another language is often measured by being able to speak that language. Therefore, it is essential to promote in students not only the skill of conveying meaning, but it is also relevant to help them build their ideas using correct grammatical structures. In this respect, the CERF (2001) states that speaking a foreign language requires non-native speakers to accomplish certain levels of speaking proficiency to be understood by others for various purposes in different context and domains.

This assumption brings up the issue of language learning and teaching in educational settings. Krashen (1995) suggests that the language learning process occurs in two scenarios: acquisition and learning. The former is a subconscious process identical to learning a native
language (L1). Second language (L2) internalization occurs when learners face meaningful interaction in the target language and when that interaction is reinforced by practicing. Krashen (1995) suggests that the learner’s brain does not focus on grammatical rules but instead on the communicative act. The latter requires learners to improve communication and acquisition by full immersion in a natural setting or context. The natural approach argues that when learners are exposed to a simple amount of comprehensible input (CI), they will be able to internalize the new language naturally rather than in a forced classroom environment.

According to Scrivener (2005) in traditional schools and some university settings, students are expected to identify and understand decontextualized grammatical structures without using them in authentic conversations. The type of speaking interaction that participants from this project have been exposed to consists of short, often fragmented utterances. Language teaching is concerned with the development of skills in brief interactional exchanges in which learners only require to make one or two utterances at a time (Nunan, 1989). Moving from speaking production to accuracy, Ellis (2008) coincides with Bygate (1987) in the sense that accuracy will highly depend on what happens with the language in the classroom and how typically it is used outside in relation to the content, reason, participants, and means of communication. There seems to be a gap between what students learn in the classroom and their actual performance in terms of speaking production. In Colombian schooling system, there are barely any end-of-the-term tests that measure students’ speaking performance in the foreign language. Instead, students continuously face paper-and-pencil type of exams to assess the target structures/vocabulary taught during the term. In this regard, Brown (2007) states that EFL learners will most probably comprehend limited concepts but are also likely to produce them inaccurately in almost any tense and aspect.
According to Nunan (1989), the bottom-up approach to speaking suggests that learner’s speaking process moves from the smallest unit of language, mastery of words and sentences to discourse. However, to achieve speaking accuracy, teaching processes should follow a top-down process. Nunan (1989) suggests that rather than teaching learners to make well-structured sentences and putting these to use in discourse, the speaking process should encourage learners to take part in the discourse. With this in mind, the teacher’s understanding of speaking in terms of knowledge and skill is crucial to prepare students to be able to communicate effectively using the target language.

2.2.3 Speaking - knowledge and skill

The vision of speaking from knowledge and speaking as a skill represents a crucial aspect of this action research project. As claimed in chapter 1, students at IECS are continuously exposed to grammar-based classes while the communicative component of seems to be undervalued. Bygate (1987) claims that to speak a foreign language, it is necessary to know a certain amount of vocabulary and grammar. Indeed, knowledge of the language is vital to convey meaning. According to Richards (2006) language learners need to use what they know about the language to organize the topics, select the vocabulary to be used, work on the appropriate grammar elements, and be aware of intonation and pronunciation of words as well as the roles of the participants. However, this “over-use” of grammar instruction has a negative impact on students oral performance. Thornbury’s (2005) claims agree with students’ perceptions about the use of grammar in the ELT classrooms: “It is this lack of genuine speaking opportunities which accounts for many students feeling that, however much grammar and vocabulary they know, they are insufficiently prepared for speaking in the real world beyond the classroom” (p.28).
Indeed, there is a difference between knowledge about the language (grammatical rules, syntax, and vocabulary) and skill in using it. Speaking as a productive skill is related to the ability of language learners to efficiently process information during the conversation (Harmer, 1991). This assumption echoes Brown’s (1983) ideas which imply that speaking skills deal with the ability to process messages so that utterances produced are appropriate within the context of the conversation and the produced utterances meet the purpose of the conversation. In other words, “we do not merely know how to assemble sentences in the abstract: we have to produce them and adapt them to the circumstances and adjust our conversation as unexpected problems appear in our path” (Bygate, 1987 p.3).

The purpose of the present study was to improve speaking accuracy by facilitating communicative events within the classroom. Brown (1994), Burns & Joyce (1997) claim that promoting interaction in controlled speaking activities enable students to negotiate meaning and to improve their speaking skills by developing aspects such as turn-taking, rephrasing, providing feedback or redirecting social skills to succeed in any communicative act. Like L1 speakers, L2 speakers produce speech through the process of conceptualizing, then formulating and finally articulating during which time they are also self-monitoring (Thornbury, 2005). This last assumption underlines the importance of the assessment process in language learning.

2.2.4 Assessment and self-assessment

The assessment process is one of the critical aspects of language learning. Assessment in English Language Teaching (ELT) focuses on gathering data and placing a value on something (Burhan, 2009). Through assessment, teachers expect to discover what students can do at a particular stage of their learning process. According to Boud (1995), all assessments comprise two main components: making decisions about the standards of performance expected and then...
making judgments about the quality of the performance in relation to these standards. Ideally, the assessment process should involve students in both of those aspects.

Within this broad area, there are two types of assessment: summative and formative. Summative assessment refers to the feedback teachers give periodically. It aims to determine at a particular point in time what exactly students know and what they do not know. Summative assessment is generally used as part of the grading process (Garrison, 2007). Gipps (1994) agrees with Hillier (2002) in the sense that summative assessment aims to assess the learning at the end of a unit, term, year or course and it is used primarily to make decisions about grading but it does not necessarily provide feedback. Although the information gathered from this type of assessment is important, it might not encourage learners to develop other essential aspects of language learning such as critical thinking skills, lifelong learning, self-confidence and collaborative skills (Nilson, 2013). Traditionally, teachers have been responsible for student’s assessment process. The population under investigation seemed to have been assessed under the principles of summative assessment. Therefore, the students tended to associate their learning progress to the grades they receive from teachers. It seems that for both, teachers and students, the final goal in the educational process can be defined by a number. In this regard, Bailey (1998) states that traditional assessment is indirect and inauthentic since it is a one-shot, speed-based and norm-referenced type of assessment. Similarly, Law and Eckes (1995) underline that traditional assessment measures what learners know at a certain point of the learning process, but it cannot point out what particular difficulties students might experience during each learning stage. Simonson et al. (2000) argue that this type of assessment often focuses on learners’ lower-order thinking skills such as repetition, memorization, and recall.
Despite the benefits that summative assessment might bring to the EFL classroom, a more student-centered type of assessment was implemented in this project. On this subject, Formative Assessment is a crucial part of the instructional process. It provides the information needed to adjust and modify the teaching and learning process according to the learner and teacher needs (Garrison 2007). Formative assessments informs the teacher about the students’ understanding and allow him/her to adjust the teaching strategy to help students achieve their learning goals. Sadler (1989) contrasts both types of assessment. Firstly, he suggests that formative assessment is concerned with judgments about the quality of the student’s responses (performances, pieces, or works) and how they can be used to improve student’s competence. Secondly, summative assessment is concerned with summarizing the achievement status of a student and it is geared toward reporting at the end of a course of study. Indeed, formative assessment represent a powerful tool for language enhancement as it allows learners to take charge of their learning and to adapt their habits and approaches. They also provide learners with the opportunity to practice skills individually and collectively as well as to discuss and reflect on qualitative judgments about the success of their practice (Hargreaves, 2005). Self-assessment corresponds to a formative type of assessment as its main goal is to “form” students’ competencies in order to improve their learning process (Brown, 2003). This suggests that students need to be exposed to different assessment strategies that allow them to play an active part of their learning process. Hence, self-assessment was selected as the strategy to help learners to improve their speaking accuracy. According to O’Malley and Chamot (1990) self-assessment contributes to the development of meta-cognitive skills that allow students to identify their strengths and weaknesses and to direct their study to the areas that require improvement.
2.2.5 Self-assessment

New trends in English language teaching and learning suggest that the teaching process has moved from teacher-centered classes to more student-centered ones. The latter implies the learners’ involvement in their learning process. Therefore, it is necessary to implement a different type of assessment that allows students to become reflective and aware of their learning process. Among the different types of assessment, peer- and self-assessment have attracted much attention in recent years due to the growing emphasis on learner independence and autonomy (Sambell, McDowell & Sambell, 2006). According to Boud (2000) self-assessment is a cognitive-reflective process in which learners develop their skills by evaluating their learning.

Andrade and Du (2007) provide a helpful definition of self-assessment: “Self-assessment is a process in which students reflect on and evaluate the quality of their work and their learning process… they reflect explicitly upon stated goals or criteria, identify strengths and weaknesses in their work, and revise accordingly (p.160). Harris & McCann (1994) went further into the definition and they described self-assessment as “useful information about students’ expectations and needs, their worries and problems, how they feel about their own (learning) process, their reactions to the materials and methods being used, what they think about the course in general” (p.36).

Indeed, the use of self-assessment in the ELT classroom increases achievement and motivation. According to Campillo, (2006) self-assessment practice has a reflective role in the learning process and can be used while dealing with a variety of language skills. When students self-assess, they develop an internal sense of control over their success and ownership of the responsibility for improving (Bandura, 1986). Self-assessment can also help students to value descriptive feedback more highly than grades (Chappuis, 2009) since learners become aware of
their progress. According to Paris & Paris (2001) self-assessment involves all three areas of self-regulated learning: cognitive, affective and motivational; therefore, students not only evaluate their levels of understanding but also might gain intrinsic motivation. This last assumption aligns with Dodd’s (1995) ideas about the close relationship between self-assessment and engagement. He states that learners who feel ownership for a task become more engaged in their learning process and enhance self-efficacy, in Bandura’s (1997) words, students believe they can complete future learning tasks.

Language learning requires students to be the central part of their progress. Regarding speaking skills, the use of self-assessment helps students understand their strengths and weaknesses, and it also provides the tools on how they might deal with them. (Harlen & James, 1997). Therefore, the use of self-assessment might prepare students with lifelong learning skills that will help them to solve difficulties in higher education and professional lives. In this regard, Gregory, Cameron, & Forewor (2000) claim that: “when students are involved in self-assessment, they provide themselves with regular and immediate descriptive feedback to guide their learning. They become more actively involved in a curriculum that otherwise can seem unrelated to their lives and personal experiences” (p.10).

So far, the vision of speaking as a skill to be developed in EFL learners and the use of self-assessment to enhance spoken accuracy has been discussed in this chapter. It is now vital to discuss the role of technology to combine those concepts.

### 2.2.6 Computer-assisted language learning

Beatty (2010) defines Computer- Assisted Language Learning (CALL) as any process in which a learner uses a computer and, as a result, improves his or her language. This definition seems to be short if we take into account different aspects that influence the use of technology in
the language learning process. It may also include issues of materials design, educational
theories, and modes of instruction. Levy (1997) agrees with this belief. He also points out the
importance of the invention and subsequent use of the computer in language learning. Because of
the non-stop technological changes in computers, CALL is a discipline continually evolving in
terms of didactic learning and technological advances in hardware and software. This constant
change is influenced by the advances in computer literacy among both teachers and learners.

Undoubtedly, in modern societies technology involves every aspect of human life.
Technology has advanced so fast and so drastically that almost every aspect of students’ life and
learning has been deeply affected (Samra, 2013). Indeed, today’s students want to learn
differently than in the past. In Prensky’s (2010) words: “they want ways of learning that are
meaningful to them, ways that make them see –immediately- that the time they are spending on
their formal education is valuable” (p. 3).

In Colombian educational settings, the use of technology in the classroom is required.
According to MEN, the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) should be part
of the student’s learning process. With the growth of technological devices and its implication on
learning, it is necessary to include cutting-edge technology in the teaching practices. Beatty
(2010) states that multimedia-enhanced CALL is capable of creating learning situations of great
authenticity through the presentation of images of realia and through video and audio input that
can represent real-world situations. Therefore, the use of technology in the classroom not only is
capable of changing the whole dynamic within the classroom but it also might help to enhance
student understanding and comprehension.

Traditional-based instruction has several disadvantages that can be tackled by the use of
technology for educational purposes. From the educational perspective, the use of technology
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allows students to interact meaningfully with the target language. This project suggests that the use of a web 2.0 tool (English Central) that features video classes might help the participants of this project with the lack of spoken accuracy. According to Pawar (2004), audio recordings “can capture the richness and subtleties of the speech and can provide means of self-monitoring and improvement” (p.37). Similarly, Bush and Crotty (1991) state that “the use of video-based exercises makes practice inherently more meaningful than traditional text-based exercises. Video/recording gives students an understandable context to work while providing many extra linguistic clues” (p.86). Likewise, Thornbury (2012) states that recorded monologs are more practical because learners can pause and record them whenever they want. Hence, it is believed that technology becomes an integral part of a student’s learning progress in language learning.

Furthermore, technology provides opportunities for teachers to meet the needs of students with various learning styles through the use of multimedia (Bryan & Hunton, 2000). Today’s technology enables students to learn at their own pace because most of the online tools for language learning provide individualized instruction. According to Benson (2013) “these applications encouraged a degree of control by offering a choice of materials… they were also designed to give learners individual control over the pace of learning” (p. 146). CALL has an important role in language learning. Chapelle (2009) states that “technology dramatically extends and changes the breadth and depth of exposure that learners can have with the target language and interactive events in which they have the opportunity for language focus” (p.10). With this in mind, it is possible to change the dynamic within the classroom and to enhance the student’s ability to interact in the target language. In retrospect, using Colombia as an example, most of the schools in the public sector seem to be well-equipped with computers and internet connection. However, teachers might be unaware of the several uses that CALL could provide to
the student’s oral performance. Additionally, Chapelle (2009) argues that the communicative competence is highly improved and tied to the technology use within and outside the classroom. Along the same line of thought, Garrett’s (1991) observation is relevant for this study as it exemplifies most teacher’s attitudes towards technology use in the Colombian public sector: “Technology that can be taken for granted is already light years ahead of the profession’s ability to integrate a principled use of it into the classroom and the curriculum” (p.74).

2.3 State of the art

This action research project claims that through the use of self-assessment strategies and technology (web 2.0 tools) the speaking accuracy in a group of students with 1 level could be improved. To provide a better understanding of this project, it was necessary to review previous studies in the EFL field that involved the primary constructs worked in this action research project. Therefore, the next section presents relevant research that has been carried out locally and internationally in the areas of speaking accuracy, with technology and its influence on language development and self-assessment strategies.

2.3.1 Speaking skills development

Concerning language learning, speaking development has been explored from different angles. In this sense, the use of technology for teaching and learning purposes has become one of the essential tools for language development. James (1996) conducted a study that aimed at analyzing the contribution of CALL (computer-assisted language learning) to speaking pedagogy. The researcher used a set of computer-based activities which aim for the students to use the target language in real contexts that could rarely be part of the classroom interaction. In this research, the author claims that educational technology offers an invaluable opportunity to
make the student’s learning experience more productive. Additionally, the author suggests that computer assistance cannot merely involve the use of hardware or software, but it should integrate different technologies to achieve the aims proposed. Similarly, the study conducted by Khan and Ali (2010) in a group of 40 Pakistani students shows that speaking skills seemed to be hampered by the lack of meaningful interaction amongst students. As part of the implementation stage, the researchers decided to include media technology to improve language accuracy and pronunciation. They concluded that speaking accuracy could be improved by giving students a model that comes from the media used. In this case, researchers decided to use BBC and CNN to provide language samples students could reproduce in their oral interaction.

Along the same line of thought, Manurung (2015) contends that speaking improvement relies on the balance between instructional techniques and instructional materials. The former holds an important role to motivate and activate students. The latter provides the context needed to make language learning meaningful by contextualizing its use. In his analysis of speaking improvement, Manurung (2015) evidenced that the participant’s speaking skills improved through the use of contextual internet-based instructional materials. In this view, it can be concluded that the integration of in-class instruction and online work facilitated learners speaking improvement. Similarly, Heng-Tsung, and Shao-Ting (2010) acknowledge the benefits of technology-enhanced learning in learners’ speaking improvement. It allows learners to draw attention to the weaker areas in their spoken production. As claimed in this action research project, the use of technology offers additional opportunities for oral practice outside the classroom.

In the local Colombian context, Guevara and Ordoñes (2012) conducted a study in kinder garden level in a private institution to analyze the impact that authentic communicative
interaction and curriculum design have on students´ attitude towards the English class and their learning process. One of the findings of this study concludes that the exposure to real communicative events outside the classroom allowed students to achieve “communicative authenticity” by combining in-class instruction and students´ ideas and interests. Another finding in this study indicated that the implementation of authentic performances led to considerable improvement of oral skills.

Similarly, Orozco (2013) carried out a study with a group of 39 pupils studying at a basic level in a public school. The study aimed to analyze the impact of communicative activities in the spoken performance and confidence in this groups of participants. After a comparative analysis of students´ performance taken during the study, the findings demonstrated that the constant use of oral interaction in the activities proposed, learners, gain a great deal of confidence as they were able to use new vocabulary and expressions. Hence, the use of communicative activities become the starting point to activate students´ interest and motivation towards the English language. The last finding becomes relevant for this study as the population involved in the present project shares the same social and educational difficulties.

The previous studies become relevant in this action research project based on the fact that technology is a crucial tool for improving speaking.

2.3.2 Self-assessment

In the language learning field, there is a growing interest in implementing self-assessment practices in the EFL classrooms. This tendency has a positive impact in the Colombian educational settings as the learners tend to rely on the assessment process by teachers. Peers and
students themselves can give effective feedback. However, for that feedback to be effective, different strategies need to be used to get students involved in their language learning process.

Different studies have attempted to analyze the role of self-assessment in oral production improvement. The studies conducted by Leander (2012), Sanchez (2012), Gomez (2014) have found similar results. The use of self-assessment strategies helped learners to monitor their performance, and they were able to assess their progress and accomplishments. There is evidence that the learners involved in self and peer assessment reached higher levels of autonomy because they were asked to evaluate each other’s performance. (Caicedo, 2016).

Likewise, Butler and Lee (2010) conducted a study that aimed to examine the effectiveness of self-assessment among 254 young learners of English. The results suggested that students improved their ability to self-assess their performance over time. Furthermore, the results evidenced positive effects of self-assessment on the students’ oral production as well as on their confidence when using the target language. The dilemma of intermixing assessment and grading was also an interesting result in this study. Students tended to associate their performance with a grading scale putting aside self-awareness about their performance. Furthermore, Dann’s (2002) study evidenced that the population under investigation had a hard time connecting self-assessment criteria with grading. The students “often incorporated additional factors that were not part of the defined criteria for allocating grading” (p.99). These findings connect to the present study as the population under investigation tend to perceive grading as the final goal for their education process as they had little or no knowledge about self-assessment as a tool for language improvement.
The self-assessment processes proved to be helpful for the learners as they raised awareness of their performance instead of waiting for teacher’s comments and feedback. However, none of the previous studies have considered the impact of using technology to support students’ self-assessment process. Thus, the present study attempts to create a technology-enhanced learning environment that fosters self-assessment and spoken accuracy through learning activities that promote communication. Technology will serve as “language accuracy mirror,” and self-assessment will provide students with opportunities to raise awareness of their language progress and to increase their confidence when using the language orally.

2.3.3 Technology and language development

Hussain et al., (2010) conducted a study that aims to determine the effectiveness of a technology-based learning environment on student achievement in English as a foreign language. Their sample of the study was 90 tenth grade students from a public school. This project was conducted using two different groups: A control group and an experimental group. The former group was exposed to regular classes using textbooks. The latter was taught using technology (computer lab, internet, chat rooms, email, and online material). The results showed that learners from the experimental groups performed better when taught in a technology-based learning environment. These results agree with Graddol’s (2006) assumptions that technology has become an important aspect of the language learning process. Globalization has influenced English language and the way students learn. Therefore, technology plays a vital role in language learning.

Worldwide, different studies have been conducted using technology as means of improving language. Cellphones (Gromik, 2010), Skype (Romaña, 2013), online radio shows
(Lemos, 2013) video technology (Lee & Liang, 2012) are learning tools that researchers have used to deal with speaking issues among students. Gromik’s study (2010) concludes that the use of technology (cell phones) facilitates the student’s performance. He found that the target demographic had improved their word count and fluency. Since the project was conducted at home, Gromik concludes that collecting more audio-visual data could show evidence of individual patterns of the participant learning process and connect those patterns with speech production. This last conclusion represents a relevant aspect of the present action research project as the data collected from the target population was similarly collected at home.

Romaña’s study (2013) agrees with Gromik (2010) in stating that technology becomes a crucial tool to facilitate students’ interaction with the target language beyond the classroom. Skype conference calls (Romaña 2013) helped learners in the reinforcement of both their fluency in the target language and their language production out of the formal classroom settings. To continue with previous studies using technology to improve the student’s skills, the online radio shows project (Lemos, 2010) was conducted using a target demographic, student’s needs and a context similar to the one used in the present research project. She found that the use of technology (radio shows) appears to be the element that triggers the student’s engagement in their learning process as it facilitated the student’s oral skills. She also found that the participants increased their pronunciation awareness as they were able to rehearse what they had to say.

The previous studies support the importance of technology as a learning tool in the EFL classrooms. However, none of them have considered the role that self-assessment strategies play in student’s speaking improvement. With this in mind, a study conducted by Chen (2011) attempted to clarify the impact that the use of technology and social experiences have on the student’s motivation and attitudes toward English language learning. This study presents relevant
information about the relationship between technology use and student’s engagement in language learning. Similarly, YanJun (2008) examined how Technology Enhanced Language Learning (TELL) enables students to work collaboratively. Likewise, Lopera (2013) conducted a study in a public school in Colombia using collaborative learning strategies to enhance speaking skills. The researcher found that factors such as anxiety, self-confidence, and motivation affected the student’s oral performance considerably. The previous studies become relevant as they open the door for studies that attempt to use technology not only as a learning tool but also as an element that triggers motivation, group work and self-assessment metacognitive process to improve speaking accuracy among students.

2.3.4 Voice message boards in language learning

The present action research project used Voxopop™ for different purposes. Initially, Voxopop™ was used as a learning tool for students to practice and interact using the target language. Secondly, it was the primary instrument for data collection. Additionally, it allowed the researcher and the participants to monitor their progress. Therefore, previous studies conducted using Voxopop™ became relevant for this project as there was evidence that voice message boards can be used for different purposes such as sharing experiences, communicating with others and language improvement.

In the last decade, different researchers all around the globe have considered Voice message boards such as Voice Thread (Pop, Tomuletiu, & David, 2011) and Voxopop™ (Ojeda Merchán, 2012) to improve speaking skills. Both researchers agree that Web 2.0 tools allow students to enhance communication skills as students could have the opportunity to use the target language in and outside the classroom. Additionally, they state that the use of voice message
boards might promote autonomy and self/peer assessment awareness. However, the studies were conducted differently. Pop et al., (2011) used Voxopop™ and Voice Thread with 62 adults at the university level. The researcher decided to use Voxopop™ asynchronously. They created groups with different topics so learners could freely join and talk (record) depending on their interests. On the other hand, Ojeda’s (2012) group was mainly teenagers. He used Voxopop™ during his classes. Students reviewed the language item in class, and as a final activity, they were asked to record on taking into account a given topic. Both researchers share similar findings: learners used the language item worked in class quite accurately, they also had followed and recycled the grammatical patterns reviewed.

Ojeda’s study attempted to link the use of Voxopop™ and awareness-raising strategies taken from Krashen’s (1982) monitoring hypothesis. However, as stated by Ojeda (2012) “It was originally planned for students to adopt these strategies and adapt them to their learning styles. In some cases, this did not happen due to learners’ pedagogical beliefs and motivations to learn a foreign language” (p.107).

The previous studies make a meaningful contribution to the teacher’s understanding of voice message boards in language learning and the possibilities to use those tools in and outside the classroom. However, the studies did not take full advantage of Voxopop™ as a self-assessment instrument. As can be seen, no previous studies have examined the use of Voxopop™ and English central combined with self-assessment strategies to improve speaking accuracy on EFL learners.

2.4 Conclusion

The theories presented above and previous studies related to the constructs of this project have shown that speaking involves more than knowledge about how particular language works.
Furthermore, previous studies have demonstrated that the use of self-assessment strategies increases student awareness and improvement of their learning process. It was also demonstrated that a different approach to assessment provides students with critical thinking skills that can be extrapolated to different areas such as education, or their daily and professional lives.

Additionally, technology use in the EFL classroom appeared to be the trigger element for student engagement and motivation towards language learning. The effectiveness of the combination of web 2.0 tools and self-assessment strategies in spoken accuracy will be described in detail in the next chapter.
Chapter 3: Research design

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the procedures followed throughout this research project to observe the effectiveness of Web 2.0 tools and self-assessment in the enhancement of speaking accuracy in a group of A2 teenage learners. The existing research on this topic has demonstrated how the use of technology and self-assessment can help students to improve their performance in using the L2. To analyze the effect of the strategy implemented, this chapter describes the type of research design, the researcher’s role, its context and the participants, the ethical considerations while implementing the project, the data collection instruments as well as the methodology used to gather evidence of the participant’s progress throughout the implementation stage.

3.2 Type of study

This qualitative research project has been conducted under the scope of Action Research (AR, hereafter). According to Burns (2010) AR attempts to identify a “problematic situation or issue” worth studying and analyzing. This phenomenon may also involve participants, teachers, and parents. Furthermore, Cohen et al. (2007) state that AR is defined as a “small-scale intervention in the functioning of the real world and a close examination of the effects of such an intervention” (p.186). This assumption echoes the work of Kemmis et al. (1992) which states that: “to do action research is to plan, act, observe and reflect carefully, more systematically and more rigorously that one usually does in everyday life” (p.162). Action research empowered the researcher to reflect and evaluate upon teaching-learning issues with the aim of implementing changes in practice. Taking into consideration the principles stated above, throughout this study, AR oriented the researcher during observation of specific language learning issues, and it
became a powerful tool for changing and improving problematic situations that the researcher has observed at IECS. This study had as its primary aim to focus on the use of WEB 2.0 tools and self-assessment to improve speaking accuracy. This action research procedure was chosen because it allows the teacher-researcher to analyze, reflect and solve the problem at hand within the specific context and its participants.

3.3 Context

The research study took place at Institución Educativa Compartir Suba (IECS). The IECS is part of Fundacion Compartir (FC, hereafter), a private non-profit organization that promotes and implements programs in different fields such as housing, public space, and education. FC is an organization very committed to Colombian education. For this reason, FC’s directors have established an agreement with the Secretaria de Educación de Bogota (Bogota’s Secretary of Education SED).

As it is common in the public school system in Colombia, all the grade levels at IEDS have an average of 41 students per class. The school offers 4 hours of English language instruction per week. Even though the English syllabus at the institution was not created based on a textbook, the school library gives the students an English textbook that they have to return at the end of the school year. Teachers at the school tend to adapt the topics presented in the book to the syllabus they have to follow.

At IECS the English syllabus has been modified according to the standards provided by Ministry of Education (Serie Guías No. 22, 2006). Thus, the syllabus follows the communicative approach principles. However, one of the issues found in the needs analysis stage was the fact that the classroom practice remains traditional with a great deal of L1 use in the teaching-
learning process. Spanish tends to be the only means of communication among learners and teachers even in the English class.

### 3.3.1 Participants

The participants for this action research study belonged to the group 905 from IECS (CEFR A2 level). At this level, students can use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases. They could provide information about their ages, home address, telephone number, family members and their profession (Council of Europe, 2001). They can interact in a very simple way, but they do not feel confident using the target language. The target group for this study is a group of 39 students characterized for having different abilities in the use of English language. The group attends three 90-minute English lesson per week.

Cognitively speaking, the group is quick to learn. They are easily engaged in dynamic activities and cooperative work. Due to the lack of contact with the target language, students seem to be reluctant to use the English orally. They felt uncomfortable when carrying out tasks in front of their classmates. They continually tried to avoid tasks that included using the target language orally. Most of the students tended to rely on written responses rather than speaking in public. Another factor to bear in mind is that students rely on teacher instructions to do any academic work. There is an evident lack of self-directed learning.

### 3.3.2 Researcher’s role

According to Burns (2010), action research involves a reflective practice process where teachers assume a self-reflective and critical view of their teaching context. Kemmis et al. (1992) highlight teacher’s role in action research. It implies more than the mere analysis of their context, the researcher’s role involves problem posing and solving. Keeping this in mind, the role of the teacher was as a participant observer. Therefore, the teacher-researcher took an active role in the
process as he observed and analyzed the problematic situation within the classroom. The teacher-researcher got involved in the process of analyzing the premise and the problematic situation that affected the participant’s learning process; he then proceeded to collect and analyze the data. Additionally, the teacher-researcher articulated theories suitable for the problem detected, monitored the results and student progress. This was aimed to improve both his teaching practices and the student’s problematic learning situation.

3.3.3 Ethical considerations

According to Cohen et al. (2007), ethical issues play an important role in research studies. Hence, there is a set of initial considerations that the researcher should bear in mind when planning any research (p.51)

- Obtaining informed consent
- Gaining access and acceptance in the research setting
- Considering problems and dilemmas confronting the researcher, including matters of privacy, anonymity, confidentiality, betrayal, and deception
- Recognize and follow personal codes of practice

This research project took into account the principles mentioned above to protect the integrity of all participants. First, the participants were informed about the objectives of this action research. Additionally, through a consent letter, participants were informed of the anonymity of this project as well as the confidentiality of the data collection and results. There was also a consent letter in which the researcher asked the institution coordinators permission to perform class observations and data collection. Consent letters were voluntarily signed and participants, parents and school directors were all involved.
3.4 Data collection instruments

This section describes the data collection instruments implemented during the pedagogical implementation stage. It aimed to gather information about student progress in the language problem stated in the rationale of this project.

The data collection instruments used in this project are illustrated in the following chart:

Table 1. Data collection instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Instrument</th>
<th>Implementation Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students' Learning Log (Burns, 2010)</td>
<td>Pre/while and post stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Self-Assessment checklist (Andrade, 2000)</td>
<td>During /while and post stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Rubric (Andrade, 2000)</td>
<td>During /while and post stage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.1 Descriptions and justifications

3.4.1.1 Students’ learning log

The pedagogical intervention was carried out in 6 different sessions in which the teacher-researcher aimed to gather students’ perceptions and assumptions regarding the strategies implemented. Therefore, learning logs were kept to monitor students’ experiences. According to Burns (2010), learning logs are traditional tools used to collect data in action research. They are powerful tools that allow the researchers to capture significant reflections and events during the implementation stage. Hence, the present study collected data from three students’ learning logs that were completed before, while and after the recording sessions. Regarding this issue, learning logs aimed to maintain an ongoing record of daily or weekly events. As stated by Burns (2010)
they aim to answer the question: What happened in sequence over my learning day/week?. In this regard, the learning logs used in this project contained seven prompts in which students were able to reflect upon their language production, the possible effects of the strategies used and their feelings towards the implementation. In Friesner & Hart’s (2005) words learning logs provided opportunities to obtain understanding about students’ learning experiences and reflections. (See Appendix C: Student’s learning log).

### 3.4.1.2 Self-assessment checklists

Checklists are used to obtain specific information from participants. According to Burns (2010), researchers might take advantage of the use of checklists as they allow the researcher to focus on the particular issue under investigation. In this project, the students’ self-assessment checklists were used to collect, analyze, and contrast the student’s perception of their language process. Participant responses helped the researcher to compare the student’s ideas about their improvement with student performance evidenced in the classroom. Self-assessment checklists and students learning logs were implemented in three different stages: before, during and after the implementation. The information gathered allowed the researcher to analyze students’ perception through the process they were exposed to (See Appendix D: Self-assessment checklist).

### 3.4.1.3 Audio recordings

Analyzing the effect of the strategies on student’s speaking accuracy among the participants was one of the aims of this project. With this in mind, the researcher decided to administer, store and analyze audio recordings using an online voice recording tool (Voxopop). According to Ariza & Suarez (2013) and confirmed by Caicedo (2016), audio recording are useful tools that allow researchers and students to monitor language progress. Besides, students
can identify specific issues in their speech that hamper the effective communication. Similarly, Cohen et al. (2007) validated the use of recordings for collecting data since it reduces the influence of misinterpretations. The researcher administrated this instrument in six different moments. Each recording was accompanied by a self-assessment checklist or an assessment rubric that assisted in determining the increase of grammar accuracy and self-monitoring. This instrument gave the researcher a better understanding of the students’ language progress before and after pedagogical implementation.

3.4.1.4 Assessment rubrics

According to Andrade (2000), instructional rubrics help teachers to assess and evaluate student progress in language learning. They also represent teaching tools that support student learning progress. Rubrics make teacher expectations clear and they provide students with more specific feedback that allows them to be aware of their strengths and weaknesses in throughout the language learning process. Furthermore, Andrade and Du (2007) state that rubrics can be used for different purposes such as:

- Supporting learning
- Supporting the development of skills
- Supporting the development of understanding
- Supporting critical thinking

Although there are a variety of standard formats, rubrics have two specific features. First, it includes a list of criteria or what is required, and secondly the levels of quality, with descriptions of strong, and problematic student work (p.1). With this in mind, this project used assessment rubrics to determine students’ oral performance, grammar accuracy and student perception about their performance. Rubrics were administrated after the recording sessions, so
researcher and students were able to peer and self-assess their oral production (See Appendix E: Assessment Rubric).

### 3.4.2 Validation and piloting

According to Whitehead and McNiff (2006), validity relates to establishing the real value or trustworthiness of a claim. This process implies “showing the authenticity of the evidence base, explaining the standards of judgment used, and demonstrating the reasonableness of the claim (p.98). As stated by Seliger et al. (1989) “through the process of item analysis it is possible to ensure that issues provide meaningful information” (p.189). To assure validity, each instrument was shared with colleagues and an expert in language acquisition at the research workplace. This process enabled the researcher to identify and edit specific elements (e.g., language use, length, and appropriateness) to assure reliable outcome and data from each instrument. After the instruments were adjusted, piloting took place. A different group from the same level with similar language difficulties helped the researcher to validate the appropriateness of the instruments.

The information was collected, analyzed and classified to identify commonalities and patterns. The instruments designed to collect data were applied in different stages during the implementation stage. Since students were asked to complete certain tasks at home, the instruments’ piloting took place during the face to face classes and asynchronously sessions. Detailed information will be given in the next chapter.

### 3.5 Conclusion

The present study explored qualitative tools and procedures that enabled the researcher to explore the use of self-assessment and Web 2.0 tools to enhance students’ speaking accuracy. This design was characterized by the principle of a contextualized, small-scale study that was
based on students’ background and educational needs. The research design helped the researcher to generate data about student’s performance and attitude towards language learning that need to be analyzed and processed to change the dynamics in the classroom. The next chapter provides detailed information gathered from the instruments designed and the methodology used.
Chapter 4: Pedagogical intervention and implementation

4.1 Introduction

This study enhanced speaking accuracy of past tense by using audio recordings and self-assessment activities. This chapter presents the pedagogical intervention by explaining the vision of language, learning, and curriculum that the researcher took into consideration during the implementation stage. The following section aims to provide a better understanding of the pedagogical procedures followed to ensure the quality of the implementation. It shows the timeline, a sample of lessons and describes in detail materials and the process carried out including pre-, while- and post-implementation.

4.2 Visions of language, learning, and curriculum

4.2.1 Vision of language

The ultimate aim of any language is communication (Drobot, 2014). This assumption echoes Thornbury’s (2005) ideas in which speaking production implies a process of conceptualization, formulation, and articulation that falls under the scope of the self-monitoring process. Although language encompasses skills such as writing, reading and listening, the participants of this study identified oral interaction as one of the most difficult challenges they face when learning a second language. According to Ur (1991) for most teachers, learning how to teach students to develop oral communication skills spontaneously is a significant concern. This situation supports Bygate’s (1987) ideas regarding speaking as “knowledge” and speaking as a “skill.” The former implies student understanding of vocabulary and the grammatical rules of the target language. The latter involves student use of what they know about the language to communicate effectively. The participant’s lack of active interaction corroborates Bygate’s assumptions regarding speaking. To some extent, this group of learners seemed to be able to
identify the vocabulary and grammatical patterns in the target language accurately. However, when learners were asked to communicate orally, they seemed to lack the skills needed to interact spontaneously.

This study aimed to assist students in gaining speaking accuracy through “smooth, rapid, effortless use of language” (Crystal, 1987) by creating a set of activities that promote spontaneous interaction and self-assessment opportunities.

4.2.2 Vision of learning

In the last decade, different approaches to language learning have been introduced to the public sector. According to the Colombian Ministry of Education’s standards (2006), language learning in the schools should serve one purpose: to Communicate. However, the lack of interaction with the target language outside the classroom represented a challenge for the researcher and participants. Regarding this situation, Byrne (1986) states that learners and teachers must accommodate “language learning to the unfavorable environment of the classroom.” With this in mind, to guarantee effectiveness in language learning during the implementation stage, the researcher used communicative approach principles and self-assessment strategies.

According to Willis & Willis (1996), the process of learning is “a logical development of communicative language teaching” they also argue that activities in which language is used to carry out meaningful tasks promote learning. Taking into consideration these principles, participants were exposed to a series of tasks that attempted to foster students’ participation and interaction. Self-assessment activities made students reflect upon their language learning process and the strategies needed to monitor and improve their spoken performance. In Brown’s (2007) words “once learners can become aware of their predispositions, their styles, and their strengths
and weaknesses, they can then take appropriate action in the form of a plethora of strategies that are available for them” (p.131).

Together these aspects comprise a meaningful learning environment for students to perform spontaneously using oral communication as well as reflecting upon their language learning process.

4.2.3 Vision of curriculum

An innovative curriculum is comprised of the goals, content, methodology, and evaluation. A local curriculum should be integrated with broader educational curriculums (Carter & Nunan, 2001). According to Richards (2013), the term curriculum refers to the overall plan or design for a specific course and the way its content is adapted to cope with students’ needs which enables learners and teachers to achieve the expected learning outcomes. A curriculum planned to foster communication among learners instead of grammar-based competence should provide learners with more opportunities to use and improve oral skills. In this regard, Johnson (1989) states that curriculum development would consist of a process of continuous adjustments or “fine tuning” (p.1) which implies teachers’ expertise on its population and needs to improve teaching.

The curriculum at Institucion Educativa Compartir Suba (IECS) was designed considering both, the standards provided by the Ministry of Education (MEN, 2006) and the guidelines for English language teaching established by the Common European Framework References (CEFR, 2011). At IECS language teachers are in charge of the curriculum design process. The school does not own a reliable curriculum since it was designed based on the study/learning of specific grammar structures for each grade. For instance, the curriculum dictates that the students of this study were expected to use active and passive voice among other grammar structures at the end of the school year.
Therefore, the curriculum at IECS was modified for the implementation stage to include activities that reflect students’ interests while promoting oral communication. The lessons were focused on a learning-centered curriculum in which activities and products were shared between students by using audio recordings (Voxopop). Self-assessment was also included as part of the evaluation process, not only for analyzing students’ performance but to reflect upon teaching effectiveness. As argued by O’Malley and Chamot (1990), cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies development are necessary for learners to acquire another language successfully.

4.3 Instructional design

The pedagogical intervention was designed under the scope of a blended learning methodology that, according to Graham (2005), is a combination of conventional-classroom instruction and online learning, combining the best of onsite and online learning environments. Likewise, Thomas (2013) conceives blended learning as “particularly appealing to foreign language educators as a result of its stress on constructivism principles and the emphasis on interactivity as a means of producing enhanced language output” (p. 17). Thus, the present study mixed face-to-face and virtual classes to provide students with tools and strategies that enhance their speaking production. Furthermore, a blended type intervention helped the researcher to optimize the work in class and to provide students with extra practice outside the classroom.

4.3.1 Lesson planning

Lesson planning was designed for both face-to-face sessions and online practice. 26 lesson plans were created with different purposes. Initial lesson plans attempted to familiarize students with the use of self-assessment checklists and learning logs as well as the use of Voxopop (online voice recording) (See Appendix F: lesson plan pre-implementation). Other lesson plans were created to give a sequenced set of tasks that provided students with
opportunities to record their voices, and to self-assess their oral production (See Appendix G: lesson plan during implementation). All lessons took into consideration two types of tasks: linguistic and communicative. The former was related to the use of past simple structures including subject-verb agreement, verb conjugation, regular, and irregular inflection. The later implied activities that encouraged students to communicate past events and experiences efficiently.

4.3.2 Implementation

The pedagogical intervention process was conducted during a twelve-week period. The implementation of this study took nine weeks / 26 sessions with a total of 24 hours. This intervention process was divided into three main stages: pre-, during, and, post-pedagogical intervention.

4.3.3 Pre-implementation

This initial stage took place in weeks 1 and 2. The aim of this stage was for students to get acquainted with the methodology used. The primary concern of the researcher was the lack of students’ experience with the self-assessment process. To ensure the students’ awareness of their role in the assessment process, the researcher devoted the first three sessions to train them on how to use self-assessment checklists and rubrics.

Technology was another issue the researcher worked on during the first two weeks. To create a more student-friendly environment, the researcher created a website called: “1005-ar-project” (http://fguillaume03.wixsite.com/1005-ar-project). Bearing in mind ethical considerations, the website was protected with a password. The aim of this website was for students to have all the technological resources in the same place (Voxopop, English Central.com). It also allowed students to download self-assessment checklists, learning logs and
intervention schedules. Therefore, the initial stage helped the researcher train students on using the instruments effectively during the implementation stage.

4.3.4 During-implementation – use of Voxopop™

Taking into consideration the equipment available at IECS the researcher decided to create asynchronous sessions were students made the recordings at home. This was necessary due to the number of participants and the connectivity available at the school. An initial survey showed that all the participants had a personal computer with internet connection at home. The researcher also wanted students to do this work independently to promote autonomy as well as collecting more reliable information.

The recording sessions were structured as follows:

- **Face to face sessions**: during these sessions, students received the input related to the past tense structure. The researcher set the context in which students worked throughout the class. At the end of each face to face session, students wrote an outline about the activity worked in class.

The following table briefly outlines the topics dealt with during the face to face sessions throughout the pedagogical intervention phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Face to face sessions</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>“A wonderful experience”</td>
<td>To talk about a wonderful experience student had had. The final product was recorded using Voxopop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-assessment and technology in spoken accuracy

| Week 5 | “This is embarrassing” | To describe an embarrassing or funny moment students experienced. The final product was recorded using Voxopop. |
| Week 6 | “Something I will always remember” | To talk about a positive and important moment for the students. They recorded their experience on Voxopop. |
| Week 7 | “Let’s try again” | To give students the opportunity to record again one of the previous topics in order for them to either add more information or improve their version. |
| Week 8 | “Places to visit” | To describe a place that impacted students the most. They recorded their experience on Voxopop. |

- **Asynchronous sessions**: Right after the face to face sessions, the students had asynchronous sessions where they completed the activities proposed in English Central and Voxopop™. The former provided students with a sample of the vocabulary they could use to record their experience. The latter was the main tool used for students to record their experiences outlined on the face to face sessions. Those recordings were also used as a self-assessment tool. Students monitored their progress by listening to their recordings while completing the self-assessment checklists and students’ learning log.

4.3.5 **Post-implementation**

In the final stage of the implementation process, participants provided their insights about the use of web 2.0 by completing a student learning log. This instrument provided the researcher with the students’ perception of the role of self-assessment strategies on language learning. In table 3, below, the timeline, activities, topics, instruments, and stages are shown in detail to give a better idea how the process was carried out.
### Table 3. Pedagogical Intervention

#### Pre-implementation stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1 and 2</th>
<th>Time Allotted</th>
<th>Type of Session</th>
<th>Topic / Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>1h 30m</td>
<td>Face to face Session</td>
<td>“Let’s explore our Website” Technology lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>1h 30m</td>
<td>Face to face Session</td>
<td>“How to use the tech toys” VOXOPOP and ENGLISH CENTRAL Technology lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>1h 30m</td>
<td>Face to face Session</td>
<td>“The world of self-assessment strategies”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### During-implementation stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 3 to 8</th>
<th>Time Allotted</th>
<th>Type of Session</th>
<th>Topic / Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>1h 30m</td>
<td>Face to face Session</td>
<td>“A wonderful experience” Grammar review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“A wonderful experience” English Central activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“A wonderful experience” Recording Activity 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 7</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“My progress” self-assessment checklist 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 8</td>
<td>1h 30m</td>
<td>Face to face Session</td>
<td>“Do’s and Don’ts” Feedback session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 9</td>
<td>1h 30m</td>
<td>Face to face Session</td>
<td>“This is embarrassing” Grammar review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 10</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“This is embarrassing” English Central activity 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 11</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“This is embarrassing” Recording Activity 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 12</td>
<td>1h 30m</td>
<td>Face to face Session</td>
<td>Do’s and Don’ts” Feedback session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 13</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“Something I will always remember” English Central activity 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 14</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“Something I will always remember” Recording Activity 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 15</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“My progress” self-assessment checklist 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 16</td>
<td>1h 30m</td>
<td>Face to face Session</td>
<td>“Do’s and Don’ts” self and peer-assessment session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 17</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“Let’s try again” Recording Activity 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 18</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“My progress” self-assessment checklist 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 19</td>
<td>1h 30m</td>
<td>Face to face Session</td>
<td>“Feedback session” Teacher’s assessment Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 20</td>
<td>1h 30m</td>
<td>Face to face Session</td>
<td>“Places to visit” Grammar review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 21</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“Places to visit” English Central activity 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 22</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“Places to visit” Recording Activity 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 23</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“My progress” self-assessment checklist 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Post-implementation stage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Time Alotted</th>
<th>Type of Session</th>
<th>Topic / Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 24</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“My insights about technology in English learning” Recording Activity 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 25</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>“Students' learning Log”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 26</td>
<td>1h 30m</td>
<td>Face to face Session</td>
<td>“Feedback session” Teacher’s assessment Rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Conclusion

The intervention and implementation stages allowed participants to use technology and self-assessment strategies as means of language improvement. The participants could experience the English class from a different perspective. The recording sessions allowed students to use the language in a different setting. Additionally, the recordings allowed them to self-assess their oral production and reflect upon their progress and learning. The topics proposed on each face to face lesson added the essential element that engaged students to participate in this project. The data collection instruments described in chapter 3 allowed the researcher to collect data to address the problem under investigation. The effectiveness of these instruments and the results of the intervention stage are discussed in detail in the next chapter.
Chapter 5: Results and data analysis

5.1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, the theoretical foundations that addresses the spoken difficulties experienced by a group of A2 level students have been examined. This chapter illustrates the data analysis method and the procedures followed to assess the influence of Web 2.0 tools and self-assessment strategies in grammatical accuracy in speech.

The data collected during the implementation stage led to a classification and organizing process that used grounded theory as the analysis method, which refers to a theory derived inductively from the data, systematically gathered and analyzed through research process to discover categories, concepts and properties and their interrelationships (Corbin & Strauss, 2014). With this in mind, core categories emerged in which the problem under investigation began to be more evident. The self-assessment process appeared to be the key element for student oral skills improvement. Similarly, the use of the Web 2.0 tools provided students with opportunities to use the target language meaningfully outside of the classroom.

5.2 Data management procedures

The researcher followed a systematic set of procedures to group and collect data. The procedures are framed under Burns’ (2010) ideas: assembling data, comparing data, building interpretations and reporting outcomes. The process of assembling data included the analysis of student self-assessment checklists, student self-assessment formats, student learning logs, and student transcripts from six recordings. The recordings attempted to elicit spontaneous participation from the users by utilizing topics that were related to the students’ personal past experiences. These set of topics attempted to analyze participants’ use of the past simple structures in speech.
As the present project included the use of two web 2.0 tools (English Central and Voxopop™) and a set of self-assessment checklists and students learning logs, the researcher designed a website (See Appendix H: Website screenshot) to gather and store all the data collected. To facilitate students’ responses, a web-based word processor was used to collect the data from students’ self-assessment checklists, students’ self-assessment formats, and students’ learning logs. Students’ recordings were stored using a voice-based e-learning tool (Voxopop™) also available on the website created for this action research project. This “online-data” facilitated the researcher to store, control and analyze the data systematically. In this respect, Flick (2002) states that computers and software can be used in the context of qualitative research for different purposes such as: storage (keeping texts in an organized database), data linking (connecting relevant data segments to each other, forming categories, clusters or networks of information), content analysis (counting frequencies, sequence, or location of words and phrases) among others.

Students recorded their voices in five different moments. Throughout these recordings, students completed three different self-assessment checklists and logs. They aimed for students to analyze their performance in the recording sessions and to become aware of their use of the language. A sixth recording was done by students in which they provided their insights about the use of technology and self-assessment strategies in their language learning process.

The data collection stage took place both synchronously and asynchronously. Taking into account Flick’s (2002) ideas: “asynchronous focus groups do not require all participants to be online at the same time… the interventions by every participant will be addressed to a conference site and stored in a folder to which all participants have access” (p.255). Thus, the data collected from participant recordings were organized in the groups created on Voxopop™.
Participants had access to each other’s recordings as the group site allowed them to listen to and share their recordings. This group site also worked as a data storage tool because the data was available at all times.

### 5.2.1 Validation

To validate the data collected, it was necessary to triangulate the raw information from the recordings, self-assessment checklist/logs and field notes to find commonalities by comparing and contrasting the data. According to Burns (1999), triangulation is valuable in enhancing validity as it enables researchers to “gather multiple perspectives on the same situation studied” (p.165). The information collected was systematically organized using excel charts. Corbin & Strauss (2014) state that matrixes “enrich analysis by helping the analyst through the range of conditions in which events are located and responded to” (p.91). The use of color-coding techniques helped the researcher to find commonalities that attempted to answer the research question proposed in this study.

### 5.2.2 Data analysis methodology

This action research project was framed under the principles of Grounded Theory for the analysis and interpretation of the data collected. According to Glaser and Holton (2004) “a good Grounded Theory analysis starts right off with regular daily data collecting, coding, and analysis” (p.11). In this regard, the analysis of data is a methodological process that involves identification, categorization, coding, and analysis of multiple variables contained in the data collected (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Thus, the process of data collection and analysis consisted of examining and interpreting data to elicit meaning from it, gaining understanding, and developing empirical knowledge (Corbin, 2008). Similarly, as stated by Cohen et al. (2007) this methodology of data analysis involved organizing, accounting for and explaining the data,
making sense of data regarding the participant’s definitions of the situation, noticing patterns, themes, categories, and regularities. With this in mind, the data under this methodology was systematically organized into concepts that aimed to provide a core category.

To identify and select the categories, subcategories and the core category that will be explained below, the researcher used three types of coding from grounded theory: open, axial and selective coding (Corbin and Strauss, 2014). A constant comparisons procedure (Corbin and Strauss, 2014) was also implemented for data reduction.

5.3 Categories

According to Corbin and Strauss (2014) as the researcher moves along with the analysis, comparing incidents for similarities and differences is essential to all analyses because it allows the researcher to differentiate one category or theme from another. Additionally, constant comparisons aim to identify properties and dimensions to those categories. This process led the researcher to compare student recordings, self-assessment checklist/logs, and field notes. The analysis of the data collected brought up three main categories shown in figure 1.

5.3.1 Overall category mapping

Three stages of analysis were used to create the category mapping. The data analysis stage started from “Open Coding” which according to Corbin and Strauss (2014), aims at “breaking data apart and delineating concepts to stand for blocks of raw data” (p.195). In this initial stage, raw information was organized to identify commonalities and similar properties. This data was collected and organized according to the instrument. As all the information was gathered in an excel file, the researcher added an extra column where all the initial patterns were identified (See Appendix I: Matrix Chart). A color-coding technique where the students’
responses were related to the research question and compared with the goals proposed was used to organize the initial codes.

Axial coding was used to refine the data obtained from the open coding. According to Corbin and Strauss (2014), axial coding refers to crosscutting or relating concepts to each other. In other words, analyzing the data collected and comparing them to find similar patterns or commonalities. Thus, the essence of axial coding is the interconnectedness of categories (Creswell, 2007). This stage helped the researcher to label the initial codification that led towards the creation of general categories and the core category. To achieve this, a chart with all the initial codes found was created.

This process helped the researcher to cross-validate the data collected among the instruments. Commonalities among the initial codes were analyzed and grouped into subcategories. Finally, to systematically relate categories to other subcategories and validate those relationships, the researcher followed a selective coding process. According to Cohen et al. (2007), it involves identifying a core category that implies the relationship between the other subcategories, or in Cresswell’s (2007) words, the researcher identifies a “storyline” and writes a story that integrates the categories in the axial coding model (p. 57).

The chart represents the final categories obtained from the coding procedure. It also shows the relationship between the categories and subcategories with the research question of this project.
5.3.2 Discussion of categories

The data analysis led the researcher to identify three main categories: improving speaking skills, explicitly related to two subcategories: improving pronunciation and fluency enhancement. The second category was the importance of self-monitoring in language improvement supported by two subcategories namely, self-monitoring in language improvement and learning strategy- imitating. Finally, category three improving language learning by means of technology (Web 2.0 tools). The latter supported by students’ perceptions about the use of technology and classroom dynamism in language learning. The analysis of the categories and subcategories led the researcher to state that the use of Web 2.0 tools and self-assessment has a positive influence in fostering oral language accuracy. The next section aims to present how language form (usage) and metacognition (self-assessment) intertwine participants' spoken language accuracy.
5.3.2.1 Improving speaking skills

The first category that emerged was improving speaking skills. Hunter (2012) provides a clear distinction between two different processes involved in learning to communicate: skill-getting and skill-using. The former implies learners to develop expertise in cognition (knowledge) and production (pseudo-communication), the latter implies student use of language to interact (real communication). In this regard, transcripts taken from the first recording session showed students’ lack of accuracy when using the simple past tense.

The following are two excerpts taken from Student A and B during the initial recording (recording session 1). It indicates the number of inaccuracies made during the student’s recording. The red highlights indicate the inaccuracies and the yellow ones indicate the accuracies.

Excerpt 1. Transcripts from recording session 1.

Student A:
“…When my family and me travel to Cartagena, the sea is so beautiful. I like this so much… after we go to the… we left Cartagena and my father drive to Bucaramanaga and we visit Chicamocha’s park. Last we visit Villa de Leyva….”

Student B:
“…Yesterday I have a presentation at school with my group of parkour… gave me much excitement as I have to see my friends happy about…”

This might imply lack of knowledge of the grammatical rules when talking about past experiences (Skill-getting level). Hedge’s (2000) ideas can also explain this situation: “learners improvise when they speak, especially in the early stages of learning a language, stringing
together chunks of language in a process that owes more to memory and understanding of the world meaning than the selection of grammatical units” (p. 151). However, as the students moved along the process, it was evidenced that they started to become aware of the use of the past tense to convey meaning as shown in excerpt 2.

Excerpt 2. Transcripts from recording session 4.

Student A:

Is the “we are tour” the concert of One Direction was amazing it was like a dream. I sang very strong with Mary, we were crazy… we shout, we jumped … we have waiting for this since we begin to be fan of one direction.

Student B:

Something I will always remember is when I rode a bike for first time. This feeling are wow. You can go anywhere anytime you want… you can be free… you feel the motorcycle power in your legs in your arms, you have a beast in your legs…”

The previous examples indicate that the participant started moving from skill getting to skill using. These students were more aware of constructing accurate S+V+C patterns, they also knew more irregular verbs, and they were aware of pronouncing the regular verbs ED endings. It can be argued that student performance on the last recording showed improvement at grammar and discourse level. According to Thornbury (2005), “grammar knowledge for speaking purposes consists largely of those grammar systems that favor rapid, real-time speech production” (p. 33). The lack of accuracy at sentence level in the first sample made it difficult to understand what the student wanted to say. In the last sample, however, the use of well-constructed sentences helped the student make himself clear when giving his opinion.
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5.3.2.2 Grammar and discourse

Students’ responses to their self-assessment logs (excerpt 3) showed that accuracy on grammar features played an essential role in their language improvement. They considered that throughout their recordings, they were better able to construct accurate sentences. Participants claimed that their pronunciation was also improved. Brumfit (1984) highlights the difference between fluency, which represents learners use of “truly internalized grammar” and accuracy, as the “conscious use” of grammar patterns and rules. He suggests that accuracy achievement depends to some extent on “allowing people to operate as effectively as they can, and attempting to mold what they produce in the desired direction, rather than explicitly teaching expecting convergent imitation (p.50). In this regard, the findings demonstrated that the use of the voice message recording and the self-assessment strategies allowed students to become aware of the use of the grammatical patterns of the simple past tense. Participants were able to self-assess their performance and notice their language mistakes. This monitoring process allowed them to correct the misuse of language on their next recordings as shown in excerpt 3.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student B</th>
<th>Al volver a grabar mi experiencia utilicé mejor uno que otro verbo, que tal vez había usado mal. (When I re-recorded my experience, I used better some of the verbs, which I had maybe used wrongly)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student D</td>
<td>Siendo sincera creo que mejore la pronunciación, porque al grabar la anterior vez no me daba cuenta de los tantos errores, y ahora si entonces pude mejorarlos. (to be honest, I think I improved my pronunciation, because when recording the last one I was not aware of so many the mistakes and now I am able to improve them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student G</td>
<td>Creo que ahora sigo las estructuras correctamente (I think now I use the structures properly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>Creo que me falta mejorar en algunas cosas la gramatica en los tiempos, a veces me confundo un poco (I think I still need to improve some grammatical issues regarding tenses, sometimes I am bit confused about them)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the other hand, the findings demonstrated that to some extent, some participants improved their speaking skills at the discourse level. This result is related to Hedge’s claim (2000) in which discourse can be appreciated towards grammar: “how utterances link in speech”. Connections can be evidenced in excerpt 4 and 5.

**Excerpt 4. Student’s recording**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student B:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I went to San Andrés this trip was the first time that I went in plane. It was indescribable. I didn’t can believe in that. When my family and I were in there the scene of the sun and the ocean was unforgettable. This trip was the last year, we was there for 5 days. The people was so friendly but the price was so high if you go, you need to go with money. San Andrés is an amazing island</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excerpt 5. Student’s recording**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student E:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would like to travel around the world. I would like to travel to Europe, Africa and Asia. But specially to USA, Italy Japan and UK because these countries are so beautiful and Japan has a different culture to the one we have. That’s the reasons I want to travel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hedge (2000) presents six different ways of organizing connections in discourse. In the students’ recordings two of them were identified: “presenting and focusing information” (indicated in green color) and “substitution and omission” (in yellow color). The former includes the way in which the student creates contrastive focus in spoken language by adding stress: “the ocean was unforgettable”. The latter, includes the use of pronouns to refer back to noun phrases “these countries, the one we have.” In other words, at the end of the recording sessions, some students began to add more complex grammatical forms to their repertoire to express better their insights and ideas.

5.3.2.3 **The importance of self-monitoring in language improvement**

At IECS, students are not familiar with self-assessment strategies. Throughout the school years, students have been exposed to traditional classes in which the assessment process relies on
the teacher. Therefore, to implement this project, it was necessary to expose students to self and peer assessment strategies. At the beginning of the process, students were allowed to self-assess their products using rubrics and checklists. This pre-data-collection stage helped students to get familiar with self-assessment processes.

The self-assessment checklists and logs brought positive results for this study. Along the process, students became more aware of their production. They used the self-assessment checklist and logs not only to improve their oral production but also to self-monitor their progress. The following chart indicates some of the student perceptions regarding the self-assessment strategies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student A</td>
<td>Me parecieron útiles porque me hacen ANALIZAR en qué voy bien o en qué voy mal. (I found them useful because they help me to analyze my strengths and weaknesses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>Me hace dar cuenta de mi desempeño en clases, y en mi vocabulario y pronunciación. (It makes me realize my performance in class and my vocabulary and my pronunciation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>Me di cuenta de lo que en realidad hice. (I realized what I just did)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student D</td>
<td>Me parecieron útiles porque uno empieza a pensar si hizo las cosas bien durante el procedimiento, si hubo concentración en dichas actividades. (I found them useful because I begin to think if I did things well during the procedure, if there was concentration on those activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student E</td>
<td>Así me doy cuenta de lo que estoy fallando. (This way I realize what I am failing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student F</td>
<td>Puedo analizar mi trabajo previo. (I can analyze my previous work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student G</td>
<td>Porque creo que así nos damos cuenta de cómo de verdad trabajamos y nos damos la nota correcta, toca ser muy honesto. (Because I think that we realize how we really work and we get the correct score. You have to be very honest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student H</td>
<td>Pude ver donde fallaba más para poder corregirlo. (I could see where I failed the most to correct it)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to Chang (2010), self-monitoring functions through self-awareness and focuses on students’ ability to monitor their progress. Student perceptions taken from the above
learning logs suggest learners become aware of their work. Chang (2010) provides a suitable definition of self-monitoring that fits within the results presented in this project: “self-monitoring is the process of having individuals record data regarding their behavior for the purpose of changing its rate” (p. 103).

The following chart represents the self-monitoring process participants went through: In-class instruction, initial recording, self-assessment checklist, recording session, student’s learning log reflection, recording session and self-assessment learning log.

Figure 2. Self-assessment process

Self-assessment was a constant throughout the implementation stage. The above chart shows the process students took from one activity to another. Participants’ assessed their own work every other activity. Transcripts supplied valuable information about the role of self-
assessment in students’ awareness of their grammar accuracy when talking about past experiences. Although some of the grammar inaccuracies seemed to be unnoticeable for some students, others were able to notice the mistake and self-repair to provide an accurate verb form.

Excerpt 7. Students’ self-repair in spontaneous speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student A:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We stay in a hotel and it had a delicious food. When we went to the sea… the water was so clear and you could see the fishes there…”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student E:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“…I will always remember when my uncle gave me a play station… I will never forget games as… because I spent hours play on it…”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings are related to Zimmerman’s (2002) ideas in which there are three forms of self-monitoring: monitoring associated with self-evaluation, strategy implementation and efforts to adapt the strategy from outcomes. Likewise, those results agree with White’s (2009) study in which he found that students benefit from both being exposed to self-monitoring practices and recording/observing their behavior, as they were able to better comprehend the material/item language learned thoroughly. Furthermore, as it can be seen on the transcript taken from the final recording (Excerpt 7), the self-monitoring process allowed students to become aware of the mistakes they produced when recording their voices. As a consequence, the recordings were gradually improving in terms of language accuracy.

Excerpt 8. Self–monitoring comments
Self-assessment and technology in spoken accuracy

Student A:

Hi, in the last years we only work in our notebooks but now we not only write, we speak too and when we record on Voxopop, we tried to the best way possible. When we see the videos in English central is something new. Because sometimes we believe that we understand everything but it’s not true we make mistakes but on the bright side yes, that we learn about our mistakes and we try again until we do well the activities. I think is amazing because the technology the web can be use more than Facebook, tweeter. If we use it we can learn so much.

5.3.2.4 Improving language learning by means of computer-based tasks

Different studies have been conducted using technology as means of language improvement (Gromik, 2010; Romana, 2013; Lemos, 2013). Similarly, the data collected in this project supported the assumption of technology is a vehicle to innovate and enhance language learning among students. At the end of this project, the participants did a final recording with their insights about this project. Student opinions addressed the same claim. Computer-based tasks were the key to foster language improvement among them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student A</td>
<td>Im gonna tell you about my experience in language learning with technology... it has been amazing because I'm one of those people that use a lot of technology. The activities in English central are so funny... when I use Voxopop™, I talk in Voxopop™, I can hear my pronunciation and it is so amazing 'cause I can find the mistake when I talking, all those things that help me to be a good speaker in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>Hi, I think I will learn more using technology because is simple, funny and interesting. I think if I use technology for learn English I will learn more easy but a problem with that is a lot of people use it for cheating like the Google traductor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student E</td>
<td>I think that technology in the learning process is very important... this also attracts attention, it is great is something different, is a change, is always to write sentences or write another work. You learn very easy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excerpt 9. Transcripts from Final recording

The above transcripts support Beatty’s (2010) idea that computer-tasks allow for greater learner autonomy because “unlike a teacher, they are available beyond the time and space confines of the classroom; a learner who wishes to revise and extend his/her learning at any time and any place” (p. 153). Students also claimed that the use of technology encouraged them to use speaking beyond the classroom. It also changes the dynamic of language learning.

The use of Web 2.0 tools engaged users in taking advantage of language learning tools. It appeared to be the vehicle to making language learning meaningful. As students were able to record their voices at home, it seemed to lower the anxiety that students experiment when speaking in class. In the face to face session, students were reluctant to participate in speaking tasks due to affective factors (Brown, 2007). Students seemed to lack confidence when using the target language. As participant E claimed in the above excerpt, students were exposed to book-based practices that did not encourage them to use the language meaningfully. Interestingly, the researcher observed that the use of Voxopop helped student confidence using the language. Gradually, students were more comfortable using English in the classroom. However, it is necessary to carry out a longer study to finally get students accustomed using English to communicate within the classroom. As the students moved from one recording/stage to another, the transcripts showed that students progressively acquired a more accurate use of language. Comparing the original transcript to the final one, students seemed to be confident producing more structured sentences. The initial recordings showed basic and short answers, in comparison to the last ones, which showed a progressive improvement of language vocabulary and accuracy at a sentence-structure level.
5.3.3 Core category

To identify the core category for this study, a constant comparison procedure (Corbin and Strauss 2014) was followed. This process aimed to analyze, reduce the data, and find a frequency of patterns. The analysis of the three main categories obtained from the coding process suggested a close relationship between students’ awareness of their language improvement process by using web 2.0 tools. Therefore, the core category emerged: Raising-awareness of the accurate use of spoken language by means of technology (web 2.0 tools). The continuous self-assessment process that participants were exposed to happened to be a trigger for self-awareness in spoken language production. The implementation process nurtured participant’s learning process since students had the opportunity to monitor their progress, reflect upon their weakness and identify their strengths. The researcher identified language improvement by listening and comparing students recording. Participants’ responses in the learning logs and recordings revealed that students felt more confident when speaking since they had the opportunity to self-assess their work. Within this study, technology was not only a tool to promote spoken accuracy, but it also constituted a methodological element that triggered spoken language interaction in a stress-free environment.

5.4 Conclusion

The results of this study have shown that the use of self-assessment strategies and technology as means of language improvement had a positive impact on student oral performance. Concerning grammar accuracy, the process of self-monitoring allowed students to construct well-formed utterances. However, this led to mispronunciation issues (most of the cases regarding the pronunciation of the “ED” sound for regular verbs in the past form). On the other hand, technology (web 2.0 tools) helped student performance in different aspects. First, it
changed the dynamics of the English class as the use of Voxopop™ and English central
introduced different ways to use language meaningfully. Additionally, students seemed to be
motivated in language learning as they were able to see (listen to) their progress throughout the
audio recordings. This language improvement was evident in the post-implementation classes, as
the students were more eager to participate in the face to face sessions.
Chapter 6: Conclusions and pedagogical implications

6.1 Introduction

This study examined the role of self-assessment strategies and Web 2.0 tools on speaking accuracy of the simple past tense in a group of tenth graders from a public school in Bogota-Colombia. In general terms, this project was organized under a systematic procedure: in-class instruction, input activities, recording sessions (Voxopop™) and self-assessment checklists and logs. This same cycle was repeated on seven different occasions. The results concluded that the use of self-assessment practices helped students to become aware of their language learning process. The use of technology (Web 2.0 tools) contributed to maximizing participant’s self-confidence, which led to more participation both, asynchronously and in the face to face sessions.

In this chapter, the conclusions derived from the data analysis led the researcher to corroborate two significant EFL learning issues. Firstly, self-assessment practices cause EFL oral communication to improve concerning grammar accuracy. As stated by Rodriguez (2007) “Through the implementation of self-assessment both students and teachers could achieve a much deeper recognition of the weaknesses and strengths they have in the complex process of teaching and learning English” (p.230). Secondly, Web 2.0 tools contributed to decrease the level of anxiety when using oral language. They also provided students with tools to use the language outside the classroom.

The results of this study were analyzed to assess their relevance for the EFL context in Colombia. These results support the conclusion that such strategies improve students’ language accuracy, since they encouraged participants to reflect upon their spoken performance and to take specific actions to improve it.
This final section of the research examines significant results and limitations that were present through the process. Further research into methods for improving student’s oral proficiency will also be discussed in this chapter.

### 6.2 Comparison of results with those previous studies’ results

Speaking has been a significant concern among EFL researchers (Brown, 1994). This project departs from generalities by focusing specifically on the spoken accuracy of simple past statements. Results found at the end of this implementation have shown that this group of students from high school had the opportunity to improve their spoken accuracy while talking about past experiences. Also, the researcher concluded that factors such as self-reliance, confidence and language awareness assisted students in increasing the rate of speaking. A large class size characterizes state-funded schools in Colombia. Hence, developing speaking skills in the classroom has been one of the most difficult challenges for English language teachers in Colombia. The researcher acknowledges that the strategies did not impact the whole group but show moderate improvement in the majority of the participants which led to conclude that spending more time on those strategies may result in students reaching higher levels of spoken accuracy. In this regard, accuracy and fluency in speech seem to be intertwined. Brand and Götz (2011) results showed that those concepts are closely related. Although the participants in this research project did not improve their fluency to the same degree that the subjects in their study did, the participants were better able to improve not only some fluency aspect such as pause, speed, and repairs but also they were able to identify mistakes in tense agreement across clauses.

Locally, different studies have been conducted in an attempt to tackle speaking issues through self-assessment strategies. A study conducted by Sanchez (2012) for instance, showed
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Evidence that participants increased involvement in their learning by monitoring their progress. Similarly, Leander’s (2012) project found that the process of peer feedback proved to be useful for the participants as they became aware of the importance of analyzing their performance instead of writing for teacher comments or approval. Ojedas’s (2012) project found that learners became more aware of their most salient mistakes and learned to detect them as they spoke by self-assessing their work. The present action research project displayed similar results. Participants were able to judge their oral performance through self-assessment practices; they were also able to adjust/modify their spoken production bearing in mind their spotted mistakes. In this process, students seemed to be less dependent on teacher’s assessment. Moving from teacher-centered classes to a student-centered one implies providing students with the role of assessing their production. The negative aspects are also similar. Students who were not committed to the activities/assessment proposed were not able to achieve the expected results.

Technology as a vehicle for language improvement and motivation was another factor that this project shared with different researcher findings. Hussain et al. (2010) findings suggested that the use of new technologies bring new opportunities for designing, developing and implementing innovative teaching methods in the classroom. The use of technology positively impacted learners as the tech-tool allowed students to achieve better language skills. Similarly, YanJun (2008) study concluded that technology-enhanced language learning changes the dynamic of the English classroom instruction. Technology allowed the teacher to deliver a more effective and valuable learning experience to meet student’s needs. This idea converges with similar studies such as those reported by Cakir (2006), Mancera (2014) and Boisvert and Rao (2014) who evidenced that audio/video recording allowed teacher and students to assess, monitor, observe while improving their performance over the time. Those results were confirmed
in this project as learners claimed that technology was a key part of language improvement as it allowed students to use language meaningfully. It also helped teachers to create a more student-friendly environment that led to a more enjoyable learning experience.

6.3 Significance of the results

The use of self-assessment strategies as a learning tool was one of the most important results from this project. Despite being an unfamiliar strategy for all the students, it became a tool for improvement. The constant use of checklists, rubrics and self-assessment logs allowed students to become aware of their learning process. According to Butler & Lee (2010) self-assessment has two aspects to be considered: “measurement and learning”. The former centers on the best way to measure the student’s degree of understanding or their mastery of knowledge/skills. This aspect of assessment is often used in the EFL classrooms. The latter relates to its potential role in advancing student learning “by providing students with opportunities to evaluate their performance as well as giving them feedback based on the results of their assessment; students can become more aware of their learning process and performance (p. 6). This was not an easy task to achieve. At the beginning of the project, it was necessary to train students on the use of self-assessment tools. Students reacted negatively as they asked how this self-assessment process would affect or not their score/grades in the English class. This attitude towards summative assessment is a commonality among students at IECS. However, at the end of the process students seemed to be more aware of their role in language improvement. Thus, it can be argued that this “skill” (self-awareness in learning) can be transferable to other classroom subjects and within the student’s daily life.

Most participants of this project showed evidence of improvement in language accuracy regarding the use of past tenses to talk about their experiences. This aspect represents a
significant result as it provided answers to the research questions. However, the use of self-assessment stages led to unexpected results. During the implementation stage, the students received in-class instruction regarding the simple past tense. After their recordings, students self-assessed their performance taking into consideration grammatical rules taught in class. This process led to mispronunciation and fluency problems. Some students tended to make emphasis on the "ED" sound at the end of the regular verbs in the past form. This behavior suggests that students were aware of the grammar rules for past tense. However, this "over-awareness" led them either to make their utterances challenging to understand or to overgeneralization mistakes. Similarly, student fluency was to some extent affected. When students wanted to talk about their experiences, they were more likely to go over the utterance in their mind before actually saying it. This issue is something worthy to investigate on further projects.

6.4 Limitations of the present study

Although self-assessment had many advantages in the EFL classroom, it was difficult for some students to assess their progress. They constantly asked the teacher to approve or disapprove their work. As the teacher/researcher role was as a facilitator rather than an evaluator, the lack of explicit feedback caused an adverse effect on those students as they stopped recording their voices. Students needed to be exposed to more formative assessment strategies as some students tended to be over-dependent on grades and the teacher’s explicit feedback. A student-centered curriculum could empower students to become aware of their role and responsibility as learners.

Technology (hardware and software) was another limitation. The project required students to access a platform designed by the researcher. In this website, students had to access to the two web 2.0 tools and self-assessment checklists and students learning logs. The primary
and most important activity was the student’s recordings that they had to provide using Voxopop™. The recording sessions were not possible to perform at school due to the lack of sufficient computers and headphones available. The demographics of this project consisted of 39 students, but the computer room only had twenty-five available. This lack of resources led to a more complicated issue: time for data collection.

The recording sessions took place outside of school. This situation had an impact on data collection during the implementation stage. To gather information, students had to complete the set of activities proposed in the lesson plans. All the recording sessions went as expected, some of the students could complete their activities while others completed them only partially. Unfortunately, the data from these students had to be discarded as there was not enough evidence to analyze. This action research project might have yielded more reliable results if the recording sessions had been conducted in the school English lab.

### 6.5 Further research

Despite the fact that students were able to construct more complex utterances at the end of the implementation process, the findings made it clear that there is lack of vocabulary. Thus, it would be advisable for further research to investigate vocabulary retention and use. Analysis of vocabulary retention might help learners in two different aspects: constructing more complex utterances and better expressing their ideas using the target language.

Another critical element to investigate is related to the shifting from grammar accuracy in speech to discourse. As the present project shows, students achieved a better understanding of the grammatical patterns in the simple past tenses. However, this “overemphasis” on grammar accuracy, led to mispronunciation and intonation problems. It would be advisable to continue with this project with a new focus: shifting from grammar in speaking to discourse.
like this might help learners to go beyond the boundaries of grammar to real-time communication. The latter could also be studied in further research: The use of technology to foster real-time communication. The current project asked students to record their voices and self-assess their production. Incidentally, this was individual work. Using similar elements from this project but aiming to foster peer-communication would provide students with new scenarios to use the language meaningfully.

6.6 Conclusion

Assessment is a process that cannot be taken for granted. It is crucial for any educational procedure. However, some students and teachers tend to associate assessment as means of grading rather than an opportunity for learning. Thus, variations of assessments (peer and self) need to be explored more thoroughly in the EFL community. Self-assessment strategies, for instance, could be the path that leads students to become autonomous learners. This project aimed to direct the students to use self-assessment strategies in the classroom to foster oral language improvement. Some students might not reach a significant level of language improvement, but all learners self-evaluated their performance. This process gave students ownership of their language improvement process. The results presented in this project could be replicated in different contexts. The use of self-assessment in the educational process could lead to a different perspective on language teaching and learning processes for both students and teachers in the EFL community.
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Appendix A: Students’ initial samples.

INSTITUCION EDUCATIVA COMPARTIR SUBA

AUDIO RECORDING FORM 1

Topic: “Let’s talk about past experiences”

Date August 15 2013

Class description:

In this class students were asked to talk about a past experience whether good or bad. The aim of this activity was to obtain samples of the students’ oral performance.

Samples:

Student (AN):

Hello (pause) my story is three days ago, I out to the street with my friends to “practique” skate {…} in this time I go to seventh street falling in the ground I smack in my foot, in my head and in my finger. Is a good time. {…} my friends teach me “sobre” another things to skate {…} there we skate all day to sixteen o clock (pause) sixty o clock and back to my home.

Student (AF):

I don’t preparate nothing so I tell you what I did yesterday. Yesterday first I was in social service in the morning for eight am and to eleven am. After I go, went to my home and have breakfast {…} after this I playing in the ps3, a lot of time like an hour so {…} I leave, left the colleague, the school, go to my house, I watch tv, play in the tablet and watched more to be, then I went to sleep (pause) slept for 5 minutes or fifty or something like this and after I connect to facebook and chat for two or two and half hours… that was my yesterday.

Student (AD):
My experience is about the dogs. Two days ago my father and a neighbor adopt a little dog of the street, the dog is a girl, I beautiful {...} another experience is a dream of me I was James bond I am save the world and I was happy in the dream this is all.

**Student (AL):**

{...} Another experience is two, three years ago my parents give the dog for my birthday.

**Student (G):**

One day I don’t like take a shower and my mother drag me for the carpet {...} other experience about one day my brother made me “loud maximus loud ever” and I was drink grape juice for the nose {...} other experience when I was a little child I like so much view the Harry Potter’s movies because are so amazing and is magic for me and I feel completely with Harry …
Appendix B: Self-assessment checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIO</th>
<th>SIEMPRE</th>
<th>CASI SIEMPRE</th>
<th>ALGUNAS VEces</th>
<th>CASI NUNCA</th>
<th>NUNCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumplío con todas las actividades asignadas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigo las indicaciones dadas para desarrollar cada una de las actividades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregunto a mi profesor cuando tengo dudas o dificultades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizo correctamente las estructuras de pasado simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugo correctamente los verbos cuando hablo de situaciones pasadas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizo correctamente el auxiliar “DID” en la formulación de preguntas y oraciones negativas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi vocabulario es acorde con los temas trabajados en clase y las actividades en voxpop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi pronunciación hace que mi opinión entendible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puedo expresarme espontáneamente sobre hechos pasados</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Students’ Learning Log

STUDENT LEARNING LOG

Lo que más disfrute del uso de voxpop fue:

Lo que me pareció más complicado del uso de voxpop fue:

Las actividades de autoevaluación me parecieron muy útiles porque...

El uso de voxpop me ayudó a fortalecer...

El uso de la tecnología en el aprendizaje del inglés me parece...

Luego de las actividades en clase y voxpop aprendí...

Como podría mejorar mi pronunciación utilizando tecnología
### Appendix D: Self-assessment checklist

**Self-assessment checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIO</th>
<th>SIEMPRE</th>
<th>CASI SIEMPRE</th>
<th>ALGUNAS VECES</th>
<th>CASI NUNCA</th>
<th>NUNCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumplí con todas las actividades asignadas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigo las indicaciones dadas para desarrollar cada una de las actividades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregunto a mi profesor cuando tengo dudas o dificultades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizo correctamente las estructuras de pasado simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugo correctamente los verbos cuando hablo de situaciones pasadas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizo correctamente el auxiliar “DID” en la formulación de preguntas y oraciones negativas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi vocabulario es acorde con los temas trabajados en clase y las actividades en voxpap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi pronunciación hace que mi opinión entendible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puedo expresarme espontáneamente sobre hechos pasados</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Assessment Rubric

**Voxopop Presentations Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categoría</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gramática</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi no cometí errores usando la estructura de pasado simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construyo oraciones básicas utilizando la estructura de pasado simple. Evidencio algunos problemas de gramática</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tengo dificultades utilizando la estructura de pasado simple. Mis oraciones no son gramaticalmente correctas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autoevaluación</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrigo los errores cometidos y reflexiono acerca de ellos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algunas veces corrijo los errores cometidos y reflexiono acerca de</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi nunca corrijo mis errores que mi profesor o mis compañeros me ha indicado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pronunciación</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi pronunciación es correcta y clara. Mis compañeros entienden todo lo que digo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aun con algunos errores en pronunciación, lo que quiero decir es claro para mis compañeros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En un poco difícil para mis compañeros entender que quiero decir debido a la pronunciación de algunas palabras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
# Appendix F: Lesson Plan Pre-implementation

## LESSON PLAN

**Week 1 and 2 – February 24 - March 3 - March 5**  
“Exploration Stage”

**NAME:** XXXXXXX  
**COURSE:** 10th Grade  
**Expected Time:** Session 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIM</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>INTERACTIVE RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • To show students the use of the platform, Voxopop and English central  
• Explore the use of USE OF 2.0 TOOLS | • “Let’s explore our Wix page”  
• “How to use the tech toys” VOXOPOP and ENGLISH CENTRAL | Technology lab:  
• WIX page  
• Voxopop  
• English Central |

### UNDERSTANDING GOALS

Students will develop understanding of:

- Following the activities plan in the platform.
- Opening an account in English central and Voxopop.
- Recording the activities in Voxopop.
- Filling out the self-assessment check list.

### PROCEDURE

In this first session, the teacher will take the students to the technology laboratory. Using a video beam the teacher will present the platform to the students.

The teacher will explain each feature of the platform. He will give them the password and the links needed to complete the tasks.

**Group work:**

As soon as the general revision is completed, students will be asked to explore the platform. All the questions arise will be solved by the teacher.

**Individual work:**

Students will be asked to open an account in Voxopop and English central. The teacher will assist all those students who have difficulties opening the accounts. Students will be asked to join the groups already created for them in the platform. (Voxopop and English Central)

**Homework**

Students will be asked to make recording test. In this recording they will have to comment on how the tasks and activities proposed look like so far. The aim of this activity will be to identify specific problems students experienced when recording or accessing to the platform.
# Appendix G: Lesson Plan During-implementation

## LESSON PLAN

### Week 1 and 2 – February 24 - March 3 - March 10-14  “A wonderful experience”

**NAME:** XXXXXXX  **COURSE:** 10th Grade  **Expected Time:** Session 4 to 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIM</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>INTERACTIVE RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TECHNOLOGY USE IN SPEAKING ACCURACY</td>
<td>“A wonderful experience”</td>
<td>Classroom work:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Notebook and English Textbook (Next Step 10th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNING OBJECTIVE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent work:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to extend their vocabulary by linking it with past experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>- WIX platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- English Central activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Voxopop Recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Self-assessment check list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANGUAGE OBJECTIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to use accurately the past form of the verbs when describing past events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATIVE OBJECTIVE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are expected to record themselves describing a wonderful experience they had had. Using the past simple tense.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UNDESTARTING GOALS

Students will develop understanding of:
Using the simple past structures to talk about experiences in the past

### PROCEDURE

In order to set the scene, the teacher will write a question on the board: “What did you do last night?”

Students will have to ask each other then one of them will report to the class. All the students’ expression will be written on the whiteboard.

After brainstorming, the teacher will ask students to focus on the verbs forms.
In order to focus on use and form there will be grammar explanation. The teacher will write a grammar chart on the board focusing on five regular verbs (watch, invite, play, study, chat). The grammar chart will include affirmative and negative statements.

After completing the chart, students will be asked to write down the activities his/her parent did last night. They will be asked to write five different facts. Students will be asked to share their work with the student next to him/her.

In order to prepare students for the recording session, students will be asked to think about a wonderful experience they had. They will be asked to write down the vocabulary they might need to make a description of that moment. Then, they will be asked to write the main facts of that moment.

Homework - Asynchronous Session

Using the platform (WIX) students will have to do the following:

1. Students will have to complete the activities in the group created in English central.
2. Record a wonderful experience they had bearing in mind the past structures from the class and activities of English central
3. Fill out the self-assessment checklist provided on WIX.
Appendix H: Website Screenshot
## Appendix I: Matrix Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument 1</th>
<th>Instrument 2</th>
<th>Instrument 3</th>
<th>Instrument 4</th>
<th>Haga1</th>
<th>Haga2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language proficiency</td>
<td>Language proficiency</td>
<td>Language proficiency</td>
<td>Language proficiency</td>
<td>Language proficiency</td>
<td>Language proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language proficiency</td>
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<td>Language proficiency</td>
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<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Language proficiency</td>
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<td>Language proficiency</td>
<td>Language proficiency</td>
<td>Language proficiency</td>
<td>Language proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
</tr>
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<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
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<td>Pronunciation</td>
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